



**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Welcome to the representative of Japan .....	169
Agenda item 31:	
Draft International Covenants on Human Rights ( <i>con-          tinued</i> )	
Article 7 of the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	169

**Chairman: Mr. Hermod LANNUNG (Denmark).**

***Welcome to the representative of Japan***

1. The CHAIRMAN welcomed the representative of Japan, who was taking his seat on the Third Committee for the first time.
2. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) expressed gratification at the admission of Japan to the United Nations. The Committee's work would undoubtedly benefit by the participation of Japan.
3. Mr. NISHIBORI (Japan) thanked the Chairman and the Dominican representative. After paying his respects to the officers of the Committee, he gave the assurance that his delegation would endeavour to make the most effective contribution possible to the Committee's work.

**AGENDA ITEM 31**

**Draft International Covenants on Human Rights (E/2573, annexes I, II and III, A/2907 and Add.1 and 2, A/2910 and Add.1 to 6, A/2929, A/3077, A/C.3/L.460, A/3149, A/C.3/L.528, A/C.3/L.532, A/C.3/L.538, A/C.3/L.541 to 548) (*continued*)**

**ARTICLE 7 OF THE DRAFT COVENANT ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS (E/2573, ANNEX I A) (*continued*)**

4. Mr. MACCHIA (Italy) said he was happy to note that the debate was more and more clearly taking on its proper technical character. The attitude of delegations appeared to be dictated by propaganda considerations to a lesser extent than before and the Committee's work was bound to benefit from the change.
5. Article 7 of the draft Covenant (E/2573, annex I A), though acceptable as a whole, since it enunciated the principle of "equal pay for equal work" which was enshrined in the Italian Constitution, nevertheless had certain weaknesses.
6. First, paragraph (b) (i) stated that women should enjoy special guarantees in respect of working conditions. Specific expression of that principle was unnecessary, as the representative of the International Labour Organization (ILO) had already observed (714th meeting). Article 7 was thus too explicit on that point. On the other hand, some of its provisions

were too vague. He entirely agreed with the Netherlands representative that paragraph (b) (ii) was a needless repetition of article 12. Admittedly article 12 had general application, but it was self-evident that a right guaranteed to "everyone" was *ipso facto* guaranteed to workers. Article 12 also proclaimed a very general principle of indisputable value, namely the right to the continuous improvement of living conditions. The Italian delegation favoured the Netherlands proposal (A/C.3/L.541) for the deletion of paragraph (b) (ii); but if the Committee decided to retain it, the text might perhaps be reworded to read: "a standard of living consonant with human dignity".

7. He was prepared to support the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.3/L.540), but suggested that the expression "decent individual and family life" in the introductory paragraph should be replaced by the words "life consonant with human dignity".

8. While he firmly believed that the development of the human personality should take place in freedom, he thought that the word "leisure" in article 7, paragraph (c), should not give rise to exaggerated fears. It did not necessarily presuppose that the State would apply a paternalist policy. His delegation would therefore have no objection to adopting that paragraph as it stood.

9. It would have greater difficulty in accepting the amendment proposed by Spain (A/C.3/L.538), which might entail a limitation on the right of trade unions to negotiate conditions of work.

10. Mrs. QUAN (Guatemala) said that her delegation was proposing the addition of a new clause to article 7 (A/C.3/L.546). Among the general provisions designed to guarantee the rights of workers, it was essential not to omit the right to be promoted solely on grounds of seniority and competence. The reasons for its inclusion were obvious, for discrimination in matters of promotion often occurred, based, for instance, on sex or political opinions. Many countries had already embodied in their Constitutions the principle underlying the proposed provision and it was fitting to introduce that principle in an international covenant designed to set the seal of equity on labour relations everywhere. The intention of her delegation was to remedy an omission; even if its proposed amendment were not accepted by the Committee, it would have the satisfaction of having sought to remedy a grave injustice.

11. She reserved the right to speak again later on the various amendments submitted.

12. Mrs. ELLIOT (United Kingdom) said that the joint amendments proposed by Greece and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.545) seemed distinctly preferable to the previous Uruguayan proposal (A/C.3/L.540). The new text did not include the word "guarantees", which she would have been unable to accept in view of the

system prevailing in her country. In the United Kingdom, conditions of work were determined through collective bargaining between workers and employers. The State was not a party to those negotiations and so could not give any guarantees. The system worked well, in the United Kingdom as elsewhere, and neither party to the bargaining would welcome State interference.

