

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL
E/CN.6/SR.644
23 September 1976
ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

OCT 19 1976

COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN
UN/ISA COLLECTION

Twenty-sixth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 644th MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 22 September 1976, at 9.35 a.m.

Chairman: Mrs. GONZALEZ de CUADROS (Colombia)

CONTENTS

International instruments relating to the status of women (agenda item 3)
(continued)

(a) Draft convention on the elimination of discrimination against women
(continued)

Article 11 (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Participants wishing to make corrections should submit them in writing to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva, within one week of receiving the record in their working language.

Corrections to the records of the meetings of the Commission at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS RELATING TO THE STATUS OF WOMEN:

- (a) DRAFT CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN
(E/CN.6/574, 591 and Add.1; E/CN.6/L.680; E/CN.6/NGO/259)
(agenda item 3) (continued)

Article 11 (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to continue its consideration of article 11 of the draft convention and drew attention to the draft amendment to the alternative text of the article, submitted by the United States delegation (E/CN.6/L.680).
2. Mrs. COCKCROFT (United Kingdom) said that, subject to certain clarifications and drafting changes, her delegation preferred, as a working text, the alternative text as amended by the United States.
3. Mrs. HUSSEIN (Egypt) said it would be better to keep to what was essential and to disregard details of secondary importance that might prove an obstacle to the accession of certain States. Although, as had been said, the situation of women in rural areas should not be overlooked, there were many other questions which should also be taken into account: for example, part-time work, lower age for retirement, shortening of the working period giving entitlement to a pension, all matters which had not yet been settled at the international level. The value of the original text was partly due to the fact that it specified certain rights, such as the right to vocational training and advanced training referred to in sub-paragraph (d). In that respect the text of the alternative was much weaker. If the alternative text was chosen, it would be necessary to strengthen paragraph 2 (c) by including in it certain provisions of articles 13 and 14 concerning services for women.
4. Mrs. GUEYE (Senegal) said that she did not understand why certain delegations wished to retain the alternative text of article 11 and to drop articles 12, 13 and 14 and their alternative texts. Although, the alternative text of article 11 seemed clearer, and although it repeated under a different form sub-paragraphs (c), (d), (e) and (f) of the original article 11, as well as the ideas expressed in sub-paragraphs (c), (d) and (g) of article 12, it left out sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (g) of article 11 and the entire content of article 13, whereas the ideas contained in those three articles were completely different. Article 11 dealt with certain aspects of social and labour policy and with the standards applicable to both sexes. Article 12 was concerned with the special protection of women in certain situations, and for that reason it would be useful to retain at least some of its provisions, such as those of sub-paragraphs (b), (e), (f) and (h), even if their wording had to be slightly changed. Article 13 referred to certain measures which made it possible for women to combine their family obligations with their occupational activities. In view of the importance of those measures for developing countries where there was an inadequate infrastructure, her delegation favoured the retention of article 13 in the wording proposed by the World Health Organization.

5. Mrs. CADIEUX (Canada) said she preferred the alternative text of article 11 which was intended to replace articles 11, 12, 13 and 14, and she considered that the draft amendment submitted by the United States was acceptable.
6. Ms. LAMINA (Madagascar) said she was opposed to the alternative text of article 11, since it involved the deletion of articles 12, 13 and 14 and of part of the substance of article 11.
7. Mrs. NIKOLAEVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that articles 11, 12, 13 and 14 should be retained, as each of them expressed a clearly defined idea. To combine them would only result in a confusing article.
8. With regard to the provisions concerning the economic and social rights of women, the original article 11 was more complete than the alternative text. If the measures to be taken were listed in detail, provision would have to be made for them to be applied progressively, in view of the different levels of economic development; but that was better than prescribing a small number of measures to be applied immediately. The provisions of the alternative text of article 11 did not go as far as those of the Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, and that was unacceptable. In addition, certain provisions, such as those in sub-paragraph (b), were lacking in precision; the corresponding provisions in the ILO convention were much clearer. If the text was to be of use, it must be clear; but the wording of sub-paragraph (c) of the alternative text, for example, was obviously vague and made no mention of maternity allowances, production bonuses and disability pensions. The original article 11 was therefore better and should be treated as a basic text.
9. Miss TYABJI (India) said that she too preferred the original text of article 11. However, it might perhaps be advisable to add a sub-paragraph to the following effect: "States Parties shall adopt all appropriate measures to progressively try and bring agricultural and rural workers, many of whom are unpaid and unrecognized, into the orbit of the same rights and privileges that are available to organized labour".
10. Mrs. HOERZ (German Democratic Republic) said that, because of the egalitarian character of her country's legislation and the measures of protection guaranteed to women by law, she preferred the original text of articles 11 to 14 of the draft convention. A convention should be a pledge of progress and at the same time provide the framework of a programme. The alternative texts of articles 11 to 14 still fell short of the rights recognized in the World Plan of Action, and in the ILO and UNESCO documents. One of the most important guarantees of the equality of women was the protection by the State of the interests of mother and child by a number of measures, such as maternity leave, services for the protection of mothers and children, free hospitalization and medical care, and the construction of crèches and kindergartens available to all working people. Protection by the State of the interests of

