

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



23

E.H.C. 11
E/CN.4/CR.473
14 May 1952
ORIGINAL ATTACHED

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Eighth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-THIRD MEETING

Hold at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 29 April 1952, at 2.30 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Draft international covenants on human rights and measures of implementation: part III of the draft covenant drawn up by the Commission at its seventh session (basic documentation as in E/CN.4/CR.268; also E/CN.4/L.54/Rev.2, E/CN.4/L.55; E/CN.4/L.56/Rev.1, E/CN.4/L.65/Rev.1, E/CN.4/L.70, E/CN.4/L.71, E/CN.4/L.72, E/CN.4/L.73) (continued)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. MALIK	(Lebanon)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. WETTLAK	Australia
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. NISOT	Belgium
	Mr. SANTA CRUZ)	Chile
	Mrs. FIGUEROA)	
	Mr. CHENG PACHAN	China
	AZMI Bey	Egypt
	Mr. CASSIN	France

Members (continued):

Mr. KYROU	Greece
Mrs. NEHTA	India
Mr. AZKOUL	Lebanon
Mr. WAJEED	Pakistan
Mr. BORATYNSKI	Poland
Mrs. ROSSEL	Sweden
Mr. KOVALENKO	Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic
Mr. KORCZOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. HOARE	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Mrs. ROOSEVELT	United States of America
Mr. BRACCO	Uruguay
Mr. JEVREKVIC	Yugoslavia

Also present:

Miss K'NAJ Commission on the Status of Women

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. MORELLET	}	International Labour Organisation (ILO)
Mr. PICKFORD		
Mr. HILL		World Health Organization (WHO)
Mr. ARNALDO		United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category A:

Miss ZENDER	}	International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU)
Mr. LEARY		
Miss KAJDI		World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU)

/Category B:

Category B:

Mrs. VERGARA	Catholic International Union for Social Service
Mr. HERNSTEIN	Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations
Mrs. PARSONS	International Council of Women
Dr. SOUDAN	International Federation of Business and Professional Women
Miss SCHEFFER	International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues
Dr. ROBB	Litonic Committee of Women's International Organizations
Mr. JACOBY	World Jewish Congress
Mrs. FAPPAN) Mrs. FOLSTEIN)	World Union for Progressive Judaism

Secretariat:

Mr. HUMPHREY	Representative of the Secretary-General
Mr. DAS Miss KITCHEN	Secretaries of the Commission

DRAFT INTERNATIONAL COVENANTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND MEASURES OF IMPLEMENTATION:
PART III OF THE DRAFT COVENANT DRAWN UP BY THE COMMISSION AT ITS SEVENTH SESSION
(basic documentation as in E/CK.4/SR.258; also E/CN.4/L.54/Rev.2, E/CN.4/L.55,
E/CN.4/L.55/Rev.1, E/CN.4/L.65/Rev.1, E/CN.4/L.70, E/CK.4/L.71, E/CN.4/L.72,
E/CN.4/L.73)(continued)

General clause (continued)

Mr. KYROU (Greece) supposed that the time limit set for the submission of draft amendments to part III of the draft covenant and amendments to them, the evening of 30 April 1952, would not apply to article 32, dealing with limitations, as its form and content would obviously depend on what decisions were taken about the preceding articles.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that the time limit could not apply strictly to article 32.

/s/ Mr. AZKOU

Mr. AZKOU (Lebanon) thought that the time limit should be more flexible, as further amendment might be required as the result of texts adopted for other articles. He proposed that the Commission should reconsider its decision on time limits.

The CHAIRMAN said that the time limit for proposals and amendments might be extended to 10.30 a.m. on the morning of 1 May 1952; the Lebanese representative should move his proposal again only if the need for it arose in connexion with any particular article.

It was so agreed.

Mr. KYROU (Greece) entirely agreed with the United Kingdom representative's observation at the previous meeting that the use of the word "progressively" in the revised United States proposal (E/CN.4/L.54/Rev.2) could not be reconciled with the terms of paragraph 2 of the revised Polish amendment to it (E/CN.4/L.65/Rev.1) and that those who wished the idea behind the word "progressively" to be incorporated in the general clause could not vote for the Polish amendment. The Lebanese amendment (E/CN.4/L.73) was an attempt at compromise but the United States wording was to be preferred, because the word "guarantee" in the Lebanese text was too far-reaching and might seem to be placing upon States obligations which they might very well be unable to fulfil. The words "take steps" in the United States proposal were more guarded and nearer to what could reasonably be expected to occur, whereas "guarantee" might even be construed to mean that every signatory State would guarantee that the rights were ensured on the territory of all other States, which would obviously not be feasible.

