

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/CN.4/SR.221

7 June 1951

77

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL : ENGLISH AND FRENCH

Dual Distribution

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Seventh Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIRST MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 1 May 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS:

Pages

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

4 - 22

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

Special provisions on the right to social
security (E/CN.4/581, E/CN.4/AC.14/2/Add.3)
(continued)

(22 p.)

Present:Chairman: Mr. MALIK (Lebanon)Members:

Australia	Mr. WHITLAM
Chile	Mr. VALENZUELA
China	Mr. YU
Denmark	Mr. SØRENSEN
Egypt	AZMI Bey
France	Mr. CASSIN
Greece	Mr. EUSTATHIADES
Guatemala	Mr. DUPONT-WILLEMEN
India	Mrs. MEHTA
Pakistan	Mr. WAHEED
Sweden	Mr. HICHENS-BERGSTRÖM
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	Mrs. ROOSEVELT
Uruguay	Mr. CIASULLO
Yugoslavia	Mr. JEVREMOVIC

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Mr. JENKS
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. BALMATE Mr. HAVET

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:Category A

International Confederation of
Free Trade Unions Miss SENDER

International Federation of
Christian Trade Unions Mr. EGGERMANN

Category B and Register

Caritas Internationalis Mr. PETERKIN

Carnegie Endowment for
International Peace Mrs. CARTER

Catholic International Union
for Social Service Miss de ROMER
Mrs. SCHRADER

Commission of the Churches
on International Affairs Mr. NOLDE

Consultative Council of
Jewish Organizations Mr. BENTWICH

Co-ordinating Board of
Jewish Organizations Mr. MONSHOWITZ

International Council of Women Mrs. CARTER

International Federation of
Business and Professional
Women Miss TOMLINSON

International Federation of
University Women Mrs. ROBB

International League for the
Rights of Man Mr. BALDWIN

International Union of
Catholic Women's Leagues Miss de ROMER
Miss ARCHINARD

World Jewish Congress Mr. BIENENFELD

Secretariat:

Mr. Humphrey

Representing the Secretary-General

Mr. Das

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:

Special Provisions on the Right to Social Security (E/CN.4/581, E/CN.4/AC.14/2/Add.3) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Soviet Union proposal contained in E/CN.4/AC.14/2/Add.3, and to the revised text of the Australian proposal, which now read: "The States Parties to this Covenant recognize the right of everyone to social security." He understood that the representatives of Yugoslavia and Uruguay had also submitted a joint proposal which would be circulated shortly.

Mr. CIASULLO (Uruguay) recalled that the definition of the right to work as recently adopted by the Commission enumerated certain aspects of that right. The delegations of Uruguay and Yugoslavia had felt that the concept of social security should also be elaborated to some extent, so as to provide a text that everybody could understand. The two delegations were therefore submitting a joint proposal (E/CN.4/581) on the article relating to social security, in which a distinction was made between social insurance in all its various forms and, in particular, as it applied to infirmity, temporary or permanent disability, old age and unemployment, family pensions in the event of death, and social welfare in all other circumstances.

The enumeration in the proposal was not exhaustive, as it was preceded by the word "including", and referred only to the more frequent and more important eventualities. Moreover, paragraph 2 supplied a very general provision covering all cases where unforeseen circumstances made it impossible for an individual to acquire the necessary means of livelihood for himself and for his family.

The Chilean representative, who at an earlier meeting had expressed the fear that certain aspects of social security might be excluded from the Covenant merely because they had not been specifically enumerated in it, might, he thought,

find the text satisfactory. The extreme alternatives were either to make no mention at all of the several aspects of social security, or to list them all. The Uruguayan and Yugoslav proposal represented a compromise between those extremes.

Mr. CASSIN (France), replying to the allegations made by the Soviet Union representative at the previous meeting concerning the circumstances of French workers, said that it was not the French delegation's practice either to extol systematically the achievements of its own country, or to contest such facts as the difficulties experienced not only by wage earners but also by the aged and by persons who had formerly worked for themselves, who now found themselves in straitened circumstances. Such facts were in any event brought frankly to the notice of the public in official documents available for all to read and criticize.

