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INTRODUCTION

In accordance with article 39 of the Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference, the International Labour Office prepared and sent to the governments of Members a report containing the text of a proposed Convention concerning the abolition of forced labour. This text was based on the Conclusions adopted by the Conference at its 39th Session (Geneva, June 1956).

The governments were requested to send any amendments or comments in time to reach the Office not later than 28 November 1956 or to inform the Office by the same date whether they considered that the proposed text formed a suitable basis for discussion at the 40th Session of the Conference. The attention of governments was drawn particularly to certain points which had provoked marked differences of opinion at the 39th Session or which the Conference had not felt able to discuss thoroughly at that session. These were: the mention of concentration camps and the deportation of national minorities in the introductory sentence of Article 1 of the proposed text; the term "labour discipline" in subparagraph (c) of that Article; the references to participation in strikes and methods of wage payment in subparagraphs (d) and (f) of that Article; the proposal made by the United States Government at the 39th Session suggesting the inclusion of provisions relating to the prohibition of the products of forced labour in international commerce.

At the time when this report was drafted the governments of the following 46 countries had replied to the request for amendments or comments or for acceptance of the proposed text as a basis for discussion: Afghanistan, Albania, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Finland, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, El Salvador, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, the Union of South Africa, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, Uruguay and Yugoslavia.

This report summarises and analyses briefly the replies of the governments. It also contains the proposed texts of a Convention and of two supporting resolutions, which, if the Conference so decides, will constitute the basis for the second discussion, at the 40th Session of the Conference, of the question of forced labour.
SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE REPLIES
FROM GOVERNMENTS

A summary and a brief analysis are given hereunder of the replies received from governments on the subject of the proposed text of a Convention concerning the abolition of forced labour.

The following 17 governments merely stated that they had no comments to make or amendments to suggest at this stage, or that, in their opinion, the proposed text constituted a suitable basis for discussion by the Conference at its 40th Session: those of Burma, Ceylon, Chile, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Jordan, Mexico, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Uruguay and Yugoslavia. The Government of Mexico added that the proposed text was in harmony with the Mexican Constitution; the Governments of Switzerland and Uruguay mentioned that forced labour was unknown in these countries, the former adding that it fully supported the general abolition of forced labour. The Government of Yugoslavia reserved the right to move amendments, if necessary, at the 40th Session.

The Government of the Netherlands indicated that the Governments of the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam had stated that they had no comments to make on the proposed text.

General Observations

CHINA

The language used in the Convention should be concise and clear, and the contents should be based chiefly on the forms of forced labour as stated by the Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labour set up by the United Nations and the I.L.O. The three forms of forced labour suggested by the Office are therefore considered suitable.

With regard to the proposal contained in the original Office text concerning the adoption of a supplementary Recommendation, it is suggested that the question of the revision of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930, be placed on the agenda of the Conference as soon as possible.

and that the substance of the proposed Recommendation be discussed then, together with the suggestions made at the 39th Session.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

It is true that the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention will be a new Convention, open to ratification independently, but this should not prevent the Conference from making clear in the new text that, in so far as the concept of forced labour and the permitted exceptions are concerned, the new Convention is in some sort conditioned by the Forced Labour Convention, 1930. The Conference at its 39th Session appealed to Members which had not ratified that Convention to consider the possibility of doing so as soon as possible.

GUATEMALA

The Government favours the complete abolition of all forms of forced labour as being contrary to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It deplores the fact that certain forms of forced labour should still exist 26 years after the adoption of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930.

IRAN

The Government considers that, from the purely juridical point of view, it is not logical to have more than one Convention on forced labour and would have preferred to deal with the question by revising the Forced Labour Convention, 1930. If a new Convention is to be adopted it should provide for the abolition of all forms of forced labour. With this in view the Government suggests a text which differs radically from that proposed, although it incorporates some parts of it. It would begin with an Article providing for the complete suppression of forced labour in all the territories under the jurisdiction of the ratifying State. This would be followed by an Article defining forced labour as "any work or service imposed on an individual by force and without his consent". In connection with this definition the Government states that there is no need to specify the exclusion of work exacted in consequence of a conviction by a court of law, military service or work in circumstances of emergency. The first of these is consequent on a court decision and the other two are civic obligations; hence they must all be in accordance with the legislation of the country concerned. Article 3, which the Government considers scarcely necessary but to which it would not object, would provide for immediate measures to secure the effective abolition of the forms of forced labour enumerated in subparagraphs (a) to (f) of Article 1 of the proposed text. The Government adds that this enu-
meration should not be considered as restrictive. It would be prepared to consider adding another Article allowing a certain time for giving effect to the Convention in territories in which the legislation or existing administrative or other practices permit or tolerate the use of forced labour.

JAPAN

The Government considers that the Convention should be simpler and clearer than the text proposed, aiming only at abolishing the types of forced labour condemned by the Ad Hoc Committee. It is therefore opposed to the inclusion of other types of forced labour.

NEW ZEALAND

The Government wholeheartedly supports the purpose of the Convention, which it conceives to be the abolition of those forms of forced labour which stem from an abuse of power by the State itself. The proposed Convention is, above all, a response to urgent practical needs; and previous discussions have revealed a high degree of unanimity about the measures essential to meet these needs. There have been more fundamental differences of viewpoint when the primary objectives were lost to sight. There will be no loss of effectiveness if the new instrument deals only with recognised abuses which the weight of international opinion overwhelmingly condemns. In this way the Convention would achieve its real goal. The paramount need is to produce a short and simple text which can command the maximum degree of support.

Subject to the comments set out below in connection with various provisions the Government considers the proposed text a suitable basis for discussion.

POLAND

Although the proposed text does not imply the abolition of all forms of forced labour, direct and indirect, a Convention on the proposed lines would very usefully supplement the Forced Labour Convention, 1930.

U.S.S.R.

