



C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Evidence of existence of forced labour (<i>continued</i>).....	303

Chairman: Mr. G. F. DAVIDSON (Canada).

**Evidence of existence of forced labour (A/2430,
chapter V A, section VIII, E/2431, A/C.3/L.395)
(*continued*)**

[Item 69]*

1. Mr. VENKATARAMAN (India) recalled that at previous meetings he had explained why his delegation was unable to subscribe to the findings of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Forced Labour (E/2431), and he had refrained from making any personal reference to the members of that committee because he felt that that was not the business of the Third Committee. Certain representatives, however, had criticized the Indian member of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. India was a democratic country and he had no objection to free speech. Nevertheless, he regretted that doubt had been cast on the integrity of the members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and would say that his delegation deprecated the aspersions cast upon the Indian member and regarded them as wholly unjust and unwarranted.
2. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) was anxious to clear up the point raised by the Brazilian representative in connexion with the Afghan suggestion. He felt that at the current stage in the debate the way in which the question had been approached was open to criticism. The topic of forced labour should be considered from a strictly humanitarian and not from a political point of view, even though it was being dealt with by other organs and even though those organs were political.
3. He recalled his suggestion (532nd meeting) to delete the fifth paragraph of the preamble and paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution. He had also wanted to replace the second and fourth paragraphs of the preamble and paragraph 4 of the operative part by a text stating that the General Assembly considered the exploitation of man by man to be contrary to the humanitarian principles of the United Nations and that it should be strongly condemned; that it expressed the conviction that forced labour should be abolished in all countries and in all its forms and urged all States to take the necessary steps towards that end, including legislative measures. Taken as a whole, those amendments were therefore not illogical, and they were absolutely in keeping with the procedural nature of the resolution. The provisions they were intended to

replace were both premature and pointless. Reference to the explanatory memorandum attached to the letter requesting inclusion of the item in the agenda of the General Assembly (A/2438 and Corr.1) showed that the report (E/2431) had been brought to the attention of the Governing Body of the International Labour Organisation and of the Economic and Social Council only a few days after publication. As that rather lengthy document had appeared only a short time before the opening of the sixteenth session, the Economic and Social Council had postponed consideration of it until its seventeenth session. As the 122nd session of the Governing Body of ILO was drawing to a close when the report was published, the Governing Body had also been unable to study it in detail. Consequently, as stated in the explanatory memorandum (A/2438 and Corr.1) it was clear that the two organs had been unable to deal with the report for want of time and that they intended to do so shortly. It was therefore pointless to ask them to undertake its consideration.

4. Moreover, ILO's study would be more useful if it could take account of any findings reached by the Economic and Social Council. The text he had suggested would strengthen the moral authority of the Governing Body in view of the fact the Director-General of ILO had already issued an appeal to the governments of States in which a system of forced labour existed or might exist to revise their laws and administrative regulations.

5. He pointed out that the proposals to which he had referred had not yet been submitted in the form of actual amendments and he reserved his right to revert to the question later.

6. Mr. McGUIRE (Australia) wished to reply to charges made by the representative of the Byelorussian SSR regarding the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the Territory of Papua, although he realized that the matter was not one for the Third Committee, but rather for the Fourth Committee, and although the current debate had to do with a draft resolution on the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Forced Labour (E/2431).

7. The authorities quoted in support of the Byelorussian representative's statements were far from conclusive: the *Pacific Islands Monthly*, like the *Australian Parliamentary Handbook*, was a private and not an official publication. In accordance with the system of freedom of the Press prevailing in Australia, those publications—the Byelorussian representative probably was not acquainted with that fact—were permitted to express views contrary to those held by the Government of the country in which they were circulated. Although the figures quoted by the two publications were probably compiled from official sources, it would be far preferable to refer to the Australian and United Nations official documents themselves.