The facts must, however, be viewed in their proper perspective, and must not be falsely interpreted. The Soviet Union representative had stated, for instance, that the share of French wage earners in the national income was at present only half what it had been before the war. Although that had been true immediately after the liberation, it was no longer true in 1951. The system of social security introduced in France during the last five years conferred on the workers benefits which represented a charge on the employer equal to 43 per cent of his wage bill. Progress had therefore been made, and, although since 1949 the rise in the incomes of wage earners had fallen behind that in the national income as a result of the prevailing international tension, it was nevertheless a fact that the purchasing power of the unskilled worker was considerably higher than the guaranteed minimum and, although less than justice required, appreciably higher than that of a similar worker in the Soviet Union. Were a comparison to be made between the length of time a Frenchman had to work in order to be able to buy a kilo of bread, meat, sugar, butter or a pair of shoes, a book or a bicycle, with that required to earn the price of those articles in the Soviet Union, it would be seen that it was not the French worker who was the worse off.

Full information on such important questions was freely available in France. He regretted to say, however, that the statistics published by the Soviet Union Government were given only in the form of percentages, and scarcely ever quoted the basic figures which would enable the achievements of that country to be evaluated quantitatively. So long as certain countries declined to publish such statistics as freely as the French authorities, they would always have the advantage where criticism was concerned. Nothing, however, would convince the free world that the disparity between the standard of living of workers in the free countries and that of workers in the Soviet Union had been eliminated, though it had undoubtedly been reduced since 1919.

However, one general conclusion could be drawn from the remarks of the Soviet Union representative. To judge from his statement on the conditions of workers in France, the United States of America and the United Kingdom, it was clear that he did not consider international supervision to be an encroachment on the sovereignty of States. Accordingly, while reserving his judgment on the criticisms made of France, he (Mr. Cassin) was delighted by the de facto acceptance of the principle of international supervision which such criticism implied, and hoped that, when his delegation again submitted its proposal that each State Member of the United Nations, whether it had acceded to the Covenant on Human Rights or not, should submit periodical reports on the action it had taken to further the effective exercise of a particular right or group of rights, that proposal would receive unanimous support, and thus make possible the establishment of an initial form of international supervision.

He would like in conclusion to remind representatives that at some fifty kilometres from Geneva they could inspect the imposing Génissiat dam, a fine example of what had been achieved in France since the liberation by free workers where they would be very welcome. France, too, had suffered heavily from the war and reconstruction was complete in only seventeen of her ninety départements. But the French Government hoped to be able to devote each year an ever-increasing proportion of its effort and economic resources to such works of general benefit to mankind.

Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom) observed that at the previous meeting the Commission had had before it only the Australian and Soviet Union proposals, the sole difference between which was that whereas the Australian proposal stated that everyone should have the right to social security (as was the case in her own country, where mothers, old people and others were entitled to benefits), the Soviet Union proposal limited it to workers and salaried employees.

Under the Soviet Union proposal social security would be provided at the expense of the State or of the employer. Was not the State the sole employer in the Soviet Union? And if everything belonged to the State and therefore the workers, and the contributions must be paid out of profits, what difference did it make whether the State or the workers paid for social services? Was it not purely a question of accounting so far as that country was concerned?

In a Socialist economy like that of the United Kingdom, profits were taxed by the State and workers were required to make a direct contribution towards the social insurance to which they were entitled.

Mr. KOVALENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation believed that the draft Covenant should contain an article stipulating that workers and employees should be provided with social security and social insurance at the expense of the State or at that of their employer in accordance with the legislation of the country concerned.

Citizens of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic enjoyed under its Constitution the right to old age pensions, health and unemployment benefits and to allowances for loss of working capacity. They enjoyed free medical services and the amenities of numerous health resorts. Thus the right to social security had been realized in practice in his country. The proof of that statement was that 67 per cent of its total budget for 1950 has been

allocated to social and cultural services, expenditure on social security alone amounting to 7 per cent. The cost of social insurance was borne entirely by the State, its administration being the concern of the trade unions. Allowances were paid to all workers and employees temporarily incapacitated, and to their families. The People's Democracies also had a comprehensive system of social insurance.