13. Paragraph 1 (a) as proposed in the joint amendments was rather vague in that only distinctions based on sex were specifically mentioned. The term "other considerations" presumably referred to the distinctions listed in article 2, paragraph 2. It would be well to make that fact clear.

14. The United Kingdom delegation had previously proposed (A/2910/Add.1) that the Committee should consider whether to retain the words "as a minimum" in article 7 (b) of the draft Covenant (E/2573, annex I A). She did not intend to submit a formal amendment on the point, but she would ask the Committee to take a separate vote on those words, which were inappropriate to the concepts of fairness and equality in paragraph (b) (i).

15. The Polish amendment (A/C.3/L.532 point 2) was not satisfactory to the United Kingdom delegation. It would be regrettable if each article were to include an implementation clause which would merely repeat the general provisions of article 2. Furthermore, that formula prejudiced the terms of article 2, which had still to be adopted.

16. In her view, the Spanish amendment (A/C.3/L.538) was unnecessary, since the term "periodic holidays with pay" also covered public holidays. She did not believe that the Afghan amendment calling for the replacement of the words "all workers" by the word "everyone" (A/C.3/L.542, point 1) was an improvement: remuneration was only in return for work done. Lastly, the additional paragraph proposed by Guatemala (A/C.3/L.546) did not seem desirable, being a further example of how the list of just conditions of work could be extended almost indefinitely.

17. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) asked what was meant by the words "other considerations" in paragraph 1 (a) of the wording proposed for article 7 in the joint amendments (A/C.3/L.545).

18. Mr. BRENA (Uruguay) explained that the words "other considerations" referred to distinctions based on the considerations other than sex specified in Article 1, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the United Nations. To clarify the situation, he added that the amendments submitted jointly by Greece and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.545) replaced his earlier amendment (A/C.3/L.540).

19. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) pointed out, with reference to certain remarks made at the previous meeting by the representative of the Dominican Republic, that the protection of human rights had been the work of men as well as of women and that the provisions adopted by the United Nations and other international organizations were not solely the result of the campaign carried on by women. If the word "conquest" was permissible, it could only refer to a conquest achieved by humanity for the protection of individuals. In presenting his amendments, he had had no intention of stifling the aspirations of women or of excluding them from the benefit of the rights

enunciated in the Covenant; he had always strenuously opposed every form of discrimination.

20. In that connexion, he pointed out that article 2, paragraph 2, and article 3 of the draft Covenant required that the rights must be exercised without distinction of any kind. As the draft already contained general provisions prohibiting all forms of discrimination, he did not consider it desirable to provide in paragraph (b) (i) of article 7 that women should be given certain guarantees with regard to working conditions.

21. Mr. CHENG (China) emphasized the possible danger of proposing a very large number of amendments and made some remarks on article 7 and certain of the proposed amendments.

22. Article 7 dealt with wage-earners in industry and agriculture and clerical workers, but did not cover self-employed persons and employers. Furthermore, the article emphasized the word "workers" rather than "persons". Those fundamental considerations should be borne in mind in considering the amendments; any which departed from the original wording on those essential points would not be amendments in the strict sense of the word but would be completely new provisions.

23. He agreed with the sponsors of the draft Covenant that the term "fair remuneration" meant a wage which would provide a decent living for the worker and his family; it presupposed the limitation of working hours, rest periods, leisure and periodic holidays with pay, and implied that public holidays would be paid. On the question whether or not the text should explicitly guarantee women working conditions not inferior to those enjoyed by men, he observed that while it was true that any such phrase would constitute a repetition of article 2, he realized that some way must be found to prevent States from merely proclaiming the principle of equality without attempting to apply it in practice. The Chinese delegation would vote in favour of maintaining the formula, as it had done in the Commission on Human Rights.

24. Turning to the amendments to article 7, he referred first to the amendment proposed by Poland (A/C.3/L.532, point 2). Article 2 did not commit States to anything more than the progressive achievement of the full realization of the rights recognized in the Covenant. Article 17 concerned the reports to be furnished by States on the progress made and article 18, paragraph 2, provided that those reports might indicate the difficulties which prevented States from fulfilling their obligations. Those provisions, together with article 23, served very well to illustrate the nature of the undertaking assumed by States with regard to the implementation of economic, social and cultural rights. The Polish amendment appeared not to have taken those articles into account, so that the formula it proposed was neither necessary nor even acceptable.