The Government of the U.S.S.R welcomes the fact that, as a result of the discussion at the 39th Session of the Conference, the list of types of forced labour to be dealt with was considerably enlarged “as compared with the very limited and biased proposals discussed earlier in various international bodies”. It believes that this extension, which was supported by a considerable majority of the delegates, is certainly in accordance with the workers’ interests. The decisions of the Conference at its last
session clearly show that the problem cannot be reduced merely to one, two or three types of forced labour but that all the known widespread forms of forced labour must be considered together, and that the interests of the broad mass of workers will be served only by an international instrument providing for full and unconditional prohibition of these forms.

The Government states that, owing to the attitude of certain Employers' and Government delegates at the 39th Session, the Conference was unable to adopt certain concrete proposals for the effective and universal eradication of various forms of forced labour. The basic task of the next session must be, while fully maintaining the provisions of the proposed text, to ensure that the Convention also provides for the abolition of other widespread forms of forced labour and that it contains no provision which would enable individual countries to retain under various pretexts any form of forced labour which is incompatible with human dignity. The Government deems it most important that any additional proposals for prohibiting open or concealed forms of forced labour anywhere (whether in independent countries or in colonial and other non-self-governing territories) which may be put forward in 1957 should be favourably considered and adopted. It would be advisable to take steps to ensure that the future Convention applies equally to independent countries and to colonies and other non-self-governing territories.

**UNITED KINGDOM**

The Government urges that the Conference should recall the circumstances which first led to the decision of the Governing Body to place the question of forced labour on its agenda. These circumstances were the existence, as demonstrated by the conclusions of the United Nations-I.L.O. *Ad Hoc* Committee, and by other evidence, of systems of forced labour for the purposes of political coercion or of punishment for holding or expressing political views, for purposes of economic development, or for purposes of labour discipline, and the expressed desire of the United Nations that action should be taken to bring such systems to an end.

The Government is impressed with the need for effective action to secure immediate and complete abolition of all such forced labour wherever it may exist and its prevention for the future. It is, therefore, clearly essential if this result is to be realised that the proposed Convention should be ratified by every Member and that it should not contain elements that are unrelated to the particular forms of forced labour in question if they could have the effect of preventing or delaying such universal ratification; nor should the Convention contain anything that would impair the absolute clarity of the obligations resting upon govern-
ments or, by confusing the issues in any way, afford the least excuse for evasion of those obligations. The Government therefore continues to urge that the proposed international instrument should be confined in substance to creating an unqualified obligation to abolish, where it exists, forced or compulsory labour for the purposes identified by the Ad Hoc Committee.

If, as they have already stated, all governments are prepared to accept obligations to abolish those systems of forced labour, there can be no obstacle to the adoption and universal ratification of a Convention on the lines originally proposed by the Office. The moral force of an international instrument that was ratified by every Member of the Organization cannot be exaggerated and it would indeed be unfortunate if the opportunity of securing this were to be thrown away by insistence on adding to the Convention clauses which it is known in advance would not be universally acceptable.

It was with these considerations in mind that the Government opposed, in the discussions at the 39th Session, the addition to the original text, of the subparagraphs that now appear as (d), (e) and (f) of Article 1 of the proposed instrument. The statements then made by a number of governments clearly showed that the addition, for example, of a reference to compulsory labour as a punishment for participation in strikes, would raise difficulties, even if only of a technical legal character, which would make it impossible for them to ratify the Convention. In these circumstances, to insist on the inclusion of such provisions in the proposed Convention would be deliberately to prevent the universal acceptance of the Convention and so frustrate the attainment of the main objective and to disappoint the hopes of all those who wish to see the complete abolition of those systems of forced labour which were so strongly condemned by the United Nations-I.L.O. Ad Hoc Committee. In the view of the Government this consideration is of itself conclusive.

This is not to say, the Government points out, that matters such as those included in subparagraphs (d), (e) and (f) of Article 1 of the Convention now proposed are not suitable for inclusion in an appropriate international instrument or instruments. Indeed, as Report IV (1) points out, the payment at regular intervals of wages due is already the subject of the Protection of Wages Convention, 1949, and further protection under this head is provided by the Social Policy (Non-Metropolitan Territories) Convention, 1947. Moreover, the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery recently concluded within the United Nations provides for the progressive suppression of systems of debt bondage and peonage. But, they are not, in the view of the Government, appropriate for inclusion in the instrument now under consideration and, as has been pointed out, they would present an obstacle to its full effectiveness.
Observations concerning the Form of the Proposed International Instrument

All the governments which replied either expressly stated or tacitly agreed that the proposed instrument should take the form of a Convention.

Observations concerning the Proposed Text

Preamble

The proposed text read as follows:

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,
Having been convened at Geneva by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and having met in its Fortieth Session on June 1957, and
Having considered the question of forced or compulsory labour, which is the fourth item on the agenda of the session, and
Having decided upon the adoption of proposals with regard to the abolition of certain forms of forced or compulsory labour, which constitutes a violation of the rights of man as enunciated by the Charter of the United Nations, and
Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of an international Convention,

Observations on the Preamble.

The Government of Japan suggests that it should be clearly stated in the preamble that the purpose of the new Convention is to supplement the Forced Labour Convention, 1930, so as to abolish certain types of forced labour condemned by the Ad Hoc Committee. This, it is suggested, might facilitate interpretation of the Convention in future. A clause has been inserted in the proposed preamble referring to the earlier Convention.

Two other new clauses are proposed for inclusion in the preamble as a consequence of the suggestion\(^1\) that subparagraph (f) of Article 1 should be omitted from the text. If the Conference should agree that this be done, it might consider it desirable to give some indication of the reasons for the decision by inserting a clause referring to the Slavery Convention adopted by the League of Nations in 1926 and the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, adopted by a Conference of Plenipotentiaries convened under the auspices of the United Nations in 1956, and a clause referring to the Protection of Wages Convention, 1949.

Several governments refer to the clause of the proposed preamble concerning the rights of man. The Government of Czechoslovakia agrees

---

\(^1\) See p. 17.
that forced labour is a violation of the rights of man, but it reserves its right to submit an amendment to this clause at the 40th Session. The Governments of Guatemala and the United Kingdom suggest that the reference to the Charter of the United Nations, which does not in fact enunciate "the rights of man", should be replaced by a reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

There would seem to be some advantage in mentioning both the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and this has been done in the proposed text.