8. He recalled that the two publications had been quoted to support the Byelorussian representative's

* Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.

contention that the indigenous population of New Guinea was being steadily deprived of occupation of fertile lands in that country. The Byelorussian representative had given figures showing the acreage of land alienated as of July 1950 and July 1951 to support her argument. Section 28 of the annual report on the administration of the Territory of New Guinea for the year ending June 1952¹ dealt with that very question. It stated very clearly that all unalienated land was regarded as indigenous land. No land could be transferred without prior investigation by the Administration. If, during negotiations preceding a transfer of land, the indigenous owners asserted that they did not wish to dispose of their land, the negotiations were suspended. Furthermore, an indigenous landholder could not sell or lease his land except to the Administration. Moreover, to confirm that fact, it was sufficient to consult the report of the 1953 Visiting Mission on the Territory of New Guinea (T/1056, paras. 89 to 98 inclusive). That document fully refuted the charges made by the Byelorussian representative. The latter had also spoken of the existence of a system of forced labour in those Territories and referred to the regulations issued in March 1952 in that connexion. The Native Labour Ordinances of 1950 and 1952 had replaced long-term labour contracts by a system of agreements freely entered into by indigenous labourers. That was clear from paragraphs 135 to 137 of the Visiting Mission's report and from section 40 of the report on the administration of the Territory of New Guinea for the year ending June 1952.² They showed how absurd it was to claim that forced labour existed in those Territories.

9. Finally, the Byelorussian representative had asserted that corporal punishment was used in the Territory. He recalled that at the twelfth session of the Trusteeship Council his delegation had explained that that type of punishment was imposed only very infrequently and only for certain carefully enumerated crimes.

10. Mr. SCHMELZ (Czechoslovakia) observed that the Canadian representative had referred to paragraph 143 of the report, which was full of slanders, and had drawn conclusions from it respecting Czechoslovakia. If she was interested in the Czech criminal laws, she would do better to study them in the original and not in the *Ad Hoc* Committee's report, in which the passages quoted were taken out of context and put in such a way as to twist their meaning and distort the principles on which the code rested. Had the Canadian representative been a jurist, she would have understood that article 36 of the penal code was, on the contrary, proof of the humanitarian principles on which that legislation was based and that it took special account of the importance of the rehabilitation of criminals. The Czech penal code rejected the theory that criminals were born and it repudiated the concept of punishment as a revenge. Czech criminal legislation was essentially humane: it enabled criminals to become reabsorbed into the community and guaranteed them the right to work on a normal basis. Convicts were paid like any other workers and were free to spend their wages as they liked. Moreover, they were entitled to all social

security benefits, as were the members of their families, who were thus spared the humiliation of soliciting charity.

11. Certain provisions in chapter 163 of the Canadian penal code, on the other hand, provided additional penalties which the judge could apply at his discretion. Article 36 of the Czech penal code might be compared advantageously with paragraph 28 of chapter 163 of the Canadian code.

12. He inquired whether convicts were entitled to work in Canada, whether they were paid on the same scale as free workers, whether they were free to spend their wages as they liked, and whether they and their families were entitled to social security.

13. Finally, he asked also what the Canadian representative thought of paragraph 1060 of the Canadian penal code, which made provision for corporal punishment and explained in detail how it was to be applied, and whether she felt that such punishment was humane. He wondered whether she did not think that it detracted from the convict's moral dignity.

14. Mrs. LORD (United States of America) said she would reply as briefly as possible to several statements made during the debate, while reserving the right to speak again.

15. The most striking aspect of the debate was that it had provided an example of Soviet tactics and propaganda. Faced with incontrovertible evidence of the existence of forced labour on a large scale within their borders, the representatives of the countries within the Soviet sphere had resorted to well-known devices: first, they had released a flood of invective, and then they had attempted to divert the Committee's attention from the question under discussion in order to deal with irrelevant issues.