mother and child and women workers, and a concern for providing the necessary services for families and for children's education would make it possible to solve the problem of the participation of women in the economic, political and intellectual life of the society in which they were living.

11. Mrs. GONZALEZ MARTINEZ (Mexico) said that she considered it preferable to adopt as a working text the alternative to draft article 11, which might possibly be amended by including parts of the text proposed by Belgium.

12. Mrs. HUSSEIN (Egypt) said that her delegation had not yet decided upon its position. The original text was more comprehensive and the alternative text required strengthening. In the case of a convention of a general nature, however, it would seem wise to merge articles 12, 13 and 14. In any case it would be necessary to delete some superfluous provisions, such as the one referring to the care of sick children, and to try to ensure conciseness.

13. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Commission that the matter under discussion was the choice of a working text which would subsequently be amended.

14. Ms. ESFANDIARI (Iran) said she accepted the principles stated in the original text of article 11, but might have occasion to make reservations concerning some of its provisions which were not compatible with Iranian legislation.

15. Ms. ATHANASAKOS (United States of America) said she preferred the alternative text, as the original text seemed to her to be too specific to be adopted by all States. Like the representative of Egypt, she thought that the convention should be acceptable to all countries, regardless of their level of development. What was necessary, therefore, was to lay down general principles, without going into details about how they were to be applied, and to leave it to each State to decide what special measures should be taken to give effect to the convention.

16. Mrs. SALYO (Indonesia) said that she, too, was in favour of the alternative text of article 11, since her Government would be unable to subscribe to certain provisions of the original text, which were too specific and were not compatible with Indonesian legislation.

17. Mrs. PENALEVAR de LEPAGE (Venezuela) said that in her view the original text and the alternative text were not mutually exclusive and that the Commission might very well choose provisions from both of them. She nevertheless preferred the alternative text, in which the provisions were better arranged, and she would be prepared to accept it subject to some amendments. In the introductory sentence of paragraph 1, for example, the word "ensure" should be replaced by the word "guarantee".

In sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) of paragraph 2 the words "to encourage" should be replaced by "to guarantee". She also proposed the deletion, in paragraph 1 (a), of the words "or any other grounds", which she considered superfluous. She supported the United States amendment to paragraph 2 (a) (E/CN.6/L.680), since the dismissal of a woman because of marriage or maternity should be prohibited by law. Lastly, she proposed the addition, at the end of paragraph 2, of a new sub-paragraph corresponding to sub-paragraph (g) of the original text, which would read: "The entitlement of women engaged on contract work, either on the premises of the enterprise or elsewhere, to all the rights, benefits and advantages granted to full-time workers". It would be better not to speak of "privileges" in the draft convention; the word "advantages" would be preferable, since the law could grant advantages but not privileges.

18. Mrs. MAKA (Guinea) said that in her opinion the original text should be taken as a working basis, provided that it was supplemented with provisions taken from the alternative text. Provisions for the protection of women workers in rural areas should also be introduced, since in her country the majority of the population lived in such areas.

19. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to decide which of the two texts - the original text or the alternative text - it wished to choose as a basis for discussion in considering article 11.