Mr. MDROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wondered why the representative of Lebanon had taken it upon himself to explain why the United States representative had submitted her revised proposal (E/CN.4/L.54/Rev.2), particularly as his explanations had been most unconvincing. They had failed to convince him that the United States proposal as it now stood adequately reflected all the ideas in the original general clause, article 1 of the Commission's draft at its seventh session (E/992). The words taken from it had lost their original meaning by being taken out of their original context.

/The idea

The idea behind the phrase "and subject to its jurisdiction" in paragraph 1 of that article had not been incorporated in the United States text. If the assurance of rights referred to in paragraph 1 was not followed by legislative measures, as laid down in paragraph 2, it would be impossible to ensure the remedies specified in paragraph 3. The use of the word "or" in the phrase "legislative or other means" in the United States text in place of the word "and" as used in the original article 1, paragraph 2, meant that the remedies specified in paragraph 3 of article 1 of the draft covenant would not be enforceable. Thus, the revised United States text had made no real move closer to the Polish text or to the original article 1. They still differed basically in principle. Article 1 of the draft covenant or that text as reflected in the Polish amendment was closer to the General Assembly's expressed wish that the draft covenant should be an instrument for the better implementation of the Declaration of Human Rights. It was hard to see, in fact, why the Lebanese representative had tried to show how close the United States text was to the original, when the United States representative herself had pointed out the differences, emphasizing that a declaration of rights was one thing but that their implementation was quite another matter. The United States representative had gone on to emphasize the dangers of undertaking obligations with regard to economic, social and cultural rights. He agreed with that representative that the Commission should be realistic: what the United States delegation was in fact proposing was once more an empty declaration of rights without adequate implementation.

The whole trouble and the need for quibbling had arisen from trying to draft an introductory clause before the Commission knew what articles that clause was to introduce. The Commission should, however, at least make up its mind that it would not adopt anything less far-reaching than what it had already adopted at its previous sessions. There was nothing unrealistic or exaggerated about the principles already embodied in the draft, nor about such amendments as that which the USSR delegation had submitted to article 20 (E/CH.4/L.45); to guarantee the creation of conditions precluding any danger of death from hunger or inanition was not an unrealistic aim. If, however, the United States proposal was accepted, that elementary right would have to be denied. At least the United States delegation was quite frank about that, a great improvement on some

/delegations'

delegations' resort to pettifoggery. It might well be that the United States Government could not guarantee any such right, but the United States was not the only Member of the United Nations and many of those Members would hardly agree with the strange view that the Commission's efforts were worthless because governments could not ensure the enforcement of elementary human rights. Such articles as articles 21 and 25 in their existing form, stating elementary rights that all governments should be able to enforce, regardless of their structure, were not the result of proposals made exclusively by the USSR delegation but of general agreement after collective discussion. These rights could easily be enforced immediately if the world ended the existing armaments race and increased trade between all countries; not merely such simple rights, but a great programme to implement all human rights for the benefit of hundreds of millions of people could thus be achieved. All that the USSR delegation was proposing was that the Commission should say that it was high time for those States which had done little or nothing to ensure economic, social and cultural rights to begin to do something. It was to be hoped that any members who were thinking of voting for the United States proposal would bear in mind that they would thereby be showing that they were opposed to ensuring even the most elementary economic, social and cultural rights.

The United States and other delegations had for three years been trying to flout the wishes of the General Assembly with regard to the draft covenants. For three years, as the record showed, they had in the Commission on Human Rights been attempting to postpone any final draft. What provisions had been drafted had been forced through against the United States delegation's bitter opposition, particularly article 25, the revision of which the United States delegation had said it would propose. The Commission was at length engaged in drafting the covenants under extreme pressure from the General Assembly. The Assembly, in instructing the Commission to prepare two draft covenants, had also asked it to include as many similar provisions as possible in each of them; but the Commission was now being asked to adopt a mere empty declaration. If the general clause was adopted in the form proposed by the United States delegation, the succeeding articles would be stillborn.