16. With respect to the attacks on the integrity of the experts comprising the *Ad Hoc* Committee, she would say only that they constituted a serious threat to any similar attempts by the United Nations in future to ascertain facts by way of objective and impartial committees of experts, for no one wanted to become the object of a "smear" campaign. With regard to the diversionary efforts of the speakers from the countries in the Soviet orbit, to reply to their charges would be to play into their hands and to neglect the real issue. On the other hand, by no reply being made, the impression might be given that their fantastic statements were accepted. She would try to keep a middle course and merely give a few examples to demonstrate clearly the irrelevancy and falsity of their charges.

17. In the eyes of the representatives of the Soviet bloc, who solved their difficulties by distorting the meaning of words, forced labour was not compulsory labour enacted by force but the kind of labour which existed wherever land or the means of production were privately owned and which involved a ruthless exploitation, constantly lowered standards of living, hunger, disease and crime. However, the Communist slogan that a free economy was the source of all evil hardly coincided with facts. The best way to verify the economic advantages enjoyed by an individual was to study his real wage. The real weekly wages of all workers employed in manufacturing in the United States of America expressed in 1947-1949 dollars was \$US25.66 in 1914. It had risen to \$US40.17 in 1939, \$US57.81 in June 1950 and \$US62.56 in June 1953. Thus, the average American citizen could purchase

¹ See *Report to the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Administration of the Territory of New Guinea from 1st July, 1951, to 30th June, 1952*, Commonwealth of Australia, 1952, p. 58.

² *Ibid.* p. 80.

2.5 times as much as he could in 1914. Further, an article in the *New York Post* stated that in 1948 the *per capita* income in the United States was \$US1,525 as compared with \$US181 in USSR. Those figures spoke for themselves.

18. As regards education, the representative of the USSR had accused the United States of spending only .04 per cent of its federal budget on that item. The United States was a federal State and education was a State function. The United States taken as a whole had spent \$US11,000 million dollars on primary and secondary education in 1952 plus about \$US2,000 million on new school buildings. Between 98 and 99 per cent of the children of school age were in school. The Czechoslovak representative had said with great pride that 47,000 persons were taking higher education in his country in 1952. That worked out to about one person in 266. In the United States there were 2,400,000 persons in institutions of higher education, or one in 66.

19. It had also been stated that the non-whites were not as well treated as the whites, and certain figures relating to mortality rates, life expectancy and types of employment had been cited to support that statement. Conditions in the United States of America had certainly never been considered perfect, but a point of which all mention had been omitted was the continual progress that was being made in the United States in that field. Thus, the Czechoslovak representative had stated that the non-white death-rate was 12.6 per 1,000, while that for whites was only 8.4 per 1,000. He had omitted to state that the Negro death-rate, which had been 27.8 per 1,000 in 1900, had declined to 12.6 per 1,000 in 1949—a reduction of over 50 per cent.

20. The representative of Czechoslovakia had said that the Negro life expectancy was shorter than that of whites. But he had not said that the life expectancy of Negroes had risen in the case of males from 47.1 years in 1919/1921 to 58.6 in 1949, an increase of 11.5 per cent. In the case of females it had risen from 46.9 years in 1919/1921 to 62.9 in 1949—an increase of 16 per cent. In the case of the white population the increase had been only 9.6 per cent for males and 13 per cent for females.

21. The Third Committee had also been told that Negroes were restricted to agriculture. It had not been told that the United States Bureau of Census figures for 1950 showed that only 13.5 per cent of the employed Negro men were farmers and farm managers compared with 21.1 per cent in 1940 and that only 11.3 per cent were farm labourers and foreman compared with 20 per cent in 1940. Those figures showed that in ten years approximately one-third of the Negro farm population had left agriculture and that was hardly consistent with the charge that Negroes were compelled to work on agricultural pursuits.

22. The representative of the Ukrainian SSR had spoken of "peonage" and had made broad and general charges. She had omitted to state that there were strict laws in the United States of America against "peonage", which was a crime, and that such laws were enforced. In the United States as a whole only 55 complaints of peonage had been made in 1952.