20. The alternative text of article 11 was chosen as a basis for discussion by 14 votes to 11.

21. Mrs. JANJIC (International Labour Organisation) said that the ILO preferred the alternative text of article 11, which the Commission had chosen as a basis for discussion, since it favoured a concise convention which would confine itself to the essential principles of non-discrimination against women, without going into detail about the measures to be taken to that end, so as not to complicate the work of Governments. The ILO had already adopted many instruments concerning women's work, including Convention No. 103 of 1952 and Convention No. 100 of 1951 concerning Equal Remuneration and Convention No. 111 of 1958 concerning Discrimination in Respect of Employment and Occupation, which had been supplemented in 1975 by the Declaration on Equality of Opportunity and Treatment for Women Workers. It was probable that in the years to come the ILO would adopt other instruments dealing with the subject, as it had been asked to prepare new texts and to revise existing texts. Governments would therefore find themselves in a very embarrassing situation if the draft convention was adopted in its original form, since in certain respects it differed from the provisions of the Declaration adopted by the International Labour Conference in 1975. For example, article 12 of the draft placed rather too much emphasis on the protection of women workers, whereas, in the 1975 Declaration on

Equality of Opportunity and Treatment for Women Workers, the ILO had carefully avoided stressing that aspect and had urged Governments to revise their laws to take account of technological progress. For instance, article 9, paragraph 4, of the Declaration, provided that "Measures shall be taken to extend special protection to women for types of work proved to be harmful from the standpoint of their social function of reproduction and such measures shall be reviewed and brought up to date periodically in the light of advances in scientific and technological knowledge". The trend in labour legislation was to provide individualized protection for workers, taking into account the individual resistance of each worker, whether man or woman.

22. With regard to maternity protection, the provisions of article 12, although very detailed - perhaps even too detailed in her view - failed to mention a fundamental element in that protection, namely the source of the funds from which women workers would be paid. Sub-paragraph (c) provided that wages would continue to be paid during maternity leave, but, unlike ILO Convention No. 103, it did not specify that those allowances should be granted "either by means of compulsory social insurance or by means of public funds". In the absence of such a provision, the present text marked a step backwards from Convention No. 103 of 1952, for there was no point in providing for the continuation of wages during maternity leave if the wages were to be paid by the employer. On the contrary, such a provision might reduce women's opportunities for employment still further, as employers were often reluctant to employ women because of maternity leave.

23. She thought, therefore, that the alternative text of article 11 was preferable to the original text and should also replace articles 12 and 13. She was less certain that that alternative text could be substituted for article 14, which, on the contrary, ought to be expanded in order to take account of the comments by FAO.

24. Mrs. DEHARENG (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions) said that she fully supported what the representative of the ILO had said. She too feared that the draft Convention might depart too much from the standards adopted by the ILO, particularly in the 1975 Declaration on Equality of Opportunity and Treatment for Women Workers, which had been drawn up with the assistance of the many women from the trade unions who had participated in the International Labour Conference of 1975. She therefore urged the members of the Commission to ensure that the provisions of articles 11, 12 and 13 conformed as closely as possible to the provisions of the Declaration adopted by the ILO.

25. Mrs. NIKOLAEVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that she did not understand why the ILO representative had spoken in favour of the alternative text of article 11, since the instruments adopted by the ILO seemed to her (Mrs. Nikolaeva) to correspond to the original rather than to the alternative text, the scope of which was much more limited. In sub-paragraph (c), the original text referred to the ILO Convention concerning Equal Remuneration, but there was no reference to it in the alternative text. The ILO representative had mentioned only three ILO Conventions, but there were many others which might be cited in support of the original text.

26. Mrs. JANJIC (International Labour Organisation) explained that she had merely wished to state the reasons why the ILO was in favour of the alternative text of article 11. She had refrained from speaking on the substance of that alternative text and had confined herself to giving two examples in order to show the dangers to which the Commission would be exposing itself if it adopted the original text. She was ready to provide fuller information about the ILO Conventions.

Paragraph 1 of the alternative text

Introductory part

27. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to consider the introductory part of paragraph 1 of the alternative text of article 11.

28. Mrs. BOKOR-SZEGO (Hungary) proposed that the words "shall adopt" should be replaced by "undertake to adopt".

29. Mrs. PENALVER de LEPAGE (Venezuela) said that she had already proposed that the word "ensure" should be replaced by the word "guarantee".