25. He said that it followed from the observations he had made that he would be unable to support the Netherlands amendment (A/C.3/L.541) and the Afghan amendments (A/C.3/L.542); nor would he support the amendment presented jointly by Afghanistan and the Netherlands (A/C.3/L.543).

26. Mrs. GERLEIN DE FONNEGRA (Colombia) pointed out that the Colombian Labour Code was in conformity with the provisions of article 7 of the draft Covenant, and gave some information on the laws

concerning safe and healthy working conditions, the minimum wage, working hours, paid leave and measures for the protection of mother and child.

27. The principle of "equal pay for equal work" was embodied in Colombian law and should find universal application. It might therefore be well to state that principle clearly in the Covenant. In addition, special mention should be made of women; she fully shared the views of the Dominican delegation on that point. Admittedly, the word "everyone" also included women, but it would be helpful to make the point clear, since equality of the sexes had not yet become a reality in all countries. The proclamation of the rights of working women would not change the working conditions of women overnight, but it would very likely have some effect. No efforts should be spared to improve the lot of women, since their part in society was equal to, though different from, that of men. Moreover, an increase in women's wages would help to improve the standard of living of the whole family.

28. The Colombian delegation whole-heartedly supported the amendment proposed by Guatemala (A/C.3/L.546).

29. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) said that while he realized that the various amendments proposed sought to improve the text of article 7, he thought that all the suggested changes should be received with the greatest caution. The Commission on Human Rights had carefully studied each of the articles with the assistance of the specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations. The members of the Committee should in turn examine those articles, and the proposed amendments to them, to determine whether they constituted a sincere effort to improve the living conditions of men and women. When his delegation examined the various provisions of article 7 on the basis of that criterion, it found that they were all calculated to ensure just and favourable conditions of work. The Afghan amendments (A/C.3/L.542) chiefly involved a question of terminology; that of Poland (A/C.3/L.532, point 2) seemed unnecessary, in view of the general provisions of article 2; the Netherlands amendment (A/C.3/L.541) would have the effect of weakening article 7, and the Philippine delegation could not support it or the joint amendment submitted by Afghanistan and the Netherlands (A/C.3/L.543). The Spanish amendment (A/C.3/L.538) seemed unnecessary. The reference to moral and civic independence in the amendment submitted by Greece and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.545, point 1 (c)) would introduce into article 7 a concept which would be too abstract and difficult to define. The Guatemalan amendment (A/C.3/L.546)—on which the Philippine delegation reserved the right to express its views at a later stage—mentioned only two factors, seniority and competence, which were perhaps insufficient.

30. In conclusion, he said that his delegation was prepared to vote for the text of article 7 as it stood.

31. U THWIN (Burma) said that his delegation fully endorsed the principles set forth in article 7, the provisions of which were in conformity with the Burmese Constitution and with his Government's economic and social policy. His delegation was accordingly prepared to vote for the text of that article, but it would not oppose the views of the other delegations in so far as they were not contrary to the fundamental principles of the draft Covenants. He hoped,

however, that the members of the Committee would only propose such amendments as they deemed absolutely necessary.

32. Mr. DIAZ CASANUEVA (Chile) said he would deal with various questions of principle raised by certain amendments which might run counter to the fundamental idea of the draft Covenant. The text of article 7 was acceptable. It could doubtless be improved, but it was only by a general attempt at compromise that an instrument could be prepared which would meet with acceptance by a large number of States. That did not mean that all the amendments would have to be dropped without exception; it meant only that the greatest caution must be exercised. With respect to article 7, for example, it would be more logical to refer the proposals concerning the numerous principles not mentioned in that article to the International Labour Organisation (ILO), where they would be studied by representatives of Governments, employers and workers. The Afghan amendments (A/C.3/L.542), like those of Greece and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.545), sought to extend the provisions of the article, some of which were restricted to workers, to all persons without exception. While it was true that the fundamental purpose of the draft Covenant was the protection of the human person, many of its provisions must relate to specific groups, such as children, adolescents, mothers or women, for example, who must be given special protection. It was quite proper that the introductory paragraph of article 7 should mention the right of everyone to just and favourable conditions of work; on the other hand, the provision concerning remuneration should be limited to wage-earners, for in many countries certain categories of persons did not receive wages and obviously could not be covered by that provision.

33. Several delegations wished to delete the special clause concerning working conditions of women, which would overlap with other provisions of the draft Covenant. He did not share that view; a special protecting clause was particularly necessary as age-old prejudices in the matter still existed and ought to be eradicated completely.