The Government of New Zealand agrees that "forced or compulsory labour", in its ordinary meaning, is a violation of the rights of man. Nevertheless, the term is sometimes used in a sense which includes obligations that may not violate human rights. It does not appear to have been the Committee's intention that work exacted in the normal course of a prison sentence should necessarily be regarded as a violation of the rights of man. Such an all-inclusive meaning may not properly be attributed to the United Nations Charter. Yet, when the words "forced labour" occur in the operative provisions of the proposed Convention they must be regarded as having this all-inclusive meaning (as in the text of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930). Otherwise the text would lose most of its significance. The Government therefore suggests that "constitutes" should be changed to "constitute", thus restricting the reference to the categories of forced labour enumerated. The Conference may wish to consider this suggestion.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany points out that the reference to "certain forms" of forced or compulsory labour appears to conflict with the obligation in Article 1 to "suppress" such labour. As, however, Article 1 does in fact refer only to certain specific forms of forced labour and as no other suggestions for a similar change were received, no change is proposed in the text.

*Article 1*

The proposed text read as follows:

Each Member of the International Labour Organisation which ratifies this Convention undertakes to suppress and not to make use of forced or compulsory labour, concentration camps or the deportation of national minorities—

(a) as a means of political coercion or education or as a punishment for holding or expressing political views or views ideologically opposed to the established social, political or economic system;

(b) as a method of mobilising and using labour for purposes of economic development;

(c) as a means of labour discipline;

(d) as a punishment for having participated in strikes;

(e) as a means of racial, social, national or religious discrimination;
as a consequence of the method of payment to the worker whereby his employer defers payment to a given date or postpones payment after the agreed date, thereby depriving the worker of a genuine possibility of terminating his employment, or where work is exacted from the worker in the form of bondage for debts or through systems of peonage.

It will be convenient to deal successively with the observations on the introductory sentence and the various clauses of this text.


The main point on which observations were made is the desirability or otherwise of including a reference to "concentration camps or the deportation of national minorities".

It will be recalled that, at the last session of the Conference, the inclusion of the reference to concentration camps and the deportation of minorities was agreed to by a majority in the Conference Committee on the distinct understanding that there should, before the 40th Session, be consultation with the Secretary-General of the United Nations and with governments regarding the effect of such inclusion from the standpoint of full co-ordination of effort between the United Nations and the International Labour Organisation and the avoidance of overlapping and duplication in the terms of international instruments dealing with related subjects. As was mentioned in Report IV (1), the Secretary-General replied in a letter to the Director-General that he could "do no more than endorse the position taken by both your representative and mine at the meeting of the Committee on Forced Labour, namely that any international consideration of these matters would appear to fall within the sphere of responsibility of the United Nations itself". He also suggested that the general problem of avoiding undesirable duplication or inconsistencies in the texts of the proposed I.L.O. Convention on Forced Labour and the Draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which is now under discussion by the General Assembly, should be further considered.

The governments of the following Members expressly favour retaining in the text the reference to concentration camps and the deportation of minorities: Brazil, Czechoslovakia, the Federal Republic of Germany and Luxembourg. The Government of Czechoslovakia points out that the I.L.O. has been entrusted with the task of dealing with forced labour and must deal with it in all its aspects, including concentration camps and the deportation of minorities. The Government of Spain would also be in favour if the competence of the I.L.O. to deal with these matters were established. The Government of Brazil, however, proposes amendment of the introductory sentence to read—

Each Member of the International Labour Organisation which ratifies this Convention undertakes to suppress and not to make use of forced or compulsory
labour, including that practised by means of the organisation of concentration camps or through the deportation of national minorities—

This, in the view of the Brazilian Government, would meet the point raised by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany also suggests amending the text to read as follows, so as to bring out more clearly the relationship with the Forced Labour Convention, 1930:

Each Member of the International Labour Organisation which ratifies this Convention undertakes to suppress concentration camps and the deportation of national minorities; it further undertakes to suppress and not to make use of forced or compulsory labour—

The governments of the following Members would prefer to delete entirely the reference to concentration camps and the deportation of national minorities: Canada, Finland, Greece, India, Iran, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, El Salvador, the Union of South Africa and the United Kingdom. The Government of the Union of South Africa adds that it is of the opinion that such forced labour should be prohibited, but would have no objection to deletion of the reference because it appears from Report IV (1) that the subject is outside the competence of the I.L.O. The Governments which explain their attitude state that the Convention should not deal with a matter which is in the sphere of responsibility of the United Nations (as stated by the Secretary-General) nor with any matters which are not strictly forced labour.

Finally, the Governments of China, Costa Rica, Denmark and Sweden (the last two of which sponsored the insertion of this phrase at the 39th Session of the Conference) reserve their position on the matter. The Government of China would agree to the reference to concentration camps and deportation of minorities, since these are clearly associated with forced labour. However, as the abolition of these practices appears to fall within the jurisdiction of the United Nations, the I.L.O. should continue consultations with that body on the practical measures for close co-ordination and should report to the 40th Session for decision. The Swedish Government states that it wishes to make the following remarks in the present circumstances without thereby adopting a fixed standpoint on the matter. As the I.L.O. is about to adopt a new Convention on the prohibition of forced or compulsory labour it seems necessary that this should be so drafted as to make it clear that every form of compulsion against individuals based on the grounds listed in Article 1 is prohibited. To attempt to establish a boundary between forms of compulsion which are within the I.L.O.’s jurisdiction and those which perhaps are more appropriate to an instrument signed by the United Nations will inevitably involve great practical difficulties. And, if the I.L.O. document remains silent on brutal measures of compulsion affecting large groups of the population, the memory of which has not yet faded and will certainly
take a long time to efface, this can only lead to doubt as to whether the I.L.O. genuinely intends to provide protection against the use of force in its most aggressive forms. The Organisation is aiming at the milder types but for formal reasons is not including the worst kinds. Such an attitude will not be understood by those wishing to deal with the matter realistically and involves serious risk that the Convention will turn out to be a defective instrument in one important respect. If it is not desired to express a clear condemnation of all forms of forced labour imposed for the reasons given in the proposed text, and a completely unreal Convention results, it may be wondered whether it would not be better to refrain from regulative action which is hardly likely to strengthen the confidence of those who wish the I.L.O. to be an agency for practical social action.