30. Ms. ATHANASAKOS (United States of America) reminded the Commission that she had proposed (E/CN.6/L.680) the deletion of the words "married or unmarried". She would prefer to keep the word "ensure", which seemed to be more precise than "guarantee".

31. Mrs. TALAWY (Egypt) thought that the amendment proposed by the Hungarian representative weakened the text.

32. Mrs. BOKOR-SZEGO (Hungary) said that, on the contrary, her intention was to strengthen the text.

33. Mrs. FOUCART-FLOOR (Belgium) said she supported the Hungarian amendment, which she too thought would strengthen the text. The French word "preminent" might give the impression that the measures in question had already been taken.

34. Mrs. HIRLEMANN (France) said that she was of the same opinion as the representative of Belgium. She favoured the retention of the words "married or unmarried". The words "ensure" and "guarantee" seemed to her to be equivalent.

35. Mrs. VELIS DIAZ de VILLALVILLA (Cuba) said that she too preferred the expression "undertake to adopt", for the reasons given by the representatives of Belgium and France.

36. Mrs. GONZALEZ MARTINEZ (Mexico) said she thought that the words "ensure" and "guarantee" had approximately the same meaning, but she would prefer the word "guarantee". She found the Hungarian amendment acceptable; it was quite obvious that, when a State ratified a convention, it undertook to take the appropriate measures for implementing it. She would support the majority opinion on that point, while observing that, in the Spanish text, the use of the future tense avoided any ambiguity. On the other hand, she would like to retain the words "married or

unmarried" which the United States proposed to delete, since an unmarried woman -- whether an unmarried mother or an elder sister -- might be the head of a family and that status should not be denied to her under the pretext that she was not married.

37. Mrs. COCKCROFT (United Kingdom) said that she preferred the word "ensure" to the word "guarantee", since States could take the necessary measures to ensure that women had the same rights as men, but they could not, "guarantee", in the strict sense of the word, that discrimination against women would disappear altogether.

38. Ms. ATHANASAKOS (United States of America) and Mrs. PEÑALVER de LEPAGE (Venezuela) withdrew their amendments.

39. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, she would consider that the Commission decided to adopt the introductory part of paragraph 1 of the alternative text of article 11, as amended by the Hungarian representative.

40. It was so decided.

Sub-paragraph (a)

41. Mrs. NIKOLAEVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that, in order to simplify the text, the expression "marital status" should be replaced by the expression "civil status".

42. Princess PURACHATRA (Thailand) proposed that there should be a reference to retraining in the sub-paragraph.

43. Mrs. FOUCART-FLOOR (Belgium) pointed out that the Belgian amendment (E/CN.6/591/Add.1) emphasized the right of women to work and was based on article 3 of the ILO Declaration on Equality of Opportunity and Treatment for Women Workers. In western countries, work by women was often considered as a means of making up the family income and the female population constituted a reserve of cheap labour on which employers drew in accordance with prevailing economic circumstances. In Belgium, one unemployed person in two was a woman and women represented only 30 per cent of the wage earners. Sub-paragraph (a) of the Belgian amendment did not provide for access to vocational training, since that question was dealt with in article 10 and mentioned a second time in article 11, sub-paragraph (c), but it did stress the importance of job security.

44. Mr. TILLFORS (Sweden) said he supported the Belgian amendment because he considered it essential to draw attention to the right of women to work and to job security. Referring to the suggestion made by the representative of the USSR, he said that he could see little difference between the terms "marital status" and "civil status".