34. On the question of leisure he held exactly the same views as those expressed by the representative of Uruguay (713th meeting). He believed that Governments and private enterprise could, without interfering with the workers' private lives, afford them the opportunity to make constructive and intelligent use of their leisure. The purpose of the amendment proposed by Chile and Peru (A/C.3/L.544) was to emphasize that workers ought to use their leisure in self-improvement rather than spend it in harmful idleness.

35. In mentioning respect for the moral and civic independence of the worker's conscience, the amendment proposed by Greece and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.545, point 1 (c)) encroached upon the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (E/2573, annex I B), articles 18 and 19 of which dealt specifically with those matters. That provision obviously did not express what the sponsors of the amendment had in mind; a clear distinction ought to be made between civic and political conscience, on the one hand, and moral and religious conscience on the other hand. The sponsors of the amendment were clearly trying to prevent any discrimination with respect to conditions of work based on political or trade-union activities or religious beliefs.

36. He had supported the Polish amendment to article 6 (A/C.3/L.532, point 1), but was reluctant to support the corresponding amendment to article 7 (A/C.3/L.532, point 2). The Commission on Human Rights had expressed its opposition to such a provision. The Committee should also take into account the difficulties of those States which could not, under their domestic legislation, undertake to make certain arrangements that had to be negotiated directly between workers and employers.

37. Mr. EUSTATHIADES (Greece) said that in proposing their amendments (A/C.3/L.545), the Uruguayan and Greek delegations had tried to take into account the observations that had been made concerning respect for the relevant provisions of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly; they had attempted to group the provisions of article 7 in a more logical sequence, to take into account various comments made during the debate and, lastly, to be as brief as possible without abandoning the original text. Point 1 (a) of the amendments was intended solely to establish a uniform terminology for the draft Covenants; point 1 (b) was a formal amendment designed to correct the wording of the provision concerned. Point 1 (c) was mainly a question of logic and drafting, with the exception of the phrase concerning moral and civic independence, which could be put to the vote separately if certain delegations preferred to exclude it from article 7. Point 2 of the amendments combined paragraphs (b) and (b) (i) of article 7; the entire substance of those paragraphs was retained, but in more concise form, with the exception of the provision barring any distinctions based on sex. The omission of that provision was, of course, in no way intended to prevent the achievement of those conditions of equality which everyone desired. Delegations desiring to retain that provision would, moreover, be able to vote for it, if the two parts of paragraph (b) (i) of article 7, were put to the vote separately. Points 3 and 4 were also drafting changes; it was logical that workers' remuneration should be mentioned first, that it should be followed by questions of safety and health, and that the guarantee of a decent living, which was the aim of the various provisions of article 7, should be mentioned last. The only amendment affecting paragraph (b) (ii) consisted in replacing the words "for themselves and their families" by the words "in accordance with the present Covenant", inasmuch as the question of individual and family standards of living did not necessarily come within the scope of article 7; thus, that amendment too was a question of presentation.

38. Mrs. KOWALIKOWA (Poland) considered article 7 acceptable, since it called upon Governments to give workers guarantees which were in accordance with justice and progress. It was consistent with the provisions of the Polish Constitution and of Polish labour legislation. Her delegation did not consider that the article overlapped with the ILO conventions, which would rather have the nature of regulations to give effect to the general provisions of article 7. The recommendations in that article were not too detailed; they were more in the nature of general indications intended to guide the action of States in that field. Their significance differed with the political system and the level of economic development of the individual States concerned, but they also expressed a uniform trend towards the improvement of working conditions, remuneration and living conditions of workers. It was

essential therefore that all those recommendations should be retained. Her delegation accordingly could not support the amendment submitted by Afghanistan and the Netherlands (A/C.3/L.543), because discrimination against women still existed in the labour legislation of many countries; even if the Covenant contained a general recommendation elsewhere, there should be no fear of repetition in a matter of such importance. Her delegation would also vote against the Netherlands amendment (A/C.3/L.541). She was glad to accept the suggestion made by the Canadian and Greek representatives (714th meeting) that the word "adequate" in the Polish amendment (A/C.3/L.532, point 2) should be replaced by the word "appropriate".

39. Mrs. NOVIKOVA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said her delegation considered article 7 acceptable as it stood, since it mentioned the various factors which enabled workers to enjoy fair working conditions and since it proclaimed the fundamental principle of equal pay for equal work and, consequently, the equality of men and women in the economic sphere.