23. The Polish representative had accused the United States of exploiting illegal Mexican immigrants ("wet-backs"), a charge which the representative of Mexico had already refuted. The United States and Mexico were co-operating closely in order to solve that problem. In

the fiscal year 1953 the United States authorities had apprehended and returned 839,149 of those illegal immigrants at considerable expense to both Governments.

24. The United States Government did not condone any kind of exploitation whatsoever, whether in the United States of America or elsewhere. The United States was continually concerned and taking corrective measures with regard to persons living in the United States whose conditions were not adequate.

25. The persons who accused the United States had made only one reference worthy of notice to United States laws or regulations, the indisputable facts upon which the *Ad Hoc* Committee had based most of its conclusions. They had mentioned the Taft-Hartley Act and had quoted statements made against that Act by United States trade-union leaders and coming from other United States sources. It should be pointed out that while some of those persons might now be out of office they were also out of prison. The United States Government had not branded them as foreign *agents provocateurs* and had not condemned them to forced labour or punished their families. Obviously, the substance of the law itself had no place in the debate: it did not provide for internment in forced labour camps or colonies, it did not allow forced labour without deprivation of liberty on sentence of a court, and it was not directed against class enemies.

26. With regard to the real issue, that is, the revelations of forced labour in the Communist areas of the world, in camps reminiscent of the Nazi concentration camps and under a régime of dictatorship, she recalled that the Soviet bloc had tried to justify some of their laws and had asserted that some provisions of the Soviet penal code were no longer in effect. For her part, she hoped that procedural measures for the protection of Soviet citizens were improving, but she thought that the stories often appearing in the Press by victims who had escaped the system of forced labour left considerable doubt. She drew attention to what the Soviet bloc had not said: it had not attempted to disprove the existence of forced labour camps and colonies, of exile with forced labour and of forced labour without deprivation of liberty, because those realities were evident from the laws of the Soviet Union and of its satellite countries, as well as in the facts presented to the world. The representatives of the Soviet bloc had not attempted to conceal that what they called "corrective labour" was widely applied in the interests of the national economy. They had made no attempt to deny two of the most condemning documents, the Corrective Labour Code and the Regulations of the Ukhta-Pechora Forced Labour Camp. They had made a weak attempt to justify forced labour by characterizing it as an "educative" measure, an argument which the *Ad Hoc* Committee had examined and disposed of in paragraphs 411 and 412 of its report (E/2431) by bringing out the political nature of that sort of measure.

27. Reference had also frequently been made by the Soviet bloc to the proposal submitted by the USSR to the Economic and Social Council³ for the establishment of an investigating committee composed of 125 union members chosen on the basis of the membership of their constituent bodies with the implication that it would on that account be truly impartial. That proposal was a smoke-screen and just another propaganda gesture.

³ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Twelfth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 13, document E/L.165.

The real attitude of the Soviet countries stood revealed by the fact that, in contrast with other countries, they refused to co-operate in giving effect to the measures proposed or taken by the Economic and Social Council to establish the facts, including those adopted before the establishment of the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

28. The Soviet Union had never satisfactorily explained in any United Nations body its consistent violation of its obligations as a signatory of the Charter to promote human rights and respect for fundamental freedoms. None the less, the Economic and Social Council still had to examine the conclusion of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. The Soviet Union still had time to submit its detailed observations in writing as the United States, the United Kingdom and other countries had done. It was to be hoped that it would do so, in order that the United Nations might set in motion an action programme aimed at the elimination of that barbaric practice from the world.

29. The joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.395) did not single out any specific country for condemnation on a political basis: it called for the abolition of systems of forced labour wherever they existed. She hoped that the Committee would, by a large majority, show its opposition to forced labour by voting in favour of the joint draft resolution.

30. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that it was not in application of any provision of the Charter that the Third Committee was dealing with the matter under review; the question had been brought before the General Assembly by the United States of America out of the specific political motives that activated reactionary circles in that country. The purpose was to divert world attention and to foment a new war, contrary to the purposes of the United Nations as enunciated in the Charter. The United States representative had just said that the Soviet Union had used the question for propaganda purposes. He might ask who was at that moment indulging in propaganda in the Third Committee. The question had certainly not been raised by the USSR, for the latter believed that there were a number of more urgent problems which the United Nations could usefully examine with a view to preventing war, ensuring peace and improving the living conditions of the working masses in all countries. Like the USSR, many delegations, even some of those belonging to the North Atlantic bloc, had said that the debate was inadvisable and ill-timed. It was the United States which, with the help of its tremendous propaganda machine, was trying to divert the attention of the United Nations from its real objective, the maintenance of peace, and was spreading slanderous charges against the Soviet Union in order to sow hatred against it. Even before the debate opened on the compilation of lies that made up the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee—which was not even part of the documentation submitted to the General Assembly—Mr. Lodge had, on 23 June 1953, issued a notorious Press release in which he had advertised the report as a document of the United Nations and I.L.O. Mrs. Lord, for her part, before her first statement on the subject in the Third Committee, had held a special Press conference at which she had released a summary in which she had advertised that notorious report to all the foreign correspondents in New York.

31. The reason why the United States had embarked on such a propaganda campaign was that reactionary circles in America and the munitions barons needed it

to prepare for a new war. As soon as the debate began, the United States Press had commented on it and distorted it and *The New York Times* had gone so far as to presume to instruct the Chairman of the Third Committee on how to conduct the debate.

32. Mrs. Lord had said that she was not referring to isolated cases of forced labour prohibited by national legislation. She was no doubt speaking of the capitalist countries and he thanked her for that significant admission. The expression "isolated cases" was hardly appropriate when there were more than 500,000 agricultural workers in the southern states and clandestine Mexican immigrants attracted to the United States of America by recruiting-agents to provide cheap labour, not to speak of the Negro workers who were reduced to semi-slavery by vagrancy laws and other repressive legislation. It was questionable whether those cases really fell outside the *Ad Hoc* Committee's terms of reference. He asked whether the term "isolated cases" was appropriate to describe the 800,000 Mexicans who, according to Mrs. Lord herself, had been returned to their country and how 800,000 persons had been able to cross a frontier without being discovered. At any rate, if they had been sent back to their country, that was probably because they had already been exploited to the utmost and no further use could be made of them.

33. Mrs. Lord had said that she was referring only to what she called "systems of forced labour" of the kind that according to her existed in the USSR. The USSR delegation had formally branded as false those calumnious allegations brought by the United States for propaganda purpose. Anyone who wanted to visit the USSR to inspect living and working conditions on the spot, to talk with the workers and see how the kholkoz and factories were run received all the necessary facilities. He had already cited the conclusions reached by foreign visitors after a tour in the USSR, where they had found not a trace of forced labour. He drew attention to the fact that the three experts of the *Ad Hoc* Committee had never gone to the USSR and knew nothing about Soviet practices and methods or how the corrective system functioned. They had stayed in New York and had met to hear escapees, diversionists and traitors to whom the United States had given shelter, after which they had drafted their so-called report at meetings held behind closed doors. Mrs. Lord's claim that censorship in the USSR prevented information from crossing the frontiers was completely untrue. The members of the 290 delegations, including peasants, workers, priests, and lawyers, who had visited the USSR since the end of the Second World War, had concealed nothing they had seen in the Soviet Union; they were honest and were not inspired by hatred. It was also untrue to say that the United Nations had no official documentation concerning the USSR; it received official publications from which it could have obtained information instead of interrogating individuals of doubtful reliability, as the Committee of three alleged experts had done. From the moment of its foundation, the Soviet Union had never hidden any pertinent information, and the particulars it afforded were available to all. The facts were as follows. In 1925 a delegation of British trade-unionists had visited the Soviet Union and had stated in its report that in the USSR criminals were imprisoned not to be punished but to learn to become useful citizens. In 1928 another visitor had stated that the Soviet penal system was more advanced by several decades than that of the rest of the world.