In view of the clear expression of opinion on the subject by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the repeatedly emphasised desire of the Organisation to avoid any duplication of effort between the I.L.O. and the United Nations, and the substantial number of governments expressing a preference for deletion, the reference to concentration camps and the deportation of national minorities has been omitted from the proposed text now submitted to the Conference.

Since, however, a number of governments feel strongly that international action for the abolition of concentration camps and the deportation of national minorities is desirable, the Conference may wish to consider whether there is any other action which it should take. One possibility would be to adopt a resolution referring the matter to the United Nations and drawing their attention to the desirability of early international action. The Conference may wish to take up this idea during the 40th Session.

The Government of Albania suggests adding at the end of the introductory sentence the words: “whether in independent States or in dependent or non-self-governing territories.” The purpose is to make it clear that forced labour in all its forms should be abolished everywhere, so as to safeguard the rights of man. A similar amendment was proposed at the 39th Session of the Conference but was rejected. The Conference may wish to reconsider the matter.

**Observations on Subparagraph (a).**

This clause defines the first type of forced labour which, it is suggested, should be covered by the proposed Convention. All the governments which replied expressly or tacitly accept it. The Government of Canada, however, suggests a slight change of wording. It proposes substitution for the words “holding or expressing” of the words “the holding or peaceful expression of.” In explanation the Government points out that this amendment appears to be necessary if work imposed in connection
with a prison sentence may be held to be forced labour. In some cir-
cumstances the expression of a political view advocating the use, without
authority of law, of force as a means of accomplishing a governmental
change might constitute the offence of sedition, for which a sentence of
imprisonment with hard labour might be imposed. This could then be
regarded as forced labour as a punishment for holding political views.
The introduction of the word “peaceful” would, the Government suggests,
overcome this difficulty. No change has been made in the proposed text
at this stage, but the Conference may wish to consider the point.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany states that it
presumes that the proposed text still permits prison labour as a con-
sequence of a conviction by a court of law for a political offence (Article 2,
paragraph 2 (c) of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930), provided that
the prison labour is not used as a means of political coercion or education
or as a punishment for holding political opinions which did not lead to
any offences being committed.

Observations on Subparagraph (b).

All the governments which replied expressly or tacitly accept this
clause, save for three which propose slight amendments. The Government
of Afghanistan suggests replacement of the words “using labour” by
the words “using forced labour.” As the introductory sentence already
refers to “forced or compulsory labour”, this suggestion would appear
to be unnecessary.

The Government of India would insert the word “normal” before
“method”. It may be recalled that the Conference Committee at the
39th Session unanimously agreed to delete this word, which had been in
the original text put forward by the Office. No other government makes
this suggestion, which the Conference may nevertheless wish to consider
afresh.

The Government of Portugal suggests adding at the end of the sub-
paragraph the words: “except when such mobilisation or use of labour
constitutes a normal civic obligation”. This would mean reintroducing
in the Convention one of the exceptions to the 1930 Convention, which
it is part of the purpose of the present Convention to eliminate; conse-
quently no change is proposed in the text.

Observations on Subparagraph (c).

It may be recalled that at the 39th Session this clause was retained
in this form on the understanding that governments would be consulted
as to the need for some definition of the term “labour discipline”. In
this connection the Conference Committee took note of an amendment
proposing addition of the words “imposed on workers for failure to com-
ply with the contract, to observe works rules or to carry out orders”.

Of the governments which make explicit reference to this clause, the following would retain it without any definition: those of Czechoslovakia, Luxembourg, Spain, the U.S.S.R. and the United Kingdom. The Government of Spain qualifies its acceptance by stating that the term "labour discipline" should be given a wide interpretation, so as to include all possible cases of forced labour as a means of labour discipline. The term would then cover not only failure to comply with the contract, to observe works rules or to carry out orders, but also participation in illegal strikes. The United Kingdom Government objects to the proposal for clarification of the term on the grounds that this would have an unduly restrictive effect. It might, for example, be taken to exclude forced labour as a punishment for failure to maintain work "norms". The Government believes the connotation of the term in the present context to be well understood; a detailed definition would complicate the instrument.

The following governments favour retention of the clause with the amendment referred to above: those of Brazil, Finland, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan and Sweden. The Governments of China and the Philippines simply state that clarification is necessary. The Government of the Union of South Africa considers that the clause should either contain a clearer definition or be deleted.

The Government of New Zealand agrees that there is need for clarification, but suggests that this should be done by addition of the following:

imposed on workers for failing to attain the prescribed standards of individual output or otherwise hampering the accomplishment of plans for economic development.

The Government of Canada accepts the amendment already referred to, but would add a further additional phrase—

but this shall not be interpreted to prohibit obligations placed by law upon a worker during the duration of his contract for purposes such as the security of life or property provided he is free to terminate his contract on reasonable notice.

The Government explains that it has in mind provisions such as are found in Mines Acts, in which the duties attached to certain key positions are defined, and under which failure to carry out the duties is an offence punishable in the same way as any other violation of the Act. An example would be the requirement that a hoist operator may not leave his post while any worker is underground.

Finally, the Government of Japan proposes addition of a proviso to the effect that forced or compulsory labour exacted as a consequence of a conviction in a court of law for having participated in illegal strikes prohibited by international law should not be prohibited by this Conven-
tion. The addition of this proviso would make clearer the relation between the proposed Convention and Article 2, paragraph 2, of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930.

In view of the differences of opinion regarding the need for clarification of this clause, no change is proposed in the text at this stage, but the Conference may wish to consider the matter further.