/The United States

The United States delegation was making its attack on fundamental economic, social and cultural rights, but it was an attack nonetheless. It contended that the under-developed countries would not be able to implement those rights; but very few under-developed countries made that contention or supported it, and many were quite willing to accept the covenant. If it was precisely the so-called advanced countries which most strongly opposed the implementation of the economic, social and cultural rights, it was because they were not in fact so advanced as they claimed to be, because they could not fully implement those rights even in their own territory, and because they wished to continue to hold many under-developed countries in economic slavery to them.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that his delegation had not changed its mind about the third amendment proposed in the paper it had submitted (E/CN.4/L.71), but thought that its intention could be better served by a separate vote on the word "progressively" in the revised United States amendment (E/CN.4/L.54/Rev.2). He wished to appeal to the representatives of India and Pakistan, whose Governments were trying to achieve social and economic progress in their countries and were anxious to fulfil the aims set forth in the draft covenant. Their contention that the under-developed countries would find it impossible to ensure the implementation of all rights immediately was met by two phrases in the revised United States proposal, "take steps" and "to the maximum of its available resources". That meant that they did not have to implement the rights immediately and that they must do so only within the limits of their available resources; and there was the further limitation in the phrase "through international co-operation". If, however, the word "progressively" was added, the assurance of the rights would become illusory. For example, article 20 was surely one which they would wish to enforce immediately and sub-paragraph (c) of article 21 surely could also be enforced at once. In the latter no number of hours of work was specified, merely "a reasonable limitation of working hours" and no specific period for holidays, merely "periodic holidays". The same applied to other articles, in particular articles 25, 26, 28 and 29. But if the word

/"progressively"

"progressively" was retained, the beginning of implementation could be postponed indefinitely. It would be much more logical to follow the text of the draft covenant and establish limitations for each country concerned in accordance with its national income, stage of development, available resources and similar factors. The limitations might be established in each article separately, whenever required, but not all articles would require it.

Replying to the Lebanese representative at the previous meeting, the United States representative had stated that in her draft the non-discrimination clause was governed by the phrases "take steps", "to the maximum of its available resources" and "progressively". The Lebanese amendment (E/CN.4/L.73) clearly showed, by placing that clause in a separate paragraph, that the United States text as it stood was unacceptable. The United States representative had said that some forms of discrimination, in particular with regard to sex, could not be changed immediately by law in face of established practice, and that the State could not therefore undertake any obligation in that respect. The Lebanese amendment, however, was not asking for an immediate ending of discrimination but that all possible measures should be taken to that end. The State did not guarantee to end crime if it had a constitutional or statutory prohibition of murder and robbery, but developed an apparatus to repress it. That could be true of the political and civil rights and of some social rights. The State would undertake the obligation to enact and enforce laws, carry out an educational campaign and punish breaches of the law, but no one could expect it to abolish discrimination overnight. It could begin the equalization of the sexes; but to say that that should be done progressively would imply legalizing inequality. The equality should be guaranteed by the State at the outset; it could later be fully enforced. His delegation would therefore vote for the Lebanese amendment and against the relevant part of the United States proposal.

In reply to the United Kingdom representative's observations, he would repeat that, if the Chilean amendment seemed to prejudice the other articles, it was that representative's fault for insisting that the general clause should be discussed before the articles. If it turned out that no specific obligations were included in the articles, it would always be possible

/to return

to return to the proviso he was suggesting and delete it. But it would have been better not to have a general clause in the form proposed and to write specific obligations into the particular articles wherever necessary.

AZMI Bey (Egypt) commended the Lebanese amendment which related to the vital question of whether States wished to implement human rights for their entire populations. He reserved the right to discuss the substance of the matter in connexion with the federal clause. The position taken up by the United States showed that it did not intend to ensure economic, social and cultural rights to its population as a whole and that it linked progressive implementation with the suppression of discrimination. The Egyptian delegation therefore opposed the United States text and would support the Lebanese amendment. If that amendment was defeated, the Egyptian delegation would vote against the word "progressively" in a separate vote because it objected to having progressive implementation linked with discrimination.