34. Another witness was the British writer, H. G. Wells, who had made several trips to the USSR, first during the civil war, and later during the reconstruction. He had been a man with scientific training, who respected accuracy and objectivity. He had toured the country, had conversed with a large number of Soviet workers and had expressed his impartial opinion; but he had never echoed calumnious lies such as those the United States delegation had uttered at the current meeting.

35. Between 1920 and 1930 a group of British trade-unionists, including Mrs. Beatrice Cabour and Mr. Sidney Webb, had made a long stay in the USSR to investigate the actual conditions prevailing in the country. They had naturally tended to view the problem from the traditional bourgeois point of view, but they had not been blinded by hatred. They had visited factories, questioned thousands of workers, and studied labour legislation and its impact on daily life. The results of their investigation had been published in two volumes entitled *Soviet Communism, a New Civilization*, which had been received with considerable interest. The authors had noted that the essential features of that new civilization were the absence of man's exploitation by man, the disappearance of profit as an economic stimulant and the complete economic and social equality of all citizens. An appendix to the work included various documents such as specimens of collective contracts used in the USSR, the Soviet labour code and other equally significant texts. That solid documentation was available to all who desired the truth; those who ignored it showed that their sole concern was to collect false testimony.

36. The United States representative had claimed that the USSR economic system was a breach of human rights; she had spoken of it as a kind of infectious disease, an epidemic threatening the world. One might ask where the centre of infection actually lay.

37. The USSR delegation to the United Nations had always worked for better international relations. The USSR had repeatedly pressed for the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and the evacuation of German territory by all foreign troops, in order to permit the development of a democratic, demilitarized and peaceful unified Germany. The United States of America had continually rejected those proposals and had maintained a special occupation régime in Western Germany with a view to arming the country so as to make it a basis for aggression under the control of fascist elements. The same contrast could be seen in the case of Japan. The Soviet policy in the Far East was one of peace; the United States was seeking to rearm Japan, deliberately ignoring the interests of neighbouring countries in Asia which felt justifiable anxiety at the survival of Japanese militarism. The United States policy threatened world peace; the Soviet policy sought only peace and friendly relations among nations.

38. All human rights had long been recognized in the Soviet Union; the USSR delegation took an active part in the drafting of international conventions. The United States had announced that it would not sign those conventions and continually created obstacles which delayed their completion.

39. The United States representative had spoken of an epidemic, but the United States Government was attempting to spread throughout the world the prin-

ciples underlying the Taft-Hartley Act. Senator Melon from Nevada had admitted that the United States was playing the part of a defender of the colonial Powers and was helping them to maintain slavery in the territories under their authority. The North Atlantic Treaty proclaimed the inviolability of the colonial system. In Germany, the Bonn authorities were copying the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act; the same thing was being done in Japan; that law was, therefore, apparently a United States export commodity. The anti-labour manoeuvres in the countries occupied by the United States Army went still further; in September 1953 pressure had been exerted on the trade-unionists of Western Germany to strip them of some of their rights and limit the social security benefits enjoyed by the population. As to Japan, the traffic in human beings continued to thrive there. On 27 November 1953, the *United States News & World Report* had stated that Japan's social structure had not changed since the war; young girls were still sold for purposes of prostitution; they cost only \$US22, whereas a pedigreed dog cost \$US50. Women in good health, fit for work, were sold for \$US30. In 1952 the police had investigated 67,000 cases of persons suspected of engaging in that shameful traffic. If there was a centre of infection, it was in such a civilization, which allowed slavery, forced labour and the humiliation and degradation of human beings, under the control of the United States occupation forces.