In the majority of capitalist countries, on the other hand, the situation was unsatisfactory. In that connexion, he proposed to quote a few examples. The Associated Press Agency had reported in February, 1950, that in the United States of America fourteen million workers were not entitled to unemployment relief, and that out of every forty persons entitled to an old age pension only one in fact drew it, since workers' contributions towards such pensions were so high as to discourage participation in the scheme. In fact, contributions considerably exceeded payments. For example, between 1939 and 1946 total workers' contributions had amounted to 4,300 million dollars, whereas benefits paid out had reached only 800 million dollars. It was obvious that the United States system of social security and insurance was of very little help to the workers, and merely served to enrich the monopolists.

The position had been frankly recognized by President Truman in his annual message to Congress in 1949, when he had admitted that existing United States social security legislation was inadequate, and that the allowances were too small. One third of all American workers did not benefit from social insurance. Many, when incapacitated, had to rely on private charity. Moreover, tens of millions were deprived of satisfactory medical services, which were too expensive for most workers.

The position in the United Kingdom was similar. The Minister for National Insurance, in reply to a question in Parliament, had said that 19,000

claims for unemployment benefit had been refused in April 1950 because the applicants had given up their jobs voluntarily. A pamphlet setting out facts about the United Kingdom economy, published under the auspices of the Organization for European Economic Co-operation on 15 February 1950, had stated that a worker's family received State aid in the form of subsidies and allowances to the amount of £2.7.0. a week, but that it paid £3.7.10. in taxes. Thus the Government took away more than it gave. Moreover, those facts related to the period before the sharp increase in taxation caused by the increased armaments programme.

In the case of colonial territories, the situation was even more lamentable. In reporting on social security in its dependent territories, the United Kingdom Government had stated on 25 July, 1949, that there was no system of social security in the Gold Coast, the Aden Protectorate or Basutoland. Similarly, there was no social security in the French Cameroons, nor did coloured workers enjoy legal protection in that Trust Territory.

The inadequacy of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in respect of social security must be made good by the insertion of a specific provision on the matter in the draft Covenant.

Mr. JENKS (International Labour Organisation), speaking at the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, said that he had listened with interest and sympathy to the remarks of the Uruguayan representative in introducing his proposal (E/CN.4/581). But if the task of the Commission was to formulate a general statement of policy, he would suggest, on behalf of his Organisation, that difficulties would arise if the provision in question were amplified by reference to particular forms of social security. If that were done, many countries would probably find it difficult to ratify the Covenant.

In preparing a draft convention on the subject, the International Labour Office had found it necessary to distinguish between eight major sectors of

social security. He believed that it would be impracticable to mention every one of those sectors in the provision under consideration especially as practice varied widely from country to country. On the other hand, if instead of referring to them all, the Commission mentioned only two or three, it would be taking an arbitrary decision as to which forms of social security should be introduced first. The matter was one in which no absolute order of precedence could be laid down owing to the variation in conditions. For example, the system of unemployment relief and the organization of health service practised differed according to the economic and medical situation obtaining in any country. The relative importance of medical care and cash benefits depended on the social structure of the country concerned. If selective mention was made of particular sectors of social security, the practical effect would inevitably be that instead of leaving each country free to develop its social services in accordance with its national needs, an artificial pattern would be imposed on them.

The second difficulty was even more serious. Although much would admittedly depend on the exact form of words adopted by the Commission, it would be difficult to devise a text mentioning specific forms of social security which would not entail an obligation on each signatory State to maintain or introduce those particular forms. For instance, it would be impossible for a country with a very highly developed system of social security, like France, to ratify the proposed text, unless prepared to make major changes to its legislation, since the French system of unemployment insurance would not fit in with the terms of that text.

