

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Fifth Session

CORRIGENDUM TO THE SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,  
on Thursday, 16 June 1949, at 2.40 p.m.

Pages 14 and 15:

Substitute the following text for the speech by Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium):

"Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) stated that there were two groups of countries among the States represented on the Commission. One group maintained that it had solved the problem of full employment, but it withheld from the rest of the world the right to view that remarkable success and it gave no information on working conditions, on the extent to which work was carried out in freedom and on the reputedly limited purchasing power which the wages of its working masses represented.

The other group, to which Belgium belonged, also believed that the right to work was one of the highest aims of humanity. That group, however, was aware of the complexity of the problem. It had devoted a considerable part of its energies to attempting to solve the problem and it was continuing its efforts in that direction. Its participation in the International Labour Organization, which for thirty years had been working successfully for the improvement of working conditions, reflected that concern. Its participation in the activities of the United Nations was to a certain extent a further illustration of its solicitude. The Commission on Human Rights was a subsidiary organ of the Economic and Social Council, all of whose activities in the economic field were aimed at the improvement of working conditions.

Mr. Woulbroun proceeded to review the recent activities of the Economic and Social Council and its subsidiary organs in seeking methods whereby full employment might be ensured.

A satisfactory formula for including in the Covenant the principle of the right to work could undoubtedly be found; the problem of full employment, however, which represented one of the noblest and oldest aspirations of mankind, could not be dealt with cursorily at the end of a session.

He was strongly in favour of the question being referred to Governments for careful study. He doubted, however, whether the report by the Secretariat for which the Danish resolution asked was necessary. The information requested from the Secretariat in that resolution had already been given on various occasions in many United Nations publications."