Referring to the Greek comment regarding "guarantee" in the Lebanese text, he said that the intention of the Lebanese amendment was obviously that each State would guarantee the exercise of the rights enunciated in the covenant within its own borders. If each State made such a commitment individually, a general guarantee of those rights would be achieved among the Contracting Parties.

In his opinion the opening phrase of the Chilean amendment was an inevitable consequence of the Commission's illogical decision to study the general clause before considering the other articles, contrary to the procedure adopted in connexion with Part II at the seventh session. In the light of the USSR representative's request that the Commission alter its procedure and the United Kingdom representative's suggestion that the Commission should enter into a gentlemen's agreement to return to the general article at a later stage, he pointed out that the Commission might remedy its error by agreeing to defer the vote on the general article until a decision had been reached on the other articles.

Referring to the recommendations of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, he stated that a proposal which would have the result of requiring governments to ignore the fact of illegitimacy in official documents was not within the scope of the Commission's work

/in connexion

in connexion with the covenant. The implications of the question were serious and at a later stage the Commission might give it consideration and, if it so desired, adopt a resolution on the subject. In the matter of legitimacy raised by the Sub-Commission, he felt that the texts proposed were adequate. He pointed out that Egyptian legislation did not recognize the existence of illegitimacy, and that he was not therefore speaking with reference to Egypt.

He reserved the position of the Egyptian delegation on the Polish amendment.

Mr. WAHEED (Pakistan) was grateful to the representative of the United Kingdom who had emphasized the difference between the United States and the Polish texts and the impossibility of integrating the two. While it was fully aware of the differences in approach, and of the fact that article 1 had not been drafted with the present part III in mind, the delegation of Pakistan concluded that the two texts were not compatible. It firmly adhered to the use of "progressively" but felt that that idea was not excluded from article 1. It therefore requested that the two texts should be put to the vote in due course.

It was significant that the Commission had decided to consider both articles 1 and 19 at that stage. Pakistan had constitutional means providing for effective remedy in the broad field of social and economic rights. It was essential for the Commission to draft those rights with great precision to make them justiciable.

He hoped that the United States position on discrimination could be made clear and that the unfortunate impressions it had caused could be removed.

In reply to the representative of Chile, he stated that legislative measures were not the only relevant factor but that implementation which required certain types of resources was also essential. In the light of the difficulties and needs, particularly of under-developed countries, the delegation of Pakistan would support the word "progressively" in the United States text as representing a realistic position.

Mr. NISOT (Belgium) shared the misgivings expressed by the representative of Greece in connexion with the word "guarantee" in the Lebanese text (E/CN.4/L.73). If it was to be understood in its legal sense it might well be asked how a State could guarantee the enforcement of its obligations under the covenant. What guarantee, surety or pledge could it be expected to give?

He took the opportunity to stress the importance of article 32, the wording of which would affect the scope of article 1 as well as of other articles.

The CHAIRMAN stated that inter-action of the various articles must constantly be kept in mind. A reservation had been accepted in connexion with article 32 and, if necessary, the Commission would reconsider article 1. Obviously the regulative articles would apply to the entire Covenant and the Commission would have to ascertain the terms of such articles in relation to the rest of the Covenant.

Mr. NISOT (Belgium) asked whether, as he believed, the votes on the articles would be considered as having for the time being a provisional, a kind of conditional, character.

The CHAIRMAN replied that all votes would be final unless the Commission decided otherwise.

Mr. AZKOUT (Lebanon) said in reply to the representative of the USSR that he had questioned the USSR objection to the word "or" in the United States text when that word occurred in the second paragraph of the Polish text, which in that respect was in no way different from the United States text. Moreover the representative of the United States had later agreed to substitute "as well as" for the word "or".

In the Lebanese amendment, he had no objection to eliminating the word "guarantee" provided that a substitute text made it clear that States formally undertook to ensure rights not merely to recognize them as in the United States text. Immediate responsibility must be taken in connexion with non-discrimination.

If the Polish motion for deletion of the word "progressively" was not adopted, he would submit a verbal amendment for the substitution of the words "to achieve more and more fully the exercise of the rights ...". That text retained the idea of progress but was not open to the same criticism. If that verbal amendment was rejected, he would request a separate vote on the word "progressively".

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) said that the United States delegation had not submitted any amendments to articles 20, 21, 22 or 23, while the USSR delegation had presented the same amendments to those articles as it had submitted in the past.