He thought it might be useful if he were briefly to indicate the way in which the International Labour Organisation had tackled the problem of drafting detailed provisions for the various aspects of social security. A detailed survey had been made of existing systems in 45 countries; the provisions had then been examined by a committee of experts made up of senior

social security administrators from 25 different countries, including a number of the countries represented on the Commission on Human Rights. At the end of those far-reaching consultations, the Organisation had come to the conclusion that it would only be possible to draft a detailed convention if it were couched in terms which would enable each contracting party to decide what particular provisions dealing with particular aspects of social security its existing legislation would enable it to ratify.

While it was possible to include detailed clauses in so elaborate an instrument as the convention he had mentioned, a similar procedure would be incompatible with the declared purpose of the Covenant, which must be capable of commanding acceptance as a whole. For those reasons the representatives of the International Labour Organisation had strongly advocated at the Commission's preceding meetings that the Covenant should be drafted in general terms.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of Lebanon, said he considered the Australian proposal to be inadequate, even though he fully appreciated the difficulties outlined by the representative of the International Labour Organisation. A great deal of work had already been done in that complex field, and would continue to be done, so that a certain degree of caution was essential.

But there were two ways of approaching the task of defining a general concept. The method of enumeration was not satisfactory, but it should surely be possible to extract the essence of the problem of social security, even as the essence of the right to work had been drawn out by linking it to human endeavour. The representative of the International Labour Organisation might perhaps help the Commission in devising a succinct and appropriate formula. Surely the basic notion of social security was that man, being essentially a social being, had duties towards society, but that society also had duties towards him, when through no fault of his own, he was unable to play his full part in life.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) urged that representatives should refrain from attacks and counter-attacks which hardly served to advance the work. She for her part did not propose to make or to answer any attacks. The Commission had met in order to draft an instrument, the purpose of which was to make life better for all the people in the world, and not in order to indulge in a comparison of national achievements.

She would inform the Ukrainian representative that as a result of the statement made by the President of the United States to Congress in 1949, agricultural and domestic workers had during the past year been taken into the social security scheme. But that extension of a national scheme was not particularly relevant to the task on which the Commission was engaged.

She agreed with the representative of the International Labour Organisation that the Covenant should be so drafted as to be susceptible of ratification by the greatest possible number of States. But it should not be looked upon as a landmark with which everyone would be satisfied. It should rather be regarded as a signpost to further progress.

Turning to the proposals before the Commission, she agreed that an enumeration of the various elements of the concept of social security would be difficult to draw up, and might prove restrictive. As to a general definition, she would say that social security meant the progressive raising of the standards and the security of a nation's life - a rough-and-ready description which would hardly do for the Covenant. Unless the Chairman, or the representative of the International Labour Organisation, was able to suggest a generally satisfactory formula, it would be preferable to accept the Australian especially as it was important to ensure that not only workers, but the entire population, would be included in social security schemes.

Mr. JEVREMOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that the aim of the joint Uruguayan-Yugoslav proposal was to link the notion of social security with the actual circumstances of life, just as the right to work had been linked to the principle that every individual must have means of livelihood. The present joint proposal was conceived as the logical outcome of accepting that principle; if a man was entitled to his means of livelihood and lost it through unemployment or sickness, he and his family should be compensated for their loss. And it was generally agreed that, whatever the economic position of a country, the payment of unemployment benefits was essential to ensure protection against unemployment, not only for the worker but also for his family. No attempt was made in the proposal to suggest how countries should solve the problem. His own Government had taken all appropriate legislative measures to ensure the individual's complete protection. But the force and value of international undertakings depended upon negotiation by agreement, and, in order to ensure the largest possible area of agreement on the Covenant, his delegation had refrained from raising the issue of how contributions should be levied, whether on the State or on the employer. What mattered most of all was that States should accept the general obligation.

He was fully aware of the difficulties described by the representative of the International Labour Organisation, and agreed that the Commission should not adopt a text which smacked of a political declaration. But he would submit that the text proposed by the Australian representative was in fact just such a declaration. What was needed was a definition, and that was what the joint proposal sought to provide. It touched only on the most important elements of social security, and he failed to see how reference to those elements could in any way hamper the work of the specialized agencies. On the contrary, he would have thought that they would be helped by it. Nor could the definition of social security be drafted with the object of shielding certain countries in their difficulties. The only thing that counted was that the rights of men should be unequivocally affirmed.