Observations on Subparagraph (d).

The following governments expressly state that they favour retaining this clause: those of Brazil, Czechoslovakia, Luxembourg, and the U.S.S.R. The Government of Brazil adds that it does so because the text clearly means only that workers who have participated in a strike cannot be sentenced to forced labour. The Government of Czechoslovakia states that it does not consider that the inclusion of this clause is likely to make ratification difficult, as was suggested by certain government delegates at the 39th Session.

The following governments favour deletion: those of Canada, China, Denmark, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, the Union of South Africa and the United Kingdom. The Governments of Canada and the Netherlands consider this clause extraneous to the subject matter of the Convention and the former Government adds that the question could better be dealt with in the context of industrial relations. The view that inclusion of this clause might well prove a serious obstacle to ratification of the Convention is put forward by the Governments of China, the Netherlands, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, the last-mentioned Government referring to its General Observations. The Government of China considers that "unless forced labour exists on a large scale strikes will not constitute a major problem relating to the system". In the opinion of the Government of Denmark the matter is already covered by subparagraph (c). The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany presumes that prison labour resulting from a conviction by a court of law because of an offence committed in connection with a strike is not ruled out, provided this prison labour is not used at the same time as a means of political coercion or education.

The Government of Japan considers this clause unnecessary if Article 1 (c) is amended as suggested above. Participation in strikes may, in the public interest, be prohibited for policemen, firemen, etc., and offenders may be imprisoned with hard labour in conformity with the law. This should not be considered a violation of human rights. The Government of New Zealand would omit the clause because it does not disclose the essential ingredients of an abuse of power by the State: it does not relate to punishment incurred unjustly and without fault. Even the authors of the clause, the Government points out, did not claim that participation in a strike should in no circumstances be punishable;
their purpose was to limit the kinds of punishment which the striker might incur. In New Zealand the penalty for participation in an illegal strike is a monetary one, imposed by a properly constituted court. Workers in certain essential services may not combine to leave their employment without giving 14 days' notice if this would severely affect the community. The penalty on conviction for such an offence may be a fine or imprisonment. The Government could not agree that such imprisonment was unjust or an abuse of power by the State, and it believes this situation is true of many countries. Inclusion of this clause would greatly detract from the value of the Convention. The Spanish Government considers that deletion of this clause would be desirable, because if a strike is legal any penalty or disciplinary measures would be contrary to the regulations; if a strike is illegal the matter is covered by subparagraph (c) as interpreted by the Government. The Government of the Union of South Africa fears that the inclusion of this clause would mean that the Convention would cover a matter which it was agreed should be deemed to be excluded from the scope of the Penal Sanctions (Indigenous Workers) Convention, 1955, as "warranting sanctions in national law in the general public interest".

In view of the conflict of opinions no change is proposed in the text at this stage. The Conference, however, will no doubt wish to give due consideration to the view of certain governments that the inclusion of this clause would make it difficult, if not impossible, for them to ratify the future Convention.

Observations on Subparagraph (e).

The governments of the following Members expressly state that they favour retaining this clause: Czechoslovakia, Luxembourg, the U.S.S.R.

The Government of Canada doubts whether its inclusion is necessary, since subparagraphs (a) and (b) seem to be wide enough to cover this type of forced labour. The Governments of Japan and of the United Kingdom favour its deletion for the reasons given in their General Observations.

As so few governments have expressed any objection to this clause, no change is proposed in the text.

Observations on Subparagraph (f).

The following governments expressly favour the inclusion of this clause, or its substance: those of Brazil, Czechoslovakia, Luxembourg, the U.S.S.R. The Government of Czechoslovakia refers to the existence of certain international instruments which contain provisions on the protection of wages and industrial relations. It holds, nevertheless, that a Convention as important as that on the abolition of forced labour, and one to which the decisive majority of States will presumably accede,
would better serve to secure the protection of wages than the other instruments in question, which have not received a very large number of ratifications. The Government of Brazil, while supporting inclusion, feels that the clause as worded might conflict with the introductory sentence of Article 1. It therefore proposes a separate Article which would read—

Each Member of the International Labour Organisation which ratifies this Convention undertakes to suppress forced labour practices established as a consequence of the method of payment, etc.

On the other hand, deletion is proposed by the Governments of Canada, China, Denmark, Finland, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the Union of South Africa and the United Kingdom. In the main these governments base their attitude on the fact that the subject matter of this clause is extraneous to the question of forced labour and is to a great extent already covered by other international instruments. The other arguments used are summarised below.

The Government of Canada points out that failure to pay wages in full is a type of abuse which is not inflicted by the State itself, as are the other abuses dealt with in the instrument. It is not the authority of the State which requires the worker to remain in his employment or which is responsible for any limitation there may be in practice on his freedom of movement. The Governments of Denmark, Finland, the Federal Republic of Germany, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden and the United Kingdom consider that the matter is one of labour-management relations and for wage protection. The Government of Japan considers that the term "forced or compulsory labour" in the proposed Convention should be understood as being the same concept enunciated in Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930. Subparagraph (f) would be an entirely new concept and unrelated to other parts of the proposed Convention. Its inclusion would suggest that the concept of "forced or compulsory labour" and indeed the whole proposed Convention bore no relationship to the earlier Convention. This would make for difficulties of interpretation. The United Kingdom Government also considers that an attempt to import into the Convention an entirely new definition of forced labour would confuse, and so reduce the effectiveness of, the Convention. The Government of the Netherlands points out that the inclusion of the clause might reduce the possibilities of ratification.

In view of the fact that a very considerable number of governments are strongly opposed to the inclusion of this clause, it has been omitted from the proposed text of the Convention now submitted to the Conference. Since, however, a certain number of other governments feel strongly that some action should be taken on the subject matter, the Conference may wish to consider some alternative means of meeting this desire. It
is suggested that, since the protection of wages and the abolition of debt bondage and serfdom are already dealt with in other international instruments, it might be appropriate for the Conference to urge governments to give early consideration to the ratification and implementation of those instruments. Texts of a proposed resolution concerning methods of wage payment and a proposed resolution concerning debt bondage and serfdom are therefore submitted to the Conference for its consideration.