/The United States

The United States delegation was opposed to restrictive amendments by which the States alone guaranteed rights. The United States would like to go beyond preventing death from hunger and exhaustion and would, as in the past, oppose the USSR's amendment limiting article 20.

She confirmed that she had accepted the words "as well as" which in her opinion had the same meaning as "and" or "or".

In her opinion, the Lebanese amendment was acceptable except for the difficulty of guaranteeing immediate implementation of rights without discrimination of any kind. Despite good faith and willingness to adopt legislative and other measures, the United States would be unable to guarantee immediate compliance. It would be dangerous to undertake guarantees exceeding what could actually and realistically be accomplished.

She could not agree with the representative of Chile that the expression "to take steps" provided a sufficient safeguard and that consequently the word "progressively" was unnecessary. In her opinion that word was essential in the covenant on economic, social and cultural rights as well as in the covenant on political and civil rights. She had not yet considered the substitute for "progressively" suggested by the representative of Lebanon but if its meaning was the same she would accept it. The covenant should not however be misleading to a reader who was unfamiliar with the comments and explanations presented during its drafting.

Mrs. KEMTA (India) stated that the Commission's difficulty in drafting the first article justified the position of having a separate covenant for economic, social and cultural rights. A different approach was necessary. Obligations could not be fulfilled without human and material resources. Without sufficient teachers, for example, it would be impossible to implement the article on the right to education. It was therefore essential to have a reference to "available resources" and to "progressively". Despite the objections of some delegations to the inclusion of "progressively", she interpreted it to mean that States would go further and further gradually but not necessarily immediately. The word did not however justify delay in implementation if the human and economic resources were available.

Articles 23 and others in general terms to which the representative of Chile had referred had already been accepted as general principles in the Universal Declaration. The question of implementation involved more than mere acceptance of principle. The Indian delegation would therefore support the first paragraph of the United States proposal. It felt however that the elements of implementation and non-discrimination should appear in separate paragraphs of the same article. She would accept the Lebanese amendment as the second paragraph and noted that the amendment really signified ensuring implementation without discrimination.

Mr. BCRATYNSKI (Poland) remarked that he had not taken part in the general debate, but had merely briefly introduced his amendments, having thought it unnecessary to explain a text which was a reproduction of article 1 of the covenant adopted by the Commission at its seventh session and with which the Commission was therefore perfectly familiar. In his delegation's view, the State should be responsible for the realization of economic, social and cultural rights to the same extent as civil and political rights. It was surely unreasonable to say that the right to vote should be implemented immediately upon entry into force of the covenant, while the right to work should be implemented only in a distant future. The theory of progressive implementation, expounded by certain delegations, had not convinced him that there was a sound reason for postponing the realization of such basic human rights.

Paragraph 3 of the Polish amendment (E/CN.4/L.65/Rt 1) provided that any person whose rights had been violated should have an effective remedy; as many members, including the United States representative, had recognized that most economic rights would call for legislation, it was only reasonable to grant the right of redress in case that legislation was violated. The paragraph dealing with an effective remedy consequently applied as fully to the present covenant as to the covenant on civil and political rights, as the State was responsible to the same extent for the observance of all its laws.

/While there

While there was a basic difference of conception between the United States text and the Polish amendment to it, paragraph 2 of the latter met the point made at the morning meeting by the United States representative by making it clear that both legislative and "other measures" must, where necessary, be taken to give effect to the rights recognized in the covenant. The Polish amendment also specified that such measures must be taken in accordance with constitutional processes, as the Commission in the past had attached importance to that idea.

Mr. JEVRENOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation, faithful to its position, would vote against the United States text (E/CN.4/L.54/Rev.2) as it had at the last session voted against the text of article 19, since both contained the same limitations. The United States text provided at least three loopholes for States which wished to evade their obligations: according to it, each State party to the covenant undertook "to take steps" for the realization of the rights concerned, but not to guarantee those rights; such steps were to be taken "to the maximum of its available resources", permitting lack of resources to be pleaded at any time; and lastly, the rights were to be realized "progressively", thus allowing for infinite delays. If the Commission were to adopt such a text, it would be disobeying the General Assembly's injunction to improve the wording of the articles on economic and social rights "in order to protect more effectively the rights to which they refer" (resolution 544(VI)).

