

through membership of trade-unions." The *New Zealand* delegate (Mr Thorn) explained that this proposal had been deliberately worded so as not to prejudice the issue of compulsory unionism. The text would meet equally well any system of trade-union organization. Mr Thorn also referred to the opposition with which trade-unionists all over the world would receive the implications of the Commission text.

Although this amendment was defeated by 18 to 10 with 14 abstentions, the sympathy with the New Zealand position, evidenced by the large number of abstentions, was illustrated later in the Committee's work. A combination of objections to the text of Article 24 led to its defeat when it was put to the vote as a whole. This gave the *New Zealand* delegate an opportunity to propose that paragraph 4 should be consistent with the form taken by the rest of the declaration and should read "Every one *has the right* to form and to join trade-unions for the protection of his interests." This proposal was accepted unanimously. In explaining her support of the article in this form the *New Zealand* delegate (Mrs Newlands) referred to the fact that the declaration as a statement of general principles must be related to the economic and social structures of member States. The New Zealand delegation believed it would be interpreting the declaration in the spirit in which it was conceived if the right to form and to join trade-unions were interpreted in the light of the industrial conciliation and arbitration system as it existed in New Zealand. Moreover, the delegation understood the particular provision of paragraph 4 of article 24 and not the general provision of Article 20 as governing the right to form and to join trade unions.

Articles 22, 24, and 25

The *New Zealand* delegation took an active part in the discussion of these articles dealing with economic and social rights. It was stressed in both Committee and General Assembly that the right to personal freedom is incomplete unless it is related to the social and economic rights of the common man. These rights, associated in New Zealand with the term "social security," could give the individual the normal conditions of life which made for the larger freedom. And in New Zealand it was accepted that it was a function of government to promote their realization.

A *New Zealand* redraft of the "social security" article—Article 25—was withdrawn when the Commission text was amended to meet some of the New Zealand objections. A *New Zealand* amendment to Article 24, specifying that the right to rest and leisure should include reasonable limitation of working-hours and periodic holidays with pay, was accepted by the Committee.