45. Ms. ATHANATHAKOS (United States of America) introduced a text (E/CN.6/L.680) which her delegation proposed to insert as paragraph 1 (a) of article 11. She preferred the version of that sub-paragraph in the alternative text to the one appearing in the Belgian amendment. She thought that the sub-paragraph should include a reference to retraining.
46. Mrs. COCKCROFT (United Kingdom) supported the idea of mentioning retraining and proposed that the words "on grounds of marital status or any other grounds" should be replaced by the phrase "on grounds of sex or marriage".
47. Mrs. SALYO (Indonesia) said that the phrase "to work, to free choice of profession and employment" should be added to the English version of article 10, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (a) of the draft convention submitted by her delegation (E/CN.6/591, annex II).
48. Miss TYABJI (India) proposed that, as a compromise, the words "the right to work and" should be added after the words "to ensure" in the United States amendment. There could then be a second sub-paragraph which would not mention the right to work but would refer to the right to free choice of profession and employment, to access to vocational training and retraining and to promotion.
49. Mrs. MARTINEZ GONZALEZ (Mexico) thought that the term "civil status" was preferable to "marital status". She also agreed that it would be useful to mention retraining. Her delegation considered the Belgian proposal to be clearer and simpler than the alternative text. She requested confirmation that the Belgian text, as amended, read: "The right, without discrimination on grounds of sex, marital status or any other grounds, to work, to training and retraining, to free choice of profession and employment, to promotion and to job security".
50. Mrs. FOUCART-FLOOR (Belgium) said that, since both article 10 and sub-paragraph (c) of the Belgian proposal for article 11 already mentioned training, it had not been felt necessary to refer to the subject in sub-paragraph (a).
51. Begum Tazee FARIDI (Pakistan) considered that the concept of retraining went hand in hand with that of training and should therefore be mentioned in sub-paragraph (a).
52. Mrs. NIKOLAEVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said she wished to maintain her proposal that the words "marital status" should be replaced by the words "civil status".
53. Ms. ATHANATHAKOS (United States of America) said she accepted the Indian sub-amendment to the United States amendment. If the Commission decided to approve the two sub-paragraphs in the form proposed by the Indian delegation, she would have no objection to its taking up sub-paragraph (c) of the Belgian proposal. It would be necessary to eliminate from that sub-paragraph the words "vocational training" and to insert the word "and" after the words "access to employment".

54. Mrs. BOKOR SZEGO (Hungary) said that it would be advisable to use the term "civil status", since the legislation of some countries provided that women could accept employment only with the consent of their husbands.

55. Mrs. DEVAUD (France) said it was important to establish the principle of women's right to work at the outset of article 11. She therefore proposed that that right should be defined by a quotation from the first part of article 3 of the ILO Declaration on Equality of Opportunity and Treatment for Women Workers. Sub-paragraph (a) would then read: "All measures shall be taken to guarantee women's right to work as the inalienable right of every human being, whatever their status";.

56. Following an exchange of views in which Mrs. GONZALEZ MARTINEZ (Mexico), Mrs. NIKOLAEVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mrs. DEVAUD (France) took part, Mrs. FOUCART-FLOOR (Belgium) proposed that the meeting be suspended to enable the sponsors of the various amendments to reach agreement on a joint text.

57. The meeting was suspended at 12 noon and resumed at 12.20 p.m.

58. Mrs. FOUCART-FLOOR (Belgium) announced that the consultations had resulted in agreement on a joint text reading:

"(a) The right to work as an inalienable right of all human beings;

(b) The right without discrimination on grounds of civil or marital status or any other grounds, to free choice of profession and employment, to promotion and to job security".

59. Mrs. BOKOR-SZEGO (Hungary), Mrs. GONZALEZ MARTINEZ (Mexico), Mrs. NIKOLAEVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) and Mr. TILLFORS (Sweden) pointed out that to speak of both "civil status" and "marital status" was tautological, and proposed that the second of those expressions should be deleted.

60. Mrs. BOKOR-SZEGO (Hungary) said that it should be specified in sub-paragraph (a) that the right to work must be ensured to women without discrimination on the grounds of civil status.

61. Mrs. GONZALEZ MARTINEZ (Mexico) said she accepted the joint text as read out by the representative of Belgium.

62. Ms. ATHANATHAKOS (United States of America) considered that the joint text did not express what was the main objective, namely the need for States parties to adopt appropriate legislation to ensure equal employment opportunities for women and to prevent job discrimination in employment on the basis of sex.

63. Princess PURACHATRA (Thailand) said that if the joint text was not to include the provisions of sub-paragraph (c) as proposed by Belgium (E/CN.6/591/Add.1), there should be a reference in it to vocational training and retraining. In any case, she preferred the United States amendment (E/CN.6/L.680), which she found clearer.

64. Mrs. VELIS DIAZ de VILLALVILLIA (Cuba) supported the joint text. In her view the concept of "equal employment opportunities" was covered by the concept of the "inalienable right to work".

65. Mrs. NIKOLAEVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that she too considered that the right to work included the idea of employment opportunities, but she would have no objection to the point being stated more clearly if other delegations were in doubt about it.