40. While grateful to the delegation of Uruguay for having taken the comments during the debate into account in the new amendment which it had submitted jointly with Greece (A/C.3/L.545), her delegation considered that the new amendment still contained certain changes which tended to reduce the scope of article 7. The original text of article 7 provided not only for equality of remuneration, but also for equality of working conditions, and the latter point was not covered in the amendment submitted by Greece and Uruguay. The amendment proposed by Afghanistan and the Netherlands (A/C.3/L.543) would also have the effect of eliminating that important point from article 7. Her delegation could not support any amendment which would have the effect of weakening article 7, as it was not sufficient in a covenant to make general statements: essential ideas should be presented in a concrete manner.

41. The principle of equal pay for equal work was far from universally applied. In many countries women were still paid less than men for the same work, with unfavourable results, not only for the women themselves, but also for the men, as firms preferred to use cheaper labour.

42. The Byelorussian delegation would vote in favour of the Guatemalan amendment (A/C.3/L.546) which assured women an equal opportunity for promotion with men. It would also support the Polish amendment (A/C.3/L.532, point 2), which not only proclaimed the equality of men and women, but also provided that States should take concrete steps to guarantee that equality in practice. In many countries, the rights of the human person were proclaimed in the national Constitution, but they remained a dead letter because the Governments did nothing to ensure their observance.

43. Mr. THIERRY (France) observed that the submission of such a large number of amendments made it difficult in many cases to assess the exact scope of each and that determining their relationship to one another and to the original text was at times like trying to solve a jigsaw puzzle. It was, of course, quite proper that the delegations not represented in the Commission on Human Rights—as well as the delega-

tions of new Member States—which had not participated in the drafting of the Covenants should voice their ideas and propose texts that seemed more satisfactory to them. By adopting a large number of amendments, however, the Committee might well modify the text of article 7 excessively and repeat what had happened in the case of article 6. Any amendment, however slight, could disturb the delicate balance achieved by the Commission on Human Rights. The Commission had endeavoured to make a synthesis of the different trends of various countries: of the liberal concept of human rights cherished by some and of the socialist concept with its emphasis on the role of the State, as advocated by others. As it stood, the draft Covenant was the product of a complex political process designed to produce a text that would be acceptable to all countries, regardless of their régime. The Commission on Human Rights had also tried to find a satisfactory solution that would serve as a link between the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the specific conventions of the ILO. If the articles were too brief, they would merely be a repetition of those of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; if they were too specific, they would duplicate the ILO conventions and might even conflict with them. The Commission on Human Rights had established a balanced relationship among the various articles of the draft Covenant. Those articles were interdependent and it was essential that none of them should pre-judge the decisions which would be made regarding the general clauses.

44. In the light of those considerations and in the hope that the text of the articles would not be overloaded and that the Committee would abide by the work of the Commission on Human Rights, the French delegation would abstain in the vote on the Spanish amendment (A/C.3/L.538), well-intentioned though it was. It would also abstain on the Polish amendment (A/C.3/L.532, point 2), which might well give article 7 a political colouring different from that of the original text. Noting that the Guatemalan amendment (A/C.3/L.546) embodied almost verbatim a passage from the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen of 1789, the French delegation would make an exception in the case of that amendment and support it.

45. It would be dangerous to use the word “guarantee” in article 7 with reference to equal remuneration for men and women, since to do so would run counter to the idea of progressive realization set forth in article 2. In affirming the principle of equal remuneration it was essential to avoid creating a more inflexible and more absolute obligation than that prescribed for the other rights dealt with in the Covenant. Although that principle was observed in certain countries, of which France was one, its application in other countries would require the introduction of reforms that would necessarily be slow and gradual. Too categorical a text of the article would induce those States to make reservations to it.

46. Mr. MARTINS DE CARVALHO (Portugal) said that his delegation endorsed the principle underlying the Spanish amendment (A/C.3/L.538) and that it would support the amendment proposed by Guatemala (A/C.3/L.546).

47. Mrs. GARDINER (Liberia) said her delegation supported the text of article 7 as it stood. The amendments proposed threatened to destroy the meaning of

the article or, as in the case of the amendment submitted by Greece and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.545), were confined to a rearrangement of the expressions and sentences of the original text. However, her delegation approved the amendments proposed by Spain (A/C.3/L.538) and the Netherlands (A/C.3/L.541).

48. Mr. MASSOUD-ANSARI (Iran) stated that his delegation would support the new amendment submitted by Uruguay jointly with Greece (A/C.3/L.545) which, in its view, improved the wording of article 7.