Proposed New Subparagraph (g).

The Government of the Philippines proposes adding a new sub-paragraph (g), to read as follows:

(g) as a part of the penitentiary régime, if the labour is unsuitable to the prisoner's rehabilitation or physical condition, or, in whatever work he may be occupied, if he is not paid a reasonable compensation, bearing in mind all circumstances.

In explanation of this proposal the Government states that the purpose of imprisonment is the rehabilitation of the prisoner. If the type of work he is required to perform is not conducive to this end, there is forced labour. Moreover, it is inhuman to compel a prisoner to undertake tasks which are dangerous to his health. In such a case also there is forced labour.

It should be pointed out that the whole question of prison labour is at present under consideration internationally, and that the I.L.O. is co-operating with the United Nations in the matter. The First United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (Geneva, August-September 1955) adopted a number of recommendations concerning various aspects of prison labour, including the type of work to be performed and the conditions under which it should be carried out. These recommendations are now pending before the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for approval. To introduce a clause of the kind suggested at this stage not only would involve overlapping with the work of the United Nations but would seem to widen unduly the substance of the matters on which governments have so far been consulted. Consequently, no change has been made in the proposed text.

Article 2

The proposed text read as follows:

Each Member of the International Labour Organisation which ratifies this Convention undertakes to take effective measures to secure the immediate and complete abolition of forced or compulsory labour as specified in Article 1 of this Convention and to secure the immediate and complete abolition of all legal provisions and administrative practices and of any other particular measures prescribing or permitting such forced or compulsory labour.
Observations on Article 2.

Two governments, those of Czechoslovakia and Guatemala, expressly state that they are in favour of this text. The Government of Czechoslovakia adds that forced labour does not and cannot exist in any form under the economic and social conditions prevailing in that country. Nevertheless it welcomes the efforts of the I.L.O. to abolish forced labour everywhere and in all its forms, whether disguised or manifest. The United Kingdom Government points out that this Article largely duplicates the introductory sentence of Article 1. Moreover, the second part of the Article, in providing for the abolition of legal provisions, administrative practices and other measures permitting forced labour, is redundant with the first part, which contains an undertaking to "take effective measures to secure the immediate and complete abolition" of forced labour, and adds nothing of substance to that undertaking.

The Government of Albania states that in several countries there is anti-worker and anti-trade union legislation which prevents the workers and their unions from fighting against forced labour. It therefore proposes the addition of a new paragraph to Article 2, as follows:

Each Member of the International Labour Organisation which ratifies this Convention undertakes to take effective measures to abolish anti-worker and anti-trade union legislation which prevents the workers and their unions from exercising their rights and effectively fighting against forced labour.

The Government of Cuba suggests adding at the end of the Article the words "or in any other manner", so as to avoid the Convention being ratified in bad faith. The Government believes that, in view of the practices existing in some countries, there is reason to fear attempts to avoid taking the Convention seriously by arguing that no specific prohibition is being violated and at the same time using ratification in order to lay claim to having complete freedom of labour.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany proposes that the reference to concentration camps and deportation of national minorities should be repeated in Article 2.

As no other governments made these proposals no change is proposed in the text.

Proposal of the United States Government

It will be recalled that, as was stated in Report IV (1), the United States Government put forward at the 39th Session a proposal to replace by a new text point 3 of the proposed Conclusions directed towards a Convention submitted to the Conference at that session in Report VI (2).
The Conference agreed that this proposal should be considered during the second discussion.

The new text read as follows:

3. The proposed Convention should provide that international trade and commerce in goods produced by any forced or compulsory labour referred to in point 2 shall be prohibited.

4. The proposed Convention should provide that every Member of the International Labour Organisation which ratifies it should take effective measures to implement the obligation assumed under the terms of its ratification and to secure either the immediate and complete abolition of forced or compulsory labour referred to in point 2, or the prohibition of international trade and commerce in goods produced by any such forced or compulsory labour, or both.

5. The proposed Convention should provide that a Member becomes a party to this Convention upon accepting the obligation of—
   (a) the whole Convention;
   (b) the whole Convention with the exception of point 2; or
   (c) the whole Convention with the exception of point 3.

   Each Member shall specify in its ratification in respect to which of these points it accepts the obligation of the Convention.

In Report IV (1) governments were specially invited to comment on this proposal, and rather more than half of the governments which replied did so.

Observations on the Proposal.

Brazil: The Government would wish to hear further explanations from the authors of the proposal before taking a decision.

Canada: The Government has serious doubts about the principle of permitting ratification upon the basis of different undertakings where the alternatives are of the nature contained in this proposal. The main purpose of the proposed Convention is that as many States as possible should agree to abolish forced labour in their own countries for the purposes specified. That purpose would be defeated if the Convention could be ratified on the basis only of an undertaking to prohibit international trade in goods produced by forced labour. This would seem to be a much more limited undertaking than the first one; if it is essentially an enforcement provision it would not seem suitable to permit Members to accept it without accepting the main undertaking. Moreover, the I.L.O. is not the most appropriate body to take action on such a matter; an undertaking such as proposed might conflict with existing obligations of the contracting parties to G.A.T.T.

China: The proposal is an essential step to substantiate the Convention and strengthen its effectiveness.
**Czechoslovakia:** In view of the very complex legislative and constitutional aspects of the proposal, the Government reserves its position at present.

**Denmark:** Danish legislation makes no provision for prohibiting the importation, transit or trade in the Danish market in respect of goods produced by forced labour. Such a prohibition would be extremely difficult to administer and might call for special control measures. The advisability of such measures should be weighed against the results likely to be obtained. The inclusion of the proposal in the Convention would involve the I.L.O.'s assuming the responsibilities laid down in the Constitution in respect of that part of the Convention; this would require the appointment of experts on these subjects to the Conference Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations.