Mr. EUSTATHIADES (Greece) said that the Commission had before it two texts embodying two different ideas - the Australian proposal and the joint Uruguayan-Yugoslav proposal. As the Yugoslav representative had pointed out, the fact should not be overlooked that not all States Members of the United Nations were represented on the Commission. It was clear, however, from the documents submitted to the Commission, and particularly from documents E/CN.4/529 and E/CN.4/552, that there was a very marked tendency in the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly to make reservations with regard to the detailed definition of economic and social rights. It was essential, for the sake of its prestige, that the Commission should take account of that tendency so as to avoid having the draft Covenant referred back to it by the Council or the Assembly on the sole ground that the definitions of economic and social rights were deemed too detailed.

That was why he supported the Australian text. In his view, the Commission's aim should be to secure the widest ratification of the Covenant by Member States and hence to facilitate acceptance of the section of the Covenant relating to economic and social rights. He had been surprised to hear certain representatives describe as progressive the tendency to include in the Covenant a series of extremely detailed texts on economic and social rights, and condemn as reactionary the preference shown by others for a more general formulation of those rights. The essential thing, to his mind, was to be realistic; and he, for one, did not regard those who favoured a statement of economic and social rights in general terms only as less progressive than anyone else. It might be asked, with good reason, whether those who advocated general formulas but also accepted the idea of international supervision were not in fact more advanced than those who favoured a detailed text but rejected international supervision in any form.

In that connexion, he submitted that the Commission was not bound by the clause in Section E of General Assembly resolution 421 (V) which called upon the Economic and Social Council to request the Commission on Human Rights to include in the draft Covenant "a clear expression" of economic, social and cultural rights" in accordance with the spirit of the Universal

Declaration". Far from setting up the Universal Declaration as a model for the Covenant, the General Assembly had merely invited the Commission to conform to the spirit of the Declaration. Moreover, to be clear, a statement did not necessarily have to be detailed.

So far as the formulation of the right to social security was concerned, he took his stand on the indisputable competency of the representatives of the International Labour Organisation. Besides, it was stated in Article 22 of the Universal Declaration that "Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security". That Article went on to specify that account would be taken of the "organisation and resources of each State...". The apparent implication of that reservation was that some latitude must be left to signatory States, and that it would be wrong to specify any particular procedure for implementation which, by making it necessary to wait until the various countries had made the necessarily laborious changes to their economic and financial structure, would postpone the ratification of the Covenant until the Greek Kalends.

As a precedent, he would cite the Rome Convention, adopted in November 1950 by the Council of Europe, Article 64 of which provided that, when signing the Convention, any State could make a reservation in respect of any particular provision to the extent that any law in force in its territory was not in conformity with the provision. In his view, the fact that the Covenant would also cover economic and social rights made it all the more necessary for it to include a provision of that nature; nor did he see how the general agreement desired by all could be reached if a detailed enumeration was included, unless the signatory States were given an opportunity of making reservations on similar lines.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the main difference of opinion between members of the Commission arose over the question whether the cost of social security should be borne by both workers and employers or by employers alone.

The joint Uruguayan-Yugoslav proposal was unacceptable to his delegation, for it made no reference to the method of financing social security systems, and was obviously a tacit acceptance of the existing state of affairs, in which the workers bore the brunt of the cost of providing social security services.

To the question put by the United Kingdom representative, he would reply that deductions from workers' wages for social security services merely went to swell the profits of the monopoly-capitalists, in support of which contention he drew attention to the increases in declared profits in the United Kingdom and France since the institution of comprehensive social security systems in those two countries.

In answer to the French representative's complaint that all statistics in the Soviet Union were given in the shape of percentages, he stated that the proposed Soviet Union budget for 1951 made provision for the expenditure of 120,000 million roubles on social security and cultural projects, or 26 per cent of the total budgetary expenditure. He could provide further figures if asked to do so.

