UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL

GENERAL
E/CN.4/SR.218
22 May 1951
ENGLISH
Original: ENGLISH and FRENCH

Dual distribution

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Seventh Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHTEENTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Saturday, 28 April 1951, at 2.30 p.m.

CONTENTS: Pages

Present:

Chairman:	Mr. MALIK (Lebanon)
Members:	
Australia	Mr. WHITLAM
Chile	Mr. VALENZUELA
China	Mr. YU
Denmark	Mr. SORENSEN
Egypt	AZMI Bey Mr. ABDEL-GHANI
France	Mr. LEROY-BEAULIEU
Greece	Mr. EUSTATHIADES
Guatemala	Mr. DUPONT-WILLEMIN
India	Mrs. MEHTA
Pakistan	Mr. WAHEED
Sweden	Mrs. ROSSEL
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	Mr. KOVALENKO
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. MOROSOV
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Miss BOWIE
United States of America	Mr. SIMSARIAN
Uruguay	Mr. CIASULLO
Yugoslavia	Mr. JEVREMOVIC
Representatives of specialized agencies:	
International Labour Organisation	Sir Guildhaume MYRDDIN-EVANS) Gov- Mr. BERGENSTRØM) erning Body of the) International) Labour Office Mr. MORSE, Director-General of the International Labour Office Mr. JENKS Mr. COX

Representatives of specialized agencies (continued):

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. THOMAS Mr. ELVIN Mr. SABA Mr. BAMMATE
World Health Organization	Dr. BROCK CHISHOLM, Director-General Mr. BERTRAND

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category A

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

Category B and Register

Caritas Internationalis	Mr. PETERKIN
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace	Miss CARTER
Catholic International Union for Social Service	Miss de ROMER
Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations	Mr. BENTWICH
Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations	Mr. MOWSHOWITZ
International Council of Women	Miss CARTER
International Federation of Business and Professional Women	Miss TOMLINSON
International Federation of University Women	Miss ROBB
International League for the Rights of Man	Mr. de MADAY
International Union for Child Welfare	Mrs. SMALL

Representatives of non-governmental organizations (continued):

Category B and Register (continued)

International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues	Miss de ROMER
Liaison Committee of Women's International Organizations	Miss ROBB
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom	Miss BAER

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 (continued):

1. Special provisions on the right to work (E/CN.4/571, E/CN.4/576)

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Commission to document E/CN.4/576, which contained the final versions of the six texts put forward in connexion with the right to work. The general debate had been concluded, and the Commission could proceed to vote on those texts in the order in which they had been submitted, which was that followed in document E/CN.4/576.

AZMI Bey (Egypt) said that in a spirit of compromise he would withdraw his own proposal in favour of the French one. He felt, too, that the text proposed by the French delegation could very well take the place of that of the International Labour Organisation.

Sir Guildhaume MYRDDIN-EVANS (Government Representative on the delegation from the Governing Body of the International Labour Office) stated that the French proposal was now entirely consonant with the views of his Organisation, and he would be prepared to withdraw his own suggestion in favour of it. He asked that in the English version the abbreviation "i.e." be replaced by the words "that is to say".

It was so agreed.

Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) welcomed the additional safeguards introduced in the final version of the French proposal, and the retention of two important elements, reflected in the words "if he so desires" and in the words "which he freely accepts". In the light of the explanations of the meaning of the proposal and in particular of the interpretation of what was meant in it by "the right to work", and in that of the support given to it by Sir Guildhaume Myrddin-Evans on behalf of the International Labour Organisation, he was prepared to withdraw the United States proposal in its favour.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Soviet Union proposal on the right to work (E/CN.4/576).

The Soviet Union proposal was rejected by 10 votes to 2 with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Yugoslav proposal in document E/CN.4/576.

The Yugoslav proposal was rejected by 7 votes to 2 with 8 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of Lebanon, said that he would like a separate vote to be taken on the preamble to the French text, namely, the words: "Work being at the basis of all human endeavour". He believed those words to be unnecessary. Furthermore, they gave undue prominence to one element of human activity; but there were others of greater importance. He believed the inclusion of those words to have been an unjustifiable concession to the spirit of the age at the expense of truth.

He considered that the placing of the phrase "if he so desires" in the French text was somewhat ambiguous. Did it govern the remainder of the text, or only the phrase "to gain his living by work"?

Mr. LEROY-BEAULIEU (France) said all ambiguity in the French text would be removed if the words "si elle le désire" were placed after the word "obtenir" instead of after the word "possibilité".

Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom) said she would prefer a separate vote on the words "which he freely accepts", as she felt certain doubts about them too. They might almost be regarded as redundant.

Mr. YU (China) regretted that the proposals of the Egyptian representative and of the delegation of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office should have been withdrawn, since the French proposal was conceived in terms that suggested that the only purpose of work was to gain a livelihood. He would therefore be unable to vote in favour of the second part of that proposal.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked that a separate vote be taken on the words "if he so desires" in the French proposal, a clause which he believed governments would invoke in the future to justify the existence of unemployment and their failure to take measures to combat it.

The CHAIRMAN said that, as a result of the foregoing discussion, the French proposal for the article on the right to work (E/CN.4/576) would be voted on in five parts. He then put to the vote the opening words: "Work being at the basis of all human endeavour,".

Those words were adopted by 12 votes to 3 with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the words "the States Parties to the Covenant recognize the right to work, that is to say, the fundamental right of everyone to the opportunity,".

Those words were adopted by 16 votes to none with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the words "if he so desires,".

Those words were adopted by 9 votes to 4 with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the words "to gain his living by work".

Those words were adopted by 15 votes to none with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the words "which he freely accepts."

Those words were adopted by 11 votes to 2 with 5 abstentions.

Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom) said that she had voted in favour of certain portions of the French proposal. She would continue to take part in further debate on item 3(b) of the agenda and to assist in the work of drafting the texts because she regarded that her duty as a member of the Commission. However, she reserved the right of her Government to recommend at the conclusion of the discussion either that the articles should not be included at all in the draft Covenant, or that they should be embodied in a separate instrument.