**Egypt:** The Government is opposed to the inclusion of this proposal.

**Finland:** The proposal would probably meet with very great practical difficulties. It would not be easy to determine what goods were produced by forced labour, and supervision would also be difficult. The Government doubts whether the proposal should be included, especially as complicated special legislation would be required in many countries.

**Federal Republic of Germany:** The Government is in principle in favour of the proposal. However, to avoid ratification difficulties, this should be a separately ratifiable part of the Convention.

**India:** The Government does not support the proposal.

**Iran:** The Government favours the proposal, but it could not agree that a State should be free to ratify the prohibition of trade clause and not ratify the part of the Convention dealing with the abolition of forced labour.

**Japan:** The Government is in sympathy with the purpose of the proposal but is opposed to its inclusion in this Convention. It would be technically very difficult to determine what goods were produced by forced labour, and the proposal might well prove ineffective in practice. It is necessary to be cautious about setting a precedent by introducing matters of this kind in an I.L.O. Convention.

**Luxembourg:** The Government accepts the proposal.

**Netherlands:** The proposal has undoubtedly a certain attraction, but there would probably be great difficulties in applying it, since there would be very little possibility of checking the circumstances in which goods were produced, especially in the case of goods manufactured behind the Iron Curtain.

**New Zealand:** The Government reserves its attitude, which will be determined by the considerations mentioned in its general observations.
Norway: The Government will express its views later.

Philippines: The Government supports the proposal. So long as goods produced by forced labour can be bought and sold in the markets of the world, all pronouncements against such labour will be considerably weakened.

Poland: There is no objection to including this proposal.

Portugal: It does not seem possible to include this proposal, since a reference to international trade would be outside the framework of the Constitution of the I.L.O.

El Salvador: This question should be dealt with more fully by the international body in the direct competence of which it lies, and in particular by the United Nations, since very complex problems are involved.

Spain: This is a very useful proposal, which should take the form of a Recommendation, in which certain other points of detail could also be dealt with.

Sweden: This proposal would involve difficulties for the I.L.O. as regards supervision. Also, such a ban seems to be outside the scope of the Convention.

Union of South Africa: No comments at this stage.

United Kingdom: The Government fully sympathises with the motive behind the proposal, but does not feel that it would be possible to implement it. The same goods can be made by both free and forced labour, and it would therefore be necessary to prove conclusively, in every case where the origin of the goods was suspect, either that particular goods out of a whole class of goods were the product of forced labour or that a particular class of goods was exclusively such a product. There would usually be no means of establishing either of these two cases except by means of documentary evidence, which in such a matter as this might well be unreliable. Countries would thus be faced with the possibilities either of unjustifiably prohibiting the importation of free labour goods, on the documentary evidence that similar goods were the product of forced labour, or of allowing the importation of forced labour goods on the evidence of documents on which it was not possible to rely. The Government also considers that the primary aim of the Convention, the prohibition of forced labour, would be seriously weakened by offering an alternative which, although without intending it, would enable a State to ratify the Convention without abolishing forced labour in its own territory. It would be better to rely on the prohibition of forced labour itself which, if effectively enforced on the basis of a Convention that could be universally accepted, would automatically prevent the pos-
sibility of trade in the products of forced labour, since there would be no such products. Nevertheless, the Government would be prepared to consider any alternative proposals on the matter which might be made in the light of the views generally expressed by other governments.

Yugoslavia: The Government would wish to have further information as to how the proposal could be implemented in practice and how possible abuses could be dealt with.

It will be seen that there are considerable differences of views on this proposal and that some governments which are sympathetic to the idea doubt whether it can be applied in practice, while others believe the matter to be outside the competence of the I.L.O. and several others wish to have fuller explanation of the proposal and of the means suggested for implementing it.
The English texts are given below of the proposed Convention and two resolutions which are submitted as a basis for the second discussion, at the 40th Session of the Conference, of the question of forced labour.

**Proposed Convention concerning the Abolition of Forced Labour**

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation, Having been convened at Geneva by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and having met in its Fortieth Session on 5 June 1957, and

Having considered the question of forced labour, which is the fourth item on the agenda of the session, and

Having noted the provisions of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930,

and

Having noted that the Slavery Convention, 1926, provides that all necessary measures shall be taken to prevent compulsory or forced labour from developing into conditions analogous to slavery and that the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, 1956, provides for the complete abolition of debt bondage and serfdom, and

Having noted that the Protection of Wages Convention, 1949, provides that wages shall be paid regularly and prohibits methods of payment which deprive the worker of a genuine possibility of terminating his employment, and
**PROPOSED TEXTS**

*(French Version)*

The French texts are given below of the proposed Convention and two resolutions which are submitted as a basis for the second discussion, at the 40th Session of the Conference, of the question of forced labour.

**Projet de convention concernant l'abolition du travail forcé**

La Conférence générale de l'Organisation internationale du Travail, convoquée à Genève par le Conseil d'administration du Bureau international du Travail et s'y étant réunie le 5 juin 1957, en sa quarantième session,

Après avoir examiné la question du travail forcé, qui constitue le quatrième point à l'ordre du jour de la session;

Après avoir pris note des dispositions de la convention sur le travail forcé, 1930;

Après avoir noté que la convention de 1926 relative à l'esclavage prévoit que toutes mesures nécessaires doivent être prises pour empêcher que le travail obligatoire ou forcé n'amène des conditions analogues à celles de l'esclavage et que la convention supplémentaire de 1956 pour l'abolition de l'esclavage, de la traite des esclaves et des institutions et pratiques analogues à l'esclavage vise à obtenir l'abolition complète de la servitude pour dettes et du servage;

Après avoir noté que la convention sur la protection du salaire, 1949, énonce que le salaire sera payé à intervalles réguliers et interdit les modes de paiement qui privent le travailleur de toute possibilité réelle de quitter son emploi;
Having decided upon the adoption of further proposals with regard to the abolition of certain forms of forced or compulsory labour, which constitutes a violation of the rights of man as enunciated by the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and

Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of an international Convention,

adopts this day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and fifty-seven the following Convention, which may be cited as the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957:

**Article 1**

Each Member of the International Labour Organisation which ratifies this Convention undertakes to suppress and not to make use of forced or compulsory labour—

(a) as a means of political coercion or education or as a punishment for holding or expressing political views or views ideologically opposed to the established social, political or economic system;

(b) as a method of mobilising and using labour for purposes of economic development;

(c) as a means of labour discipline;

(d) as a punishment for having participated in strikes;

(e) as a means of racial, social, national or religious discrimination.