He agreed that under-developed countries might be unable to implement at once all the rights recognized in the covenant; the remedy for that, however, was not a general clause permitting all States to evade their responsibilities, but provisions in specific articles permitting only the under-developed countries to delay the full realization of the rights enunciated in those articles.

With reference to the United Kingdom representative's remarks, he said that an effective remedy should be provided against violations of labour legislation precisely as was planned for violations of civil and political rights. In the United Kingdom itself, there was a right of appeal against breaches of labour contracts; he saw no reason why that laudable practice
/should not

should not prevail everywhere else. The United States text made no mention of "effective remedy", but the Polish amendment to it reproduced the paragraph on that subject adopted by the Commission at its seventh session. He would vote for that amendment, since in so doing he would be voting for the Commission's own article.

Mr. CASSIN (France) remarked that it was proper for the Commission to discuss the general clause first at the present session, as it had considered all the subsequent articles the previous year and had a general idea of their content. The United Kingdom and Belgian representatives, however, had both drawn attention to the fact that the text adopted for other articles might require changes to be made in the general clause. He therefore thought that, as the Commission must submit to the General Assembly a draft covenant representing a harmonious whole, it would be wise to give the general clause a second reading after all the other articles had been completed.

He was unable to accept the Polish amendment, which summarily lifted out of its context article 1 of the covenant adopted at the seventh session. The right of appeal against violations of economic and social rights should, however, be granted in some form, and the Commission could deal with that subject after it had finished the articles enunciating these rights. In voting against the Polish amendment, he would be voting against the method suggested rather than rejecting the need for redress, whether in the domestic or the international plane.

He was strongly in favour of retaining the word "progressively", which had come to have the value of a principle and which derived -- like the covenant itself -- from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

While he sympathized with the Lebanese amendment (E/CN.4/L.73) to the United States text, he could not, in all honesty, vote for it as it stood. France was earnestly endeavouring to extend its system of social security and its labour laws to its overseas territories; but it would be unable to ratify the covenant if it thereby undertook to guarantee that the rights enunciated in it would be exercised without distinction of any kind. The Lebanese amendment had the merit of separating the two ideas, merged in the United States text, of progressive realization of rights and of non-discrimination as regards their exercise. He would be able to vote for the

/Lebanese

Lebanese amendment if the word "guarantee" was replaced by some such form of words as "take the necessary measures". He would also vote in favour of the first part of the United States text.

Mr. KYROU (Greece) thought that the word "steps" in the French representative's verbal amendment would be preferable to "measures", as it would include educational as well as legislative action.

Mr. KOVALENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, as the debate went on, the Commission appeared to lose sight of the fact that a Declaration of Human Rights had already been adopted, and that the time had come to prepare a covenant which would implement the rights proclaimed in the Declaration by imposing definite legal obligations on States.

Many amendments tending to make the rights recognized in the covenant more concrete had been misrepresented during the debate. Thus, the United States representative had said that she would be unable to accept the USSR amendment to article 20 (E/CN.4/L.45) because, with its minimum requirements, it constituted a limitation of the right to work. He feared, however, that the real objection of the United States was not to "precluding any danger of death from hunger or exhaustion", but to the earlier part of the amendment, which said that the State must guarantee the right to work in such a way as to preclude that danger. If he was mistaken, he would be glad to hear the United States representative say that she would accept the USSR amendment provided that the minimum requirements it contained were broadened.

The United States representative had also pointed out that her delegation had not submitted amendments to articles on economic, social and cultural rights, the inference being that it was satisfied with those rights. The trouble was that the United States delegation had submitted an amendment to the general clause which, if adopted, would so weaken the enunciation of those rights as to render the covenant as a whole completely ineffective. The United States, therefore, proposed a more drastic change than any other delegation.

/The United States

The United States delegation defended the limitations in the text of a general clause it had proposed by saying that its Government was unable to guarantee at once the enjoyment of the rights recognized in the covenant. Those were the rights to earn a living, to minimum pay and to social security, to name but a few. If enjoyment of those rights could not be guaranteed, the covenant would not perform the function laid upon it. The basic question to be solved by the Commission was to draft a covenant on economic, social and cultural rights which would really guarantee the enjoyment of those rights to all men everywhere.

Mr. MORSEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) moved the adjournment of the meeting.

The motion for adjournment was adopted by 12 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.