40. The United States representative had dwelt at length on her Government's efforts to promote social progress. In that connexion he cited an article by Mr. Ruskin published in *The New York Times*, which described the policy of the Republican administration as a policy of recession, one that favoured finance and the capitalist monopolies. The profits of large companies had increased at the expense of workers and small businesses; the workers' situation had deteriorated as a result of measures affecting house rents and the introduction of new provisions into labour legislation; farmers were suffering from the drop in prices of agricultural products; the administration had not kept its promises; and new tax increases were being considered. That was the opinion of an American trade-unionist regarding the social policy of the Government in Washington.

41. The United States representative had said that the Third Committee was not concerned with the Taft-Hartley Act, as it had nothing to do with the matter under discussion. It seemed odd, while decrying the Soviet labour code, to refuse any reference to corresponding American legislation. If Soviet legislation was to be criticized the USSR delegation felt it was justified in citing United States legislation and in recalling the opinions that a number of Americans had expressed on it. He had merely replied in kind to the attacks launched against the economic and social system of the Soviet Union.

42. The Norwegian representative had taken exception to the USSR representative's observations (530th meeting) concerning Mr. Paul Berg, one of the three members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Forced Labour; he had said that those observations had deeply offended the Norwegian people. He (Mr. Saksin) however, had made no reference in his statement to the Norwegian authorities or to the Norwegian people, for whom the Soviet people entertained feelings of friendship and respect. Mr. Berg had not taken part in the preparation

and drafting of the report (E/2431) because of any instructions he had received from the Norwegian Government or people; he had not acted in their name.

43. Mr. Berg had never gone to the USSR; he was not familiar with the laws of that country and he had no idea of the conditions actually prevailing there. Nevertheless, he had not hesitated to accept the false testimony of a handful of criminals and traitors who supported their lies with false or forged "documents" and to sign a report bristling with inadmissible calumnies and attacks against the Soviet Union. The USSR delegation could not remain silent in the face of such an attitude towards a country whose heroic army had contributed mightily towards the liberation of the Norwegian people from the nazi yoke, a point which Mr. Berg seemed to have forgotten.

44. In accusing Mr. Berg of having thanked Quisling publicly the USSR representative had merely been reproducing the findings of the Commission of Inquiry of the Norwegian *Storting*. He read a speech reproduced verbatim in volume 1, page 159, of that commission's report, in which Mr. Berg paid a tribute to Quisling. The speech had been broadcast by the German occupation authorities in Norway. Everyone knew who Quisling was; an international criminal who had rightly been branded by world public opinion.

45. In stating that Mr. Berg had thanked an international criminal he had simply recalled a fact which the Norwegian Parliament had acknowledged. He hoped that the Norwegian representative would find those explanations satisfactory. He repeated that he had never intended to criticize the Norwegian people, for whom he felt sincere esteem and friendship.

46. Mr. SCHMELZ (Czechoslovakia) wished to make a brief statement in reply to the United States

representative, who had referred on two occasions to an earlier statement by the Czechoslovak representative.

47. The United States representative had admitted the accuracy of the figures that had been cited with respect to American Negroes but she had added that the Czechoslovak delegation should have taken into account the statistics for the preceding years, since comparison showed that a certain amount of progress had been made. The Czechoslovak delegation was well aware that the problem was not a new one; it had considered that in 1953, figures for 1953 should be cited; the objection raised by the United States representative left the substance of the question unaltered.

48. Furthermore, the United States representative had compared the number of students in her country with the number of students in Czechoslovakia. But the important consideration in the case of Czechoslovakia, was not so much the current figure as the per cent of increase since 1937. He had emphasized that there were currently in Czechoslovakia two and a half times as many students as in 1937 and ten times as many scholarships. It was regrettable that the United States representative had not been able to report a similar increase in her country.

49. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) requested an opportunity to reply at the beginning of the following meeting to the USSR representative, who had repeated his earlier allegations against Mr. Berg.

50. The CHAIRMAN took note of the Norwegian representative's intention to make use of his right of reply at the beginning of the next meeting

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.