Mr. LEROY-BEAULIEU (France) explained that he had voted against the retention of the words "if he so desires" because they added nothing, since the word "right" did not imply the idea of obligation.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the French proposal as a whole.

The French proposal was adopted by 16 votes to none with 2 abstentions.

Mr. CIASULLO (Uruguay) said that he had wished to display a co-operative and understanding spirit, and had therefore voted for the French proposal. He was not however altogether pleased with the wording of the article just adopted by the Commission, and reserved the right of his delegation to submit drafting amendments, which would not affect the substance, in the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he had abstained from voting on the French proposal because he considered it to be an entirely unsatisfactory formulation of a most important right. It was merely the expression of a pious hope which committed no-one to anything. His delegation would strive for the adoption of a better text at the next stage of consideration of the draft Covenant.

The CHAIRMAN observed that no decision had yet been taken on the second part of the original French proposal (E/CN.4/571), namely, the words: "They undertake to adopt the measures necessary for the exercise of that right." The Soviet Union representative's apprehensions might be somewhat allayed by the fact that the Commission had not yet dealt with the problem of the obligations to be undertaken by States in respect of the right to work.

He then suggested that, as the representatives of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office would not be present much longer, every opportunity should be taken to hear their views on the remaining economic and social rights. He would therefore invite Sir Guildhaume Myrddin-Evans to make a statement on them. Afterwards the Commission could decide whether it would deal with the second part of the original French text (that was, that relating to implementation) immediately or at a later stage.

Sir Guildhaume MYRDDIN-EVANS (Government Representative on the delegation from the Governing Body of the International Labour Office) said he was grateful for the opportunity of expressing the views of his Organisation on the rights which might be included in the draft Covenant under the heading of economic and social rights, particularly as, judging from the progress so far made, he would not be present when the Commission came to the detailed drafting of the texts on other economic and social rights.

The remaining rights of direct concern to his Organisation might be dealt with under three heads. First, there was the right to social security, which might be stated in simple and concise terms or elaborated by specific reference to such measures as health and unemployment insurance, maternity welfare and other forms of social security. His Organisation's preference lay with the former method, for the general reasons which he had expounded earlier in the discussion to the effect that, as the application of most of such rights would have to be undertaken by specialized agencies, they could best be expressed in general and simple terms. In the particular case of social security, the International Labour Organisation had undertaken to draw up international instruments bringing all aspects of social security within the scope of one or more conventions. A great deal of work had already been done by preliminary committees, and a number of reports drawn up. The first step in the final stage of the work would be taken at the forthcoming International Labour Conference, to be held in June 1951, when the first draft of a convention would be elaborated. The draft would be completed and adopted at the 1952 Conference, and would be a comprehensive instrument. For that reason he believed that only a general reference to social security was required in the draft Covenant.

Secondly, his Organisation was in favour of the inclusion of a provision in the draft Covenant ensuring just and favourable conditions of work. It would be for the Commission to decide whether the provision should be elaborated by reference to a number of specific aspects, as in sub-paragraph (f) of the United States proposal (E/CN.4/539/Rev.1). In that particular instance, there were certain advantages in making the provision somewhat more precise. Yet the same

considerations as applied to the question of social security also held there, since much of the field was already covered by conventions and recommendations of the International Labour Organisation. For example, in the coming month a convention would be adopted on the subject of equal pay. Thus, while his Organisation again held a preference for a provision conceived in general terms, it had no very strong objections to the addition of detailed clauses.

The third subject was that of trade union rights, and in that respect article 16 of the draft Covenant might perhaps adequately cover what his Organisation had in mind, namely, the right to effective recognition of trade unions and collective bargaining, and of the freedom to form trade unions. It might not be found necessary or even desirable to draft a detailed article on the subject. Two conventions relating to it had already been adopted by the International Labour Conference, which was engaged in drawing up further recommendations. It had been found an extremely difficult task, and had taken two years to accomplish. It might therefore be best for the Commission to draw up a simple, precise provision, such as that contained in article 16, leaving the details to be worked out by the international organizations concerned. If it was thought that that particular right should appear in the section of the draft Covenant devoted to economic, social and cultural rights, the existing article 16 might be transferred, but there was one objection to doing so, namely that the right of association also belonged among civil and political rights.

Those three subjects represented the minimum that his Organisation would like to see included in the draft Covenant. He believed that if appropriate provisions could be included, enormous benefit would accrue to the peoples of the world. He did not know whether the Commission would decide to consider those rights before dealing with the last sentence of the original French text, but he hoped that he would be allowed, before leaving, to make a statement on his Organisation's views on implementation.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Commission whether it wished to proceed at once with the examination of the second sentence of the original French proposal

(E/CN.4/571) relating to the obligations to be undertaken by governments in respect of the right to work.

Mr. WHITLAM (Australia) thought that consideration of that matter might be deferred.

He himself was in favour of an over-all clause relating to implementation, applicable to all the provisions relating to economic, social and cultural rights.

Mr. SÖRENSEN (Denmark) agreed with the Australian representative. He did not think the Commission could usefully consider the second part of the original French proposal until it had decided whether there should be a general implementation clause or separate ones relating to each right.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Commission should be clear about whether it was in favour of a general clause constituting an over-all engagement by States to put certain rights into practice. A possible method of approach was one which had on one occasion been adopted in the past, when separate implementation clauses had been considered in relation to different articles: it being understood that at the conclusion of the discussion they might all be embodied in a single article.

Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) thought it reasonable that members of the Commission who preferred a clause containing a general undertaking should deem it advisable to defer discussion of the obligations to be assumed by States signatories to the Covenant. But such decision would have the effect of prejudging the solution of the question, since members of the Commission who, like himself, favoured special undertakings would be deprived of the opportunity of stating their views on the relevant clause which should be included for each right.