**Article 2**

Each Member of the International Labour Organisation which ratifies this Convention undertakes to take effective measures to secure the immediate and complete abolition of forced or compulsory labour as specified in Article 1 of this Convention and to secure the immediate and complete abolition of all legal provisions and administrative practices and of any other particular measures prescribing or permitting such forced or compulsory labour.
Après avoir décidé d'adopter des propositions relatives à l'abolition de certaines formes de travail forcé ou obligatoire, qui constitue une violation des droits de l'homme tels qu'ils sont énoncés dans la Charte des Nations Unies et dans la Déclaration universelle des droits de l'homme ;

Après avoir décidé que ces propositions prendraient la forme d'une convention internationale, adopte ce jour de juin mil neuf cent cinquante-sept, la convention ci-après, qui sera dénommée Convention sur l'abolition du travail forcé, 1957 :

Article 1

Tout Membre de l'Organisation internationale du Travail qui ratifie la présente convention s'engage à supprimer le travail forcé ou obligatoire et à ne pas y recourir :

a) en tant que mesure de coercition ou d'éducation politique ou en tant que sanction à l'égard de personnes qui ont ou expriment certaines opinions politiques ou manifestent leur opposition idéologique à l'ordre social, politique ou économique établi ;

b) en tant que méthode de mobilisation et d'utilisation de la main-d'œuvre à des fins de développement économique ;

c) en tant que mesure de discipline du travail ;

d) en tant que punition pour avoir participé à des grèves ;

e) en tant que mesure de discrimination raciale, sociale, nationale ou religieuse.

Article 2

Tout Membre de l'Organisation internationale du Travail qui ratifie la présente convention s'engage à prendre des mesures efficaces en vue de l'abolition immédiate et complète du travail forcé ou obligatoire tel qu'il est décrit à l'article 1 de la présente convention et en vue de l'abolition immédiate et complète de toutes les dispositions légales, des pratiques administratives, ainsi que de toute mesure individuelle ordonnant ou tolérant ce travail forcé ou obligatoire.
Proposed Resolution concerning Methods of Wage Payment

The International Labour Conference,
Having adopted the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957,
Having noted that in certain circumstances conditions analogous to forced or compulsory labour may arise as a consequence of the method of payment to the worker whereby his employer defers payment to a given date or postpones payment after the agreed date, thereby depriving the worker of a genuine possibility of terminating his employment,
Noting that the Protection of Wages Convention, 1949, provides for the payment of wages at regular intervals, for a final settlement of all wages due upon termination of a contract of employment and for limitations to be placed on deductions from wages and on the attachment or assignment of wages,
invites Members, in so far as they have not already done so, to give urgent consideration to the possibility of ratifying the above-mentioned Convention and to inform the Director-General of the International Labour Office of the extent to which effect has been given, or is proposed to be given, to the provisions of the Convention and to state the difficulties which prevent or delay its ratification.

Proposed Resolution concerning Debt Bondage and Serfdom

The International Labour Conference,
Having adopted the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957,
Considering that the Forced Labour Convention, 1930, and the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957, on the one hand, and the Slavery Convention, 1926, and the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, 1956, on the other hand, are mutually complementary,
Having noted that the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery provides for the complete abolition or abandonment of various institutions and practices similar to slavery, including debt bondage and serfdom,
Projet de résolution concernant les modes de paiement du salaire

La Conférence générale de l’Organisation internationale du Travail,
Ayant adopté la convention sur l’abolition du travail forcé, 1957;
Ayant noté que, dans certaines circonstances, des conditions analogues
à celles du travail forcé ou obligatoire peuvent découler d’un
mode de rétribution du travailleur par lequel l’employeur diffère
le paiement jusqu’à une date déterminée ou au-delà de la date
convenue, privant ainsi le travailleur de la possibilité réelle de
mettre fin à son emploi ;
Notant que la convention sur la protection du salaire, 1949, prévoit
que le salaire doit être payé à intervalles réguliers, que le règle-
ment final de la totalité du salaire dû sera effectué au moment où
le contrat de travail prendra fin et que le salaire ne peut faire
l’objet de saisie ou de cession que dans certaines limites,
invite les États Membres, s’ils ne l’ont pas encore fait, à envisager,
dès maintenant, la possibilité de ratifier la convention susmentionnée
et à informer le Directeur général du Bureau international du Travail
de la mesure dans laquelle ils ont donné suite ou se proposent de donner
suite aux dispositions de la convention et à exposer les difficultés qui
empêchent ou retardent la ratification de ladite convention.

Projet de résolution concernant la servitude pour dettes et le servage

La Conférence générale de l’Organisation internationale du Travail,
Ayant adopté la convention sur l’abolition du travail forcé, 1957;
Considérant que la convention sur le travail forcé, 1930, et la conven-
tion sur l’abolition du travail forcé, 1957, d’une part, et la conven-
tion de 1926 relative à l’esclavage, ainsi que la convention supplé-
mentaire de 1956 pour l’abolition de l’esclavage, de la traite des
esclaves et des institutions et pratiques analogues à l’esclavage,
d’autre part, sont complémentaires ;
Ayant noté que la convention supplémentaire pour l’abolition de
l’esclavage prévoit l’abolition complète ou l’abandon des diverses
institutions et pratiques analogues à l’esclavage, dont la servitude
pour dettes et le servage ;
Having noted further that the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, at its 133rd Session (November 1956) expressed the hope that the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery would be ratified and implemented in the very near future by all countries,

invites Members, in so far as they have not already done so, to give urgent consideration to the possibility of ratifying the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery at the earliest possible date.