66. The concern expressed by some delegations might be met by adding the words "and the right to training and retraining" at the end of sub-paragraph (b) of the joint text.

67. Miss TYABJI (India) said that she too preferred the United States amendment, which might be altered to read:

"(a) appropriate measures, including legislation, to ensure the right to work and equal employment opportunities for women and to prevent discrimination in employment on the basis of sex".

68. It would be useful to include the idea of vocational training and retraining in sub-paragraph (b), but it would be more logical to mention it before the words "free choice of profession and employment" rather than at the end of the sub-paragraph.

69. She hoped that the Belgian representative would withdraw sub-paragraph (c) of her text in favour of sub-paragraph (c) of the alternative text, in view of the fact that due attention had been given to the question of vocational training in article 10 and that it would therefore be sufficient simply to refer to it in sub-paragraph (b).

70. Mrs. FOUCART-FLOOR (Belgium) explained that the expressions "civil status" and "marital status" had both been included in the joint text since some delegations preferred one and others the other. She would have no objection, however, if the Commission decided to delete one of them. With regard to the United States amendment (E/CN.6/L.680), the joint text made no mention of legislation because in some countries, such as Belgium, working conditions were not necessarily regulated by law but rather by collective agreements; but she would have no objection to the inclusion of a reference to legislation.

71. To mention the right to vocational training and retraining in sub-paragraph (b) would be to remove it from the general context of equality of opportunity and treatment for women as proclaimed in the 1975 ILO Declaration on Equality of Opportunity and Treatment for Women Workers. Her delegation therefore preferred the version of sub-paragraph (c) which it had proposed (E/CN.6/591/Add.1).

72. Mr. EHSASSI (Iran) said that he found the joint text acceptable and had no objection to the addition proposed by the USSR representative, although the point was already covered in sub-paragraph (c) of the Belgian proposal. Acceptance of the working in that proposal would make the proposed addition to sub-paragraph (b) superfluous.

73. Since the word "emploi" was repeated several times in the French version of sub-paragraph (b) of the joint text, it could be deleted at the end of that sub-paragraph.

74. Mrs. GONZALEZ MARTINEZ (Mexico) said that she had no objection in principle to the addition proposed by the USSR representative; but the point was already covered by sub-paragraph (c) as proposed by Belgium (E/CN.6/591/Add.1). Similarly, the provisions suggested by the United States delegation (E/CN.6/L.680) were already covered by the joint text and by article 3. She proposed that the Commission should adopt the joint text without further delay.

75. Mrs. BOKOR-SZEGO (Hungary) said she supported the joint text and the addition proposed by the USSR delegation. If the Commission wished to include a reference to "legislation", it should do so in the introductory part, not in the sub-paragraph.

76. Mrs. SALYO (Indonesia) said she had some doubts about the expression "inalienable right to work". It was normal that States should guarantee the right to work to all their nationals, but they could not be required to do so in the case, for example, of persons who had entered their territory illegally, or of stateless persons.

77. Mrs. DEVAUD (France) said that the right to work was a basic right like the right to life or the right to freedom of expression, and it had long been accepted by all States: it was inadmissible that it should be called in question.

78. Mr. TILLFORS (Sweden) said he supported the joint text and the addition proposed by the USSR delegation, which should be inserted at the point suggested by the Indian representative.

79. Ms. ATHANATHAKOS (United States of America) said that she preferred the expression "fundamental right to work" to the term "inalienable right to work". The joint text and the United States amendment could be combined to read:

"Since the right to work is a fundamental right of all people, appropriate measures, including legislation, to ensure the right to work and equal employment opportunities for women and to prevent discrimination in employment on the basis of sex".

80. Mrs. FOUCART-FLOOR (Belgium) pointed out that the text read out by the United States representative made no mention of the important question of discrimination on the grounds of marital status.

81. Mention of legislation should be made in the introductory part and should not be repeated in the subsequent sub-paragraphs.

82. The CHAIRMAN said that the joint text proposed for sub-paragraph (a) seemed to command general support. She accordingly suggested that the United States amendment (E/CN.6/L.680) should be left aside for the time being, on the understanding that the Commission could return to it at an appropriate time.

83. If there was no objection, she would take it that the joint text proposed for sub-paragraph (a) was approved by consensus.

84. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.