He was firmly convinced that the method of drafting a clause containing a general undertaking was not the best, and thought the time had come to settle the question, which, he was equally convinced, had become still more urgent since the submission of a proposal concerning measures of implementation by the International Labour Organization (E/CN.4/AC.14/1).

He therefore proposed that the substance of the question should be discussed forthwith.

Mr. LEROY-BEAULIEU (France) thought it advisable, in the interests of orderly procedure, and if it was at all possible in the time available, to accept the Chilean representative's proposal, and hence to study the special undertaking clause most appropriate to each right. The Commission should obviously avoid prejudging the question of any particular right. But time was short and, in addition, that meeting was the last that the representatives of the International Labour Organisation would be able to attend. Moreover, since the General Assembly had directed the Commission to carry out a specific task, namely, to complete the preparation of a draft First International Covenant on Human Rights at that session, there were practical difficulties in the way of the Chilean proposal, although it was perfectly logical.

Mr. WHITLAM (Australia) thought that he might have been misunderstood. What he had meant was that the specific provision relating to the implementation of the right to work should be discussed at a later stage.

Mr. JEVREMOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) supported the Australian representative. He did not think it would be appropriate to discuss at the present stage only the implementation of the right to work.

Mr. DUPONT-WILLEMIN (Guatemala) agreed with the Chilean representative, since the Commission could hardly, at that stage, refrain from discussing the clauses laying down State undertakings. Furthermore, it would be perfectly simple for the Commission to discuss the text of a special undertaking clause concerning the right to work without thereby prejudging the question of a general undertaking clause. He therefore requested the Commission to turn to the second part of the French proposal, with regard to which he would accept the Chilean proposal, apart from one point of detail.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed. If the French representative still maintained the last sentence of the French proposal, namely:

"They undertake to adopt the measures necessary for the exercise of that right", it should surely be discussed forthwith. If he did not, the sentence should be withdrawn. He feared that the Commission was adopting a somewhat unusual method of conducting its business.

He personally considered that the wording of that sentence merely echoed that of article 1 of the draft Covenant. It laid no obligation whatever on governments to guarantee the right to work. It would always be open to them to say that they had taken certain measures which had unfortunately proved unsuccessful.

Mr. EUSTATHIADES (Greece) recalled that when at the previous meeting, he had been obliged to revert to the question whether or not discussion on an overall undertaking clause should be suspended for the time being, the Commission had confirmed its previous decision not to go back to the matter, in view of the need for taking the fullest possible advantage of the presence of the representatives of the specialized agencies, and especially of the competent advice which the representatives of the International Labour Organisation could offer on questions within their purview. Purely on those grounds, he thought that the Commission might defer examination of the second part of the French proposal.

Mr. SÖRENSEN (Denmark) too was in favour of deferring the discussion on the second sentence of the French proposal (E/CN.4/571). The International Labour Organisation, although not indifferent to the wording of that sentence, was not primarily concerned with it. On the other hand, the Commission would benefit greatly by the advice of that Organisation on the three points referred to by Sir Guildhaume Myrddin-Evans. It should be possible for the latter to speak later on the question of implementation.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Australian proposal that further discussion on the second sentence of the French proposal be deferred.

The proposal was adopted by 11 votes to 5 with 2 abstentions.

2. Special provisions concerning conditions of work and the right to rest and leisure (E/CN.4/AC.14/2/Add.2)

The CHAIRMAN then asked the Commission to take up the various proposals concerning conditions of work and the right to rest and leisure set out in document E/CN.4/AC.14/2/Add.2. He recalled that one of the representatives of the International Labour Organisation had remarked that although it would be preferable for the Commission to restrict itself to a general declaration in respect of those conditions, the International Labour Organisation would have no objection to the inclusion of detailed clauses in the case under discussion.

Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom) supported the United States proposal. She presumed that an introductory phrase such as "The States Parties to this Covenant recognize the right" would have to be included. Those words would meet the conditions suggested by the International Labour Organisation as most suitable, particularly in view of the circumstance that so many of the points under that heading had been taken up, or were under consideration, by the International Labour Organisation through its Conventions and Recommendations.

She preferred the phrase "reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay" to the words "the right to rest and leisure", which was too general and might lay itself open to strange interpretations. The phrase "equal pay for equal work" was better than the wording "equal pay for men and women" because the question not only of men and women but also of people of different races, of nationals and non-nationals and of similar categories had to be taken into account. The phrase "equal pay for equal work" seemed to meet the need for equal treatment for workers of all kinds.

Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) agreed that an introductory phrase, such as that suggested by the United Kingdom representative, should be included in the United States text.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the haste with which the Commission was proceeding rendered the work of delegations most difficult. Without finishing one matter, it was passing quickly to others at a speed unlikely to produce any effective results.

The Soviet Union proposal, which had been rejected by the Commission, could

be found in mutilated form in other proposals, but, whereas his proposal included not only a declaration of principle but also a statement of the specific measures to be undertaken by States in implementing the provisions, the suggestions put forward by the Danish and other delegations consisted mainly of an expression of pious hopes and wishes. Had the Soviet Union suggestion been adopted, signatory States would have been obliged to implement the provisions either by law or by means of collective agreements. His proposal would have allowed each signatory State full freedom, in compatibility with its legislative and constitutional structure, to undertake the practical application of the provision. He had drafted it with due regard for the differences between the economic systems of the various Member States.

The sponsors of the other proposals had, at least outwardly, attempted to approximate to his wording, not because they felt any strong predilection for his suggestion, but because they realised that it was impossible to deny to any worker the rights prescribed in the Soviet Union proposal.