49. He wished to suggest the addition of the words “provisions of the” to paragraph 2 of the text of article 7 proposed in that amendment, so that it would read as follows: “A decent living in accordance with the provisions of the present Covenant”.

50. Mr. SUMARJO (Indonesia) said that his delegation would be inclined to vote for the original text of article 7 (E/2573, annex I A), as it was in accordance with the Constitution and laws of Indonesia. However, since it always desired to support constructive proposals, it would endorse any amendment designed to improve the text of the articles of the draft Covenant or to make them more specific. It did not share the view of those delegations that wished to limit the right to propose amendments, for the sponsors of such amendments were always guided by humanitarian motives or sought to introduce ideas reflecting the situation existing in their own countries so as to enable those countries to accede to the Covenant.

51. The Indonesian delegation would support the Polish amendment to article 7 (A/C.3/L.532, point 2) as it had previously supported the Polish amendment to article 6 (A/C.3/L.532, point 1): it felt that the obligations which States would have to assume, regardless of their social or economic system, should always be defined in detail. On the other hand, it would be unable to support the Netherlands amendment (A/C.3/L.541) calling for the deletion of paragraph (b) (ii). In its view, paragraph (ii) was not redundant but rather expressed the aim of every worker and underlined the humanitarian purpose of article 7. Although it endorsed the principle underlying the Spanish amendment (A/C.3/L.538), the Indonesian delegation felt that that amendment was already incorporated in the expression “periodic holidays with pay”, which appeared in the text of article 7.

52. His delegation would vote in favour of point 1 of the Afghan amendments (A/C.3/L.542) as it would help to clarify paragraph (b) and would avoid the possible differences in interpretation to which the term “worker” could give rise. His delegation would be unable to support the joint amendment submitted by Afghanistan and the Netherlands (A/C.3/L.543), which failed to do justice to the principle of equal rights. If the Committee adopted that amendment, it would be guilty of drafting an international Covenant that repudiated the rights of women and thereby negated the very principle of human rights.

53. He wished to reserve the right to state his delegation's views on the amendments submitted by Greece and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.545) and on the Guatemalan amendment (A/C.3/L.546) at a later stage.

54. Mr. MUFTI (Syria) welcomed the action of the delegations of Uruguay and Greece in presenting a revised text (A/C.3/L.545) of the Uruguayan amendment (A/C.3/L.540). The Syrian delegation was

prepared to support the new text, with the exception of point 1 (c). It would abstain on that amendment, because it considered it pointless to introduce considerations of that nature into the article, and because the principles and rights set forth in the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (E/2573, annex I B) were equally valid for workers. It would also abstain on the Guatemalan amendment (A/C.6/L.546) because in practice seniority and competence were not the only criteria on which promotion was based. It would support the Spanish amendment (A/C.3/L.538), which supplemented the text of article 7, since in its view the expression "periodic holidays with pay" used in the article did not include public holidays. The Syrian delegation would abstain on the amendment submitted jointly by Afghanistan and the Netherlands (A/C.3/L.543). It would be unable to vote against that amendment because it considered it pointless to emphasize the rights of women, inasmuch as the Covenant elsewhere contained numerous provisions against discrimination; on the other hand, it would be unable to vote in favour of that amendment, for to do so might imply that it was opposed to the principle embodied in paragraph (b) (i) of article 7. It would, however, vote against the Netherlands amendment (A/C.3/L.541), which sought to delete a fundamental provision of article 7. It would abstain on the Afghan amendments

(A/C.3/L.542) as it considered the original text to be more satisfactory. It would vote in favour of the Polish amendment (A/C.3/L.532, point 2) because it believed that special implementation measures did not run counter to the general measures proposed for all the provisions of the Covenant.

55. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) said he wished to clarify a few points and to reply to certain remarks on the amendment proposed by his delegation (A/C.3/L.538).

56. The Chilean representative had pointed out that certain social groups needed special protection by the State. Workers constituted such a group: in some countries they did not enjoy the same advantages as civil servants and were not paid, as the latter were, for public holidays. A number of delegation had opposed certain amendments on the ground that they merely repeated provisions appearing in other articles of the draft Covenant; but the principle of remuneration for public holidays was mentioned nowhere and the expression "periodic holidays with pay" did not, as the Chinese representative thought, include public holidays. It was essential that that important principle should be embodied in the Covenant in order to eliminate the discrimination against workers as compared with State employees.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.