Chairman: Mr. J. J. DEDMAN (Australia)

1. PROPOSAL BY THE DELEGATION OF BELGIUM CONCERNING ARTICLE 7
   (document E/CONF.2/C.1/15/Add.1).

Mr. van TICHOLEN (Belgium), referring to the proposed redraft of Article 7, suggested that the previous draft of the Committee, together with the note submitted by his delegation, and the record of the discussion thereon at the present meeting should be referred to the Central Drafting Committee. He indicated that the point raised in his note would be satisfied if the French text could be changed as follows, possibly without, so far as he was concerned, modifying the English text:

"Ils reconnaissent que tous les pays ont un intérêt commun à la réalisation et au maintien de normes équitables de travail en rapport avec la productivité de la main d'œuvre et, par suite, à l'amélioration des conditions de rémunération et de travail concurrent avec l'accroissement de la productivité".

Mr. PIERSON (United States of America) supported the suggestion made by the representative of Belgium.

Mr. LLLOSA (Peru) agreed with the English sense of the redraft.

Mr. NASH (New Zealand) referring to the amendment, proposed in E/CONF.2/C.1/15/Add.1, said he was concerned about the words "improvement of fair labour standards". He felt that it should be stated that it was necessary to improve conditions at present existing in relation to productivity, and should there be increased productivity then there should be a greater improvement in labour standards.

Mr. PIERSON (United States of America) agreed with the remarks of the representative of New Zealand. He felt that the English text already stated what was needed and with the proposed modification in the French text both texts could be accepted. He supported the suggestion of the representative of Belgium for a modification in the French text, subject to review of both texts.
texts by the Central Drafting Committee.

The change in the French text as suggested orally by the representative of Belgium was approved, subject to review of the texts by the Central Drafting Committee.

2. CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF SUB-COMMITTEE C CONCERNING A RESOLUTION ON EMPLOYMENT (see document E/CONF.2/C.1/17)

Mr. PIERSKN (United States of America), Chairman of Sub-Committee C, said that the Sub-Committee had been confronted with the fact that the London draft resolution had not been officially transmitted to the Economic and Social Council, but had been taken into account by that Council as explained in document E/CONF.2/5. The Sub-Committee also had before it certain new ideas, e.g. the proposal of the delegation of Italy regarding permanent migration and the proposal of Mexico regarding temporary migration. The Sub-Committee decided that a resolution should be submitted which would

(1) affirm the interest of all nations represented at the present Conference in the points raised in London by the Preparatory Committee;
(2) urge speed in completing the studies at present being undertaken by the United Nations regarding the whole subject of achieving and maintaining full employment and adequate production and demand; (3) urge study of, and recommendations on, the international aspect of long-term manpower surplus and shortage problems; (4) urge study of temporary and seasonal migratory labour problems, looking towards the formulation of conventions and model bilateral agreements which nations might adopt.

He called attention to a minor typographical error on page 3 of document E/CONF.2/C.1/17 and said that in line one of paragraph 3 the word "or" should be added after the word "surplus".

Mr. LLOSÁ (Peru) emphasized the importance of the third section of the resolution. Many of the underdeveloped countries had plans for reconstruction which included a programme of immigration so that their abundant natural resources could be developed.

Mr. AMINI (Afghanistan), referring to the amendment (document E/CONF.2/C.1/20) proposed by his delegation to the last paragraph of the resolution on employment, said the delegation of Afghanistan felt that existing treaties and long established customs and usages pertaining to migration should also be studied before conventions or model agreements were drawn up. The Economic and Social Council and the Specialized Agencies concerned should also consult with Members directly affected in the course of formulating such conventions.

MOHAMED ALI Khan (Pakistan) supported the amendment suggested by the representative of Afghanistan. He pointed out that Afghanistan and its
country would continue to settle by mutual consultation any matters arising between the two countries.

Mr. LIEU (China) felt that the wording of the amendment should be modified. He suggested that the word "including" should be changed to "taking into account".

Mr. AMINI (Afghanistan) agreed with the suggested redrafting.

The Committee approved the amendments submitted by the delegation of Afghanistan to the last paragraph of the resolution, as modified by the representative of China.

3. Other Business

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON UNEMPLOYMENT SUBMITTED BY THE DELEGATION OF CUBA (document E/CONF.2/C.1/19)

Mr. TORRAS (Cuba) believed that, as previous efforts had been insufficient, a recommendation should be made to the Economic and Social Council, the International Labour Office, and other specialized agencies for statistical research to be broadened in order to discover the extent and character of unemployment in each country. This would expedite the attainment of full employment throughout the world. Individual governments should also establish machinery specially to deal with unemployment and to forecast employment projects.

Mr. SKAUG (Norway) pointed out that the ILO had already convened an International Conference of Labour Statisticians which had produced very comprehensive reports. The Cuban Resolution did not take into account the fact that such work had already been initiated, and paragraph 1, at least, should be amended.

Mr. FER (Turkey) agreed with the representative of Norway regarding the amendment of paragraph 1. He recalled the 1919 Convention of Washington which had dealt with statistical data on, and the measures for the prevention of, unemployment.

Mr. TORRAS (Cuba) said that the Resolution was meant to stimulate the Specialized Agencies to further effort.

Mr. PHILLIPS (Australia) supported the intention of the Cuban resolution, but did not agree with the ideas expressed in paragraph 2 of the preamble. Chapter II of the Charter was fundamental to the working of the whole Organization. It did not merely give general statements, and was not subordinate to Chapter IV.

He agreed with the representative of Norway that in the field covered by paragraph 1 of the recommendations, work was already well advanced.

Regarding paragraph 2, Article 3 of the Charter made it clear that the type of action undertaken by each country was its own domestic concern. It was
was inappropriate for an international conference to recommend the type of machinery to be set up.

Mr. SHACKLE (United Kingdom) supported the remarks of the representatives of Australia and Turkey.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that part of the Cuban Resolution appeared to be covered by Article 2 (3), Article 5 (1) (a), and to some extent by the Resolution just adopted. He noted in particular that paragraph 3 of Article 2 had been inserted on the initiative of the delegation of Cuba in Geneva.

Mr. GUTIERREZ (Bolivia) supported the Cuban Resolution. The simple pronouncements of the Charter should lead to concrete actions, otherwise the working classes in the various countries might think the word "Employment" had been used in the Conference for purely political reasons.

Mr. MULLER (Chile) saw no reason for the Charter not stressing the need to study employment problems, even if the subject had already been considered by other organizations. This proposal should be discussed by a Sub-Committee.

Mr. ZOLOTAS (Greece) said there was nothing in the Cuban Resolution that was not covered by the Resolution just adopted, and it had not taken into consideration the efforts of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in co-ordinating and speeding the work of the specialized agencies.

The CHAIRMAN then took the sense of the meeting as to whether, in the light of the discussion, it was considered necessary to examine the proposal further in full Committee or in Sub-Committee.

The sense of the meeting was that the proposal by the delegation of Cuba was not acceptable and should not be considered further.

The CHAIRMAN, in declaring the meeting of the First Committee closed, expressed his gratitude to the members of the Committee for their co-operation, and to the Vice-Chairman and the Chairman of the Sub-Committees and Drafting Groups for their great help. He also expressed appreciation, on behalf of members of the Committee, of the work done by the Secretariat.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.