The Danish text laid down no obligations to be undertaken by States; the operative part merely declared that States should undertake to promote conditions which would ensure the right to just and favourable wages and conditions of work. The final words of the Danish draft were almost verbatim those of the Soviet Union text. It might seem that the differences between the two texts were of a minor, editorial nature, but it should be noted that the Danish text spoke of promoting conditions, whereas the Soviet Union draft stipulated that the rights in question should be ensured by the adoption of specific measures. The obligation to promote certain conditions was not at all the same thing as the obligation to guarantee observance of certain rights. The provisions in the Danish text were much too elastic, and could be applied either very largely or not at all with equal facility. The same was more or less true of the proposals submitted by the other delegations, particularly that of the United States of America.

His delegation, imbued with the desire not just to voice pious hopes but also to include in the Covenant specific obligations to be assumed by States for the improvement of the living conditions of the workers, would continue to urge the adoption of its text. That text did not, perhaps, include all that his delegation might want. It did not, for instance, include the rights enjoyed by workers in the Soviet Union, because he was not entirely oblivious to the economic and social

situation obtaining in other countries. But the provisions it did contain could be accepted by all signatory States irrespective of their economic and social structure.

The CHAIRMAN explained that he had not intended to speed up the Commission's proceedings unduly. When he had spoken of acting on the texts submitted, his intention had been to urge representatives to express their views.

Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) noted that the United States and Soviet Union proposals had one point in common, on which he would like to comment, namely, the adjective "reasonable", as applied to the limitation of working hours.

He did not think it advisable to use such an epithet as "reasonable" in a legal instrument like the Covenant. The word was ambiguous. After all, who was to decide whether the 48-hour week or the 60-hour week constituted the more "reasonable" limitation? What length of working day could be regarded as conforming with the provisions of the Covenant? The same observation applied to the use of the word in the same context in the Danish proposal.

Hence he urged the adoption of some more precise epithet than "reasonable". Possibly the expression "legal limitation" might be used.

Mr. SÖRENSEN (Denmark) said that in certain countries the limitation of working hours was fixed by collective agreements. The Danish trade unions would therefore regard it as interference in their process of collective bargaining if the limitation of working hours was regulated by legislation. Such difficulties would not, of course, arise in every country; he had merely mentioned them to convey the situation in Denmark.

Miss BOWIE (United Kingdom), referring to the words "reasonable limitation of working hours", believed that the International Labour Organisation had already dealt with, and might still be working on, certain conventions bearing on working hours. She felt that the experience of that Organisation might be helpful to the Commission at the present stage.

Mr. JEVREMOVIC (Yugoslavia) explained that his proposal had not gone into the duties and obligations of States. The question of whether States would be able to create the proper conditions to guarantee the rights under consideration

would be taken up later. On the other hand, the Commission must examine what rights should be included in the article and guaranteed to workers. The Yugoslav proposal, which was not exhaustive, listed four such rights: those to a fair wage, to reasonable working hours prescribed by law, to working conditions not harmful to health, and to annual holidays with pay.

In reply to the Danish representative, he would point out that working hours were determined by mutual agreement not only in Denmark, but also in other countries. Although the State prescribed the legal limits of the working day, it would still be possible to apply the stipulations of the Covenant within those limits.

The proposals submitted by other delegations did not list all the rights which should be included in the article, for example, the right to proper conditions of work and to reasonable working hours. The United States suggestion made no reference to the right to working conditions which were not harmful to health. Thus it would be seen that the most essential rights of workers were embodied in the Yugoslav proposal.

Mr. KOVALENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) considered it necessary to lay down how the rights proclaimed in Article 24 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should be ensured, and who was to guarantee them. It was essential to include in the draft Covenant provisions stipulating that the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay, should be guaranteed to all workers by the State, either through collective bargaining or by legislation.

The rights enumerated in Article 24 were constitutionally guaranteed in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and, indeed, throughout the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. In the Ukraine, the working day was limited to eight hours, and to seven or even six hours in the case of arduous trades and professions. Ukrainian workers and employers enjoyed annual holidays with pay, and a network of clubs, sanatoria and rest houses. 67 per cent of the budget was devoted to social and cultural activities, a large part being used to ensure the right to rest, to leisure and to holidays with pay. In other countries, particularly in colonies, non-self-governing territories and trust territories, such rights were not provided for constitutionally, or at most were applied only to a limited extent. He therefore supported the Soviet Union proposal, which aimed at the inclusion in the

Covenant of provisions supplementing Article 24 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Sir Guildhaume MYRDDIN-EVANS (Government Representative on the delegation of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office) was in favour of the United States draft, with the addition of the phrase "working conditions which are not injurious to health" from the Yugoslav draft. The combined text would provide a fairly complete picture of just and equitable working conditions. The United States draft included, after the words "just and favourable conditions of work", most of the important points.

The text submitted by the Soviet Union representative was not satisfactory at the current stage, because it included rights to be defined and provisions laying responsibility on Governments. When discussing the right to work, the Commission had tried to treat those matters separately. It was particularly important to follow the same procedure during the discussion on conditions of work, because there were several ways of ensuring the observance of the rights in question. It was, for example, possible to create just and favourable working conditions without a system of collective agreements. Those conditions might equally well be brought into existence by collective bargaining or by Government intervention.

The Chilean representative had suggested the use of the words "legal limitation of working hours". Such wording would be acceptable if it were known what the extent of working hours would be as limited by statutory law in the various countries. Legal limitation was a purely relative concept. He considered the words "reasonable limitation" the best suited to express the right of workers not to be unduly imposed upon. In defining "reasonable limitation", the State would not be the sole judge; the body set up to examine the extent to which those rights were being implemented would have to pass judgment on the basis of periodical reports, and could work on a strict interpretation of the word "reasonable".

It might be suggested that some particular figure should be quoted to limit the working week. Forty-eight hours was the figure mentioned in a Convention of the International Labour Organisation negotiated in 1919. In 1951, forty hours might be regarded as the basic figure. It would be impracticable to stipulate any precise figures in that connexion.

Miss SENDER (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions), speaking at the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, suggested that any information which the International Labour Organisation might have to offer on the subject of working hours, wages and similar matters, which it had probably discussed in the elaboration of its Conventions, might be useful to the Commission.

Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) thought that, in connexion with the legal limitation of working hours, reference might be made to laws in force, so as to provide the Covenant with a formula which was both terse and specific. He was prepared to agree to the adjective "fair" in connexion with wages. But the question was somewhat different in respect of the limitation of working hours. In international law, the reasoning and judgment of States were expressed in the form of laws, and it was inconceivable that a government would approve a law prescribing an unduly long working day; in any event, the political parties and trade unions would oppose any such step. He was convinced that the improvement of the workers' lot was essentially dependent on their own action. They would inevitably strive to ensure that the legislation of their countries prescribed a reasonable working day.

In that connexion, no general decisions could be taken. Whereas a working day of eight or nine hours might seem reasonable in most instances, that would not be true in the case of miners, whose working conditions were particularly arduous. Hence it was desirable that the laws should stipulate working days of different lengths for particular categories of workers; and he therefore formally proposed that the United States proposal be amended, the word "reasonable" being replaced by the word "legal" or by the expression "prescribed by law".

Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) agreed with Sir Guildhaume Myrddin-Evans that the words "working conditions which are not injurious to health" could be inserted in the United States text after the word "including". He could not accept the Chilean s ggestion that the word "reasonable" be replaced by the word "legal", mainly because a legislative body might conceivably adopt working hours completely regardless of reason.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the words "reasonable and legal" might be used.

Sir Guildhaume MYRDDIN-EVANS (Government Representative on the delegation of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office) said in reply to the observation of the representative of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions that the International Labour Organisation had, in elaborating various Conventions, dealt with working hours, holidays with pay, weekly rest days, minimum wage machinery and protection of wages. At the moment it was discussing matters bearing on the wages of agricultural workers and hoped to complete its consideration of those items at the coming International Labour Conference. In 1952, his Organisation intended to take up the drafting of international regulations for the protection and safety of workers at their places of employment, a subject to some extent connected with that part of the Yugoslav text which he felt might be included in the United States draft.

Miss SENDER (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions) asked whether the International Labour Organisation had found a better formula to express the idea of reasonable limitation of working hours and of similar subjects under discussion.

Sir Guildhaume MYRDDIN-EVANS (Government representative on the delegation of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office) replied that, in connexion with a Convention to be applied for a particular time, his Organisation had specified a particular weekly period of work as the maximum desirable. It would, however, be inappropriate to include a reference to specific hours in a definition of fundamental human rights. The implementation of the document on human rights at any period would be carried out, in conformity with detailed regulations, by a United Nations organ, by the International Labour Organisation or by whatever other competent body was set up for the purpose.

Mr. JEVREMOVIC (Yugoslavia) felt that, although the phrase "working hours as prescribed by law" was not entirely satisfactory, it was better than the words "reasonable limitation of working hours". It was particularly

desirable to provide for the limitation of working hours in under-developed countries, where no relevant legislation existed. The word "reasonable" was vaguer than the phrase "prescribed by law". It might be advisable to combine both ideas, and to say "reasonable working hours as prescribed by law".

Mr. SORENSEN (Denmark) stressed that insistence on the phrase "working hours as prescribed by law" would create immense difficulties for the Danish Government. If the working hours for agricultural workers in Denmark had to be legally limited, the figure would probably not be less than 60 hours per week. Again, the limitation of working hours would apply not only to hired workers, but also to small farmers working their own land. Similar difficulties would arise in the case of ships and crews. It might be possible to limit working hours on larger ships with sizeable crews, but not on smaller ships. In the instances to which he had referred, collective bargaining would be needed to safeguard the interests of hired workers. The dynamic element of collective bargaining should be maintained.

In agriculture, the limitation of working hours might not be the most favourable procedure for the workers themselves; it would also hinder the efforts of the trade unions which, by collective bargaining, were striving to cut down unreasonable working hours. The representative of the International Labour Organisation had already remarked that such problems could only be solved by very detailed regulations drafted with due regard to the particular trades, industries and the conditions obtaining in the various countries.

The CHAIRMAN felt that the word "reasonable" should be used, because it referred to "reason", the most noble of man's attributes.

Mr. JEVREMOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that the Danish representative had been speaking of exceptions to the rule; the cases he had mentioned arose in other countries also. It was advisable to establish a general law which would make provision for permissible exceptions.

Mr. EGGERMANN (International Federation of Christian Trade Unions), speaking at the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, reminded the members of the Commission

of the statement he had made at the beginning of the session. He had recommended that mention should be made of the family as the basic unit of society. He regretted to note that none of the proposals before the Commission made any mention of the family, despite the provisions of Articles 23 (3) and 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

He appealed to the members of the Commission to devote attention to the matter, and to include some mention of the family in the text they were drafting. Workers everywhere would sense discrimination if no account was taken of so important a social factor.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with the representative of the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions, and was prepared, as representative of Lebanon, to sponsor his suggestion.

Mr. FISCHER (World Federation of Trade Unions), speaking at the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, pointed out that the rights of the family were incorporated in specific clauses in the proposal submitted by his Federation. With regard to the ensemble of the problems before the Commission, he thought an intermediate course should be taken between the statement of principles lacking positive effect, and highly detailed provisions. That was the Federation's objective in putting forward its proposal.

He did not feel that the arguments of the representative of the International Labour Organisation in defence of his viewpoint were altogether convincing. Sir Guildhaume Myrddin-Evans had argued that it would be sufficient to have a brief and clear statement of economic and social rights in the Covenant, since detailed provision relating to those rights had already been made in conventions or recommendations negotiated by the International Labour Organisation.

But a specialized agency could not expect the United Nations to steer clear of all fields in which it happened to possess special competence. It was, after all, conceivable that even though a question had been fully dealt with by the International Labour Organisation, the Commission on Human Rights might succeed in drawing up a more satisfactory text. Again, there were considerable

differences between the membership and structure of the International Labour Organisation and that of the United Nations. Hence the States called upon to ratify the former's conventions would not necessarily be the same as the parties to international covenants on human rights.