The present discussion on social and cultural rights was unrealistic. Certain delegations refused to admit unpleasant facts about their own social security systems, and made slanderous charges against the socially more advanced countries which brought those facts to light at public meetings of United Nations bodies. The magnificent work which the people of the Soviet Union had accomplished in destroying Fascism and in reconstructing their peaceful economy could not be belittled by mere slander.

In conclusion, he repeated that his delegation's attitude towards the question of financing social security was that the employer must bear the entire cost of social security, irrespective of whether the workers were employed by the State or by a private capitalist.

AZMI Bey (Egypt) found that the very simple proposal of the Australian delegation, which a large majority of the Commission appeared ready to support, had been complicated, in the philosophical sense of that term, by the submission of the joint Uruguayan-Yugoslav proposal and by the observations of the representative of the International Labour Organisation.

The concept of social security was the outcome of an historical evolution: first social welfare, then social insurance, and, finally, the overall social security of the present day had been developed. That development had not, however, proceeded at the same rate in all countries, and consequently the social systems of the various nations were at different stages.

In those circumstances, he was opposed to any detailed enumeration on the ground that it might lead to omissions and errors. The Commission having so far restricted itself to laying down principles, he proposed that the Australian draft be amended to read:

"The States Parties to this Covenant recognize the right of everyone to social welfare, insurance and security."

He hoped that a decision could be reached before the end of the current meeting, and therefore formally proposed that the discussion be closed.

The CHAIRMAN stated that, according to rule 48 of the rules of procedure, permission to speak on a motion for the closure of the debate could be granted only to two speakers opposing the closure, after which the motion would be immediately put to the vote. On the other hand, only two other representatives still wished to speak on the subject under discussion. He wondered whether the Egyptian representative would be prepared to agree that his motion should not be put to the vote until those two representatives had been heard.

Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom) opposed the motion for the closure.

AZMI Bey (Egypt) agreed to the Chairman's suggestion.

Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom) said she could not accept the joint Uruguayan-Yugoslav proposal because by allocating certain services to social insurance and others to social welfare the Commission would be laying down the methods of putting social security into effect. The Commission had to draft an article on the general principles of social security, whereas the terms social insurance and social welfare concerned the implementation of that principle.

In the United Kingdom the words "social welfare" had a connotation of public assistance. Moreover the Uruguayan-Yugoslav proposal related the granting of social services only to destitute persons. But under the United Kingdom social security system, a considerable number of benefits, such as free meals to schoolchildren, family allowances and services for expectant mothers, were afforded to everyone irrespective of income.

With regard to the Soviet Union representative's observations, she did not intend to waste the Commission's time by answering his inaccurate and irrelevant attacks at the previous meeting on the United Kingdom with the object of preventing the Commission from achieving satisfactory results, nor would she answer any such attacks in future. She would suggest, however, that in order to clear up any misunderstandings which might exist, representatives might hold a private and informal discussion which could be attended by all those who had a right to sit round the table, at which the systems in their respective countries could be discussed. She would like to hear if the Soviet Union and Ukrainian representatives would accept that.

In conclusion, she asked why the Soviet Union draft only covered "workers and salaried employees". The restriction imposed by that wording was unnecessary and unfair; everybody should have the right to social security.

Mr. SORENSEN (Denmark) considered that the Australian text was too short and lacked precision. The Commission had already adopted articles establishing the right of the individual to earn a decent living for himself and his family by work. Social security, however, was based on the principle that if for any reason the individual was unable to earn a decent living by

work, he should be entitled to the assistance of society under its social security provisions. He therefore proposed that the Australian draft should be amended as follows:

"The States parties to this Convention recognize the right of everyone to social security, that is to say, the right to social provision for everyone who, for reasons beyond his control, is unable to provide a livelihood for himself and his family".

He could not accept the joint Uruguayan-Yugoslav proposal, which was too restrictive.

He saw no necessity for including in Article 18 (b) a provision concerning the right to health; that question should be dealt with in another article still to be discussed.

He admitted that his proposal was not so comprehensive as that of the United Kingdom representative; but the United Kingdom conception of social security was unusually far-reaching, and he felt that if the Commission was to provide an article capable of being applied in existing conditions it should limit itself to an article of relatively modest scope.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of Lebanon, supported the Danish proposal.