Finally, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council had specifically instructed the Commission on Human Rights to include in the Covenant provisions relating to economic, social and cultural rights. The competence of the International Labour Organisation was, however, confined to the social field. That was a shortcoming to which Albert Thomas himself had drawn attention. In any case, the First International Covenant on Human Rights would not have the same psychological effect as the technical conventions of the International Labour Organisation. The Covenant would include a whole series of widely different rights, some of which would derive their value entirely from their juxtaposition with the others.

The World Federation considered that the rights to be included by the Commission in the Covenant should be in keeping with the requirements of the working people. In other words, the provisions referring to such rights should aim at eliminating unfair treatment of workers. The latter would fail to grasp the scope and value of the Covenant if the rights which more specially concerned them were laid down in too abstract a manner.

He felt that the Soviet Union proposal and that of the World Federation were in keeping with the interests of the workers. The Commission should mention the rights to a decent standard of living; to social security; to unemployment benefits (at present certain types of workers did not receive unemployment benefits at all, or were entitled to relief only after they had been out of work for some time); to rest, leisure and paid holidays; and to adequate housing. The Covenant should also include a general statement of the principle of non-discrimination, including its practical application to women workers. It should likewise define cultural and trade union rights, which were at the very foundation of economic and social rights, since the latter would not exist if there were no trade unions to safeguard them.

Mr. SORENSEN (Denmark) said that he would withdraw his suggestion in favour of the United States text in which the phrase "working conditions which are not injurious to health" had been inserted.

Mr. SIMSARIAN (United States of America) then read out the revised United States text:

> "The States Parties to this Covenant recognize the right to just and favourable conditions of work, including working conditions not injurious to health, fair wages, reasonable limitation of working hours, periodic holidays with pay and equal pay for equal work".

Mr. LEROY-BEAULIEU (France) submitted a proposal concerning conditions of work and the right to rest and leisure (E/CN.4/577). The text was based on the United States proposal, the main provisions of which had been retained, but re-arranged in what seemed to him a more logical order, with the addition of the concepts of family responsibilities, safety and health conditions.

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that consideration of the new French proposal be deferred until Monday, April 30, by which time it would have been translated.

The Soviet Union proposal was unanimously adopted.

(c) CONSIDERATION OF PROVISIONS FOR THE RECEIPT AND EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS FROM INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS WITH RESPECT TO ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF THE COVENANT - STUDIES ON QUESTIONS RELATING TO PETITIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION (E/CN.4/AC.14/1)

Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) stated that he had certain questions of a legal nature to raise in connexion with the proposal of the International Labour Organisation set out in document E/CN.4/AC.14/1, and wished to be allowed to put them before the representative of that body addressed the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that in view of his impending departure Sir Guildhaume Myrddin-Evans might be invited to introduce his suggestion concerning implementation (E/CN.4/AC.14/1).

Mr. MOROSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether that would entail further discussion on implementation. If so, he would have an alternative proposal to make.

The CHAIRMAN observed that he was not opening a general debate on the question of implementation. He would only invite representatives to put such questions to Sir Guildhaume as pertained to the form, suitability or any other

general aspect of his suggestion. No observations on its substance would be allowed.

He asked the Chilean representative whether he would be prepared to defer raising his questions.

Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) stated that in his opinion the proposal of the International Labour Organisation set out in document E/CN.4/AC.14/1 raised a question of a legal nature concerning the relationship between the United Nations and the specialized agencies. At first sight, the proposal seemed to him contrary both to the letter and to the spirit of the Charter. He might be mistaken, but he thought that article (a), paragraph 1, of the proposal was incompatible with the provisions of Article 1, paragraph 1, of the Charter, which gave the United Nations, not a general responsibility, but a definite and lasting responsibility in all cases where international peace and security were threatened.

The Organisation's proposal made it appear that the main responsibility for ensuring respect for economic, social and cultural rights lay with that specialized agency. But, according to Article 1, paragraph 3, of the Charter, it was the responsibility of the United Nations "To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms .....". The provisions of Articles 24 and 103 of the Charter could also be quoted with equal relevancy.

Hence the proposal of the International Labour Organisation seemed to conflict with the purposes of the Charter, and by adopting it the United Nations would be surrendering certain responsibilities entrusted to it by the terms of the Charter, and contenting itself with the role of a co-ordinating body between the specialized agencies.

Sir Guildhaume MYRDDIN-EVANS (Government Representative on the delegation of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office), introducing his suggestion (E/CN.4/AC.14/1), said that the question of implementation had two

separate aspects, that of application and that of compliance. The latter involved some measure of supervision. Perhaps his remarks on application might dispose of some of the Chilean representative's difficulties. It was a fact, and one, so far as he knew, that had never been challenged, that the specialized agencies had been entrusted with responsibilities for dealing with certain aspects of economic, social and cultural questions. In the course of the past thirty years the International Labour Organisation had drawn up international regulations on many subjects, including over one hundred conventions, and nearly as many recommendations, which were only slightly less binding in character. Thus, much of the field which it was proposed to cover in the articles of the draft Covenant under discussion by the Commission had already been dealt with by the International Labour Organisation, which had a continuing responsibility in such matters. It was essential that it be clearly understood that his Organisation would pursue action within its field of competence with as much authority as had been assumed by the United Nations over a wider range.

In discussions between the United Nations and specialised agencies during the past five or six years, constant emphasis had been placed on the need for avoiding duplication of effort and for co-operation in the common work, in order to avoid conflicts of decision, statement of aim or regulations. All must work together in their respective fields so as to cover the whole field of international action. As the United Nations was taking the Universal Declaration a step further by drawing up a covenant on human rights involving binding commitments on governments, the further development of international legislation on those rights should be entrusted to the responsible specialized agencies, the basic conditions having been laid down in the draft Covenant itself.

Passing to the question of compliance, he pointed out that the International Labour Organisation had adopted and would continue to adopt as part of its normal work detailed conventions and recommendations on a great variety of subjects. Those instruments laid on Governments Members of the Organisation the responsibility of making periodic reports on the action taken on the legislative situation in their country and on the extent to which they anticipated the possibility of further action. That responsibility rested not only on signatory

governments, but on every member of the Organisation. It was an obligation, therefore, of far wider application than those involved in international instruments drawn up by other specialized agencies, where commitments were only undertaken by signatory States.

It seemed desirable that where the rights to be written into the draft Covenant fell within the competence of specialized agencies, use should be made of the latter's existing machinery, rather than that new machinery should be set up. There were, of course, matters which were not covered by any specialised agency, and therefore had to be dealt with by the United Nations. Again, a particular right might involve States which were not members of a specialized agency. That gap, too, could only be filled by an organization embracing the largest number of States.

Those were the two principles on the basis of which he had framed his suggestion. It was true that in article (a), paragraph 1, he had made no mention of the responsibility of the United Nations in the promotion of human rights, though the intention had been to recognize the over-all responsibility of the United Nations in that field.

The Chilean representative had taken exception to the use of the word "general" qualifying the word "responsibility". What he had had in mind in using it was the over-all responsibility of the United Nations. If the word "general" raised doubts in the minds of certain representatives, he would agree to its deletion.

With all due respect, he must express his regret that the Chilean representative should have raised the question of competence. That representative had argued that the United Nations could take any action it wished in any field irrespective of the responsibilities any specialized agency might have in that field. He did not believe that the issue was pertinent to the matter in hand, or that it would be fruitful to pursue it. The specialized agencies had been entrusted by their constitutions with direct responsibilities. Those of his Organisation dated back to 1919. It counted 62 States amongst its members, all of whom adhered to the Constitution and agreed that the Organisation should carry

out certain tasks. He would quote in that connexion Article 1 of the Relationship Agreement between the United Nations and the International Labour Organisation, which read:

> "The United Nations recognizes the International Labour Organisation as a specialized agency responsible for taking such action as may be appropriate under its basic instrument for the accomplishment of the purposes set forth therein."

There had been a long partnership of trust and co-operation between the United Nations and its specialized agencies, which was an example of what could be achieved by goodwill on both sides. If that spirit continued to prevail no difficulties could arise with regard to the delimitation of functions.

Passing to article (b) of his suggestion, he said that it had been taken verbatim from paragraph 4 of the Australian proposal (E/CN.4/543), and as it appeared to him to provide a valuable statement of purpose and of the position, he hoped it would be accepted. He had indeed failed to understand the nature of the Chilean representative's objections to it.

Mr. BERGENSTRØM (Employers' Representative on the delegation of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office) said that the fact that he had remained silent during the discussions should not be misinterpreted. It only meant that he had given his personal blessing to the general line taken by Sir Guildhaume Myrddin-Evans and Mr. Jouhaux. That fact in no way committed the employers' representatives on the Governing Body. It was well known that employers in most countries and workers in some held definite views about the undesirability of government intervention in labour problems through legislation or other means. In view of the tripartite structure of the International Labour Organisation, such differences of opinion often occurred, and would certainly occur in relation to the subjects before the Commission. He had deemed it, however, to be more constructive not to take up the time of the latter in expounding the detailed views of employers on the problems under discussion by the Commission. But he wished to make it absolutely clear that they were not bound in any way by the attitude he had taken at the present preliminary stage of the discussions on that most complicated and important group of problems.

He was not very familiar with the procedure of United Nations Commissions, but he assumed that the employers' representatives would have an opportunity of examining the matter at a later stage, and of giving their considered views. He regretted that he was making his statement in the absence of Mr. Jouhaux, of whose impending departure he had been unaware.

Passing to the question of implementation, he declared his conviction that duplication in international work must be avoided at all costs. He strongly supported the general ideas underlying the suggestion put forward by Sir Guildhaume Myrddin-Evans (E/CN.4/AC.14/1). He believed it to be abundantly clear that implementation should be the responsibility of the specialized agency concerned, which had both the necessary machinery and experience for that task.

Sir Guildhaume MYRRDIN-EVANS (Government Representative on the delegation of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office) said that before leaving Mr. Jouhaux had asked him to state that he was in complete agreement with the suggestions put forward on behalf of the International Labour Office and with the statement he (Sir Guildhaume) had made on implementation.

Mr. LEROY-BEAULIEU (France) had listened to the comments on the proposal of the International Labour Organisation with great interest. His first reaction resembled that of the Chilean representative.

In any case, the text of the International Labour Organisation proposal was of fundamental importance, as it might create a precedent. He felt that only a few changes of substance would be necessary, and asked whether any other specialized agencies supported the proposal.

The CHAIRMAN had no objection to the representatives of the specialized agencies replying to the French representative's query. He pointed out, however, that the question of implementation was being discussed only in order to derive the greatest possible benefit from the presence of the representatives of the International Labour Organisation before their imminent departure.

Speaking as representative of Lebanon, he recalled, moreover, that his delegation had submitted a scheme for the implementation of the provisions of

the Covenant. When he came to speak on that proposal during the substantive debate on implementation, he would also wish to comment on the International Labour Organisation text.

Mr. SABA (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) expressed willingness to outline the opinion of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) on the proposal before the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN said that if any representative of a specialized agency did not wish at once to answer the question put by the French representative, he could do so later, in the course of the detailed study of implementation measures.

Mr. SABA (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) stated that the proposal of the International Labour Organisation was acceptable to UNESCO. The procedure which it provided for seemed entirely suitable. In the Constitution of UNESCO there were already provisions requiring States Members of UNESCO to report on the measures they had taken in the educational field.

The International Labour Organisation proposal was of an entirely general nature. The French representative (Mr. Cassin) had already suggested that special procedures for certain specific rights might be laid down in addition to the general implementation procedure, and had mentioned as an example the provisions of the Covenant relating to the right to education.