AZMI Bey (Egypt) said that he would like to hear the comments of the representative of the International Labour Organisation.

Mr. JENKS (International Labour Organisation) stated that there was a tendency to use the term "social security" in an extremely comprehensive sense, covering both social assistance and social insurance. The phrase "social assistance" had a special connotation in the English language; it related especially to all social welfare measures taken on the basis of the means test. He felt that the use of the words "social security" would be preferable, in view of their more general connotation.

The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the Egyptian motion that the debate on the provision relating to social security be closed.

The motion for the closure was carried by 9 votes to 2 votes with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put the Soviet Union proposal to the vote (E/CN.4/AC.14-
/2/Add.3, page 2, Column 1).

The Soviet Union proposal was rejected by 11 votes to 2 votes with 4 abstentions.

Mr. JEVREMOVIC (Yugoslavia) explained that he had abstained from voting on the question of who was to bear the cost of social security. As he had already said, in his own country the cost of social security was borne by the State and employers. In his opinion, however, the question depended solely on the strength of the workers' political and trade union organisations in each country, and not on the nature of the declarations made for another purpose by the representatives of any country, whichever it might be. He considered, moreover, that any attempt to impose the policy of one country, no matter which, on the honest struggle of the workers in other countries, would only harm their cause.

AZMI Bey (Egypt) said that, having heard the explanation of the representative of the International Labour Organisation, he would withdraw the amendment he had submitted to the Australian proposal.

Mr. CIASULLO (Uruguay) stated that he maintained sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) of paragraph 1 of the joint Uruguayan-Yugoslav proposal.

Mr. JEVREMOVIC (Yugoslavia) asked that separate votes be taken on the different parts of the joint proposal, one on the preamble and paragraph 1 and another on paragraph 2.

Mr. CASSIN (France) said that the effect of the Danish amendment to the Australian proposal, notwithstanding the excellent intentions of its author, would be to place so strict a limitation on the field of social security as to render the relevant articles in the Covenant dangerous.

Personally, he would prefer an article with the following wording:

"The States Parties to this Covenant recognize the right of everyone to social security for himself and his family".

That would make the Australian proposal identical with the initial phrase of the Uruguayan-Yugoslav proposal.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) said she would vote against the Danish amendment which, in her opinion, constituted an excessive restriction of the Australian draft.

Mr. YU (China) considered that the Commission had been mistaken in adopting the provision relating to the right to work, in which the two expressions "the right to work" and "to earn a decent living by work" were equated by the use of the phrase "that is to say", as if they were one and the same thing. It would commit a similar mistake if, as suggested in the Danish amendment, the phrase beginning "that is to say" was employed to describe social security. Consequently, he would vote for the Australian proposal but not for the Danish amendment to it.

Mr. WHITLAM (Australia) considered the Danish amendment excessively restrictive. He would therefore vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN put the Danish amendment to the Australian proposal to the vote.

The Danish amendment was rejected by 10 votes to 2 with 5 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the French amendment, namely, the addition to the Australian proposal of the words "for himself and his family".

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) pointed out that the idea contained in the words "for himself and his family" was already covered by the word "everyone" in the Australian proposal.

The result of the voting on the French amendment was 4 in favour, 4 against and 8 abstentions, and it was therefore rejected.

The text submitted by the Australian delegation, reading "The States Parties to this Covenant recognise the right of everyone to social security" was then put to the vote.

The Australian text was adopted by 9 votes to 3 with 5 abstentions.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote, stated that no text which did not specifically mention the financial sources from which social security funds were to be derived could be accepted by his delegation.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of Lebanon, stated that he had abstained from voting because the Australian text made no attempt to define the concept of social security.

Mrs. MEHTA (India) explaining her vote, stated that she had consistently abstained from voting because she found all the texts submitted unsatisfactory.

Mr. DUPONT-WILLEMIN (Guatemala) stated that he had abstained from voting on the Australian proposal because he had intended to vote for the Uruguayan-Yugoslav proposal.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.