Mr. EUSTATHIADES (Greece) felt that the representative of UNESCO would have difficulty in giving a precise answer to the question put to him, as the machinery of control by reports, described in the International Labour Organisation proposal, already existed and was giving excellent results. But the special system of control envisaged by the Director-General of UNESCO in his extremely interesting proposal, was not absolutely identical with that.

The task of the Commission was therefore to endeavour to define in principle the nature of the assistance which could be given to the United Nations by the specialized agencies. Admittedly, there were certain extremely delicate aspects

of that question, due to the fact that some of the States parties to the Covenant might not be members of the International Labour Organisation or of UNESCO. Tact would also be needed to establish a system which would avoid overlapping.

The International Labour Organisation's proposal set up a general framework, certain points of which would require more precise definition. His delegation considered that proposal highly constructive and that it allowed reasonable scope for the intervention of the specialized agencies and the collaboration of those agencies with the United Nations.

He had listened with very great interest to the convincing arguments put forward by Sir Guildhaume Myrddin-Evans in reply to the question put to him by the Chilean representative concerning the incompatability of the International Labour Organisation's proposal with the provisions of the United Nations Charter. He would add that Articles 56, 57 and 63 of the Charter obliged States Members of the United Nations to undertake certain activities, in co-operation with the specialized agencies, in pursuance of those aims of the United Nations which that organization had not wished to relinquish.

He considered that Article 1 of the Charter should be interpreted in the light of the provisions of Articles 56, 57 and 63. In his opinion, the United Nations and the specialized agencies formed an organic whole, and should act in the most complete co-operation in certain fields, and especially in that of the protection of human rights.

The CHAIRMAN hoped that the Greek representative, and others, would refrain from embarking on any further substantive debate, since the matter would come up again at a later stage, when it was hoped that the three members of the delegation of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office would again be present to give their advice.

Mr. MORSE (Director-General of the International Labour Office) said that he was sorry to have to take up the time of the Commission when the delegation of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office had already fully

expressed its views on implementation. But since his early departure from Geneva on official business would prevent his being present at subsequent meetings, he wished to make one or two additional observations.

First, he felt that the question dealt with by Sir Guildhaume Myrddin-Evans was a critical issue, and perhaps a turning-point in the development of relations between the specialized agencies and the United Nations, A decision on it at the present time was therefore of supreme importance to all Member States and international inter-governmental organizations. Of that he was convinced, both personally and from the views expressed to him by Heads of States. He thought the Commission should not lose sight of the fact that the position of the delegation from the Governing Body was, in his view, consistent with that of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, whose task it was to guard against duplication and frustration of the various agencies' activities and to ensure that they did not interfere in each other's fields of competence, but moved forward together in a spirit of solidarity and co-operation towards the attainment of their common objectives. The International Labour Organisation was confident that its own work and its co-operation with the United Nations had been of a high standard and profitable both to the man-in-the-street and to the States Members of the various inter-governmental organizations.

Secondly, with reference to article (a), paragraph 3, of the proposal of the International Labour Organisation, which referred to the responsibilities of the Economic and Social Council, he thought he should make it clear that there was a wide area of agreement between the United Nations and the specialized agencies on that point. Both the International Labour Organisation and the other specialized agencies recognized the responsibilities and duty of the Economic and Social Council in co-ordinating the functions of international and special organizations with a view to marshalling their joint resources for the accomplishment of their common objectives. The International Labour Organisation, he repeated, was not opposed to measures of co-ordination. The question of interference in the prescribed fields of competence of the specialized agencies was an entirely different matter. He hoped that statement would go some way towards answering the point raised by the representative of Chile.

The views expressed by the delegation of the Governing Body had been settled after careful deliberation. Their only interest had been that of co-operation and the joint achievement of the Commission's objectives. It was on that note that he wished to leave the discussions of the Commission.

In answer to a question put to him by the CHAIRMAN, he undertook to ensure that the International Labour Organisation was suitably represented at future meetings of the Commission when the views of other representatives on implementation would be discussed.

On behalf of the Commission, the CHAIRMAN said that it would be most desirable that the representatives of the Governing Body, and the Director-General, of the International Labour Office should be present when the question of implementation was discussed in substance. He agreed that it was a crucial matter, and that no precipitate action should be taken. It raised some of the deepest issues in the field of international co-operation. For that reason the Commission would be all the more eager to have the opportunity of a free and authoritative exchange of view with representatives of the International Labour Organisation and Office when the substance of the matter came to be discussed. He was sure that no-one represented on the Commission had any desire to interfere with another's work or to run counter to the wishes of the General Assembly. In that spirit, he was sure that a further exchange of views would be extremely useful. And in fact he had understood that the proposals of the International Labour Organisation did not necessarily represent their last word on the subject, but were open to discussion. For that reason, too, the Commission would be grateful for the presence of their sponsors at a later stage.

Mr. MORSE (Director-General of the International Labour Office) hoped that his future absence would not be taken as a sign of discourtesy. In fact, he was on his way to Paris to a meeting of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination.

The CHAIRMAN said that since the representatives of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office would not be present at subsequent meetings, he wished to express the Commission's sincere appreciation of their

collaboration over the past week, and particularly of the most capable contributions they had made during the past two days. He wished to express the same deep appreciation to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and to the World Health Organization, and their respective Directors General, for their co-operation in those important deliberations. The meetings had been unique in the extent of intimate and fruitful co-operation between the United Nations and the specialized agencies which had been achieved.

Sir Guildhaume MYRDDIN-EVANS (Government Representative on the delegation of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office) said that, on the contrary, the debt was on the side of the International Labour Organization, which greatly appreciated the freedom with which it had been permitted to take part in the debate. He regretted that other duties of an international nature prevented his delegation being present at the next few meetings, but assured the Commission that it would return later to give of its best in the important tasks before the Commission.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.