

carried on by national workers in order to assert their rights had been clearly demonstrated. Administrative bodies took savage action against him and, when that was not sufficient, deported him.

147. In France, Polish workers and miners, although settled there for many years, were arrested or deported when they took part in the union activities of their French comrades; yet the convention concluded between France and Poland in 1920 was still in force and guaranteed trade union rights for Polish workers, including the right to strike. At the same time, paradoxical as it might seem, the French Government, since 1948, had placed difficulties in the way of the repatriation of workers who wished to return to Poland.

148. The representative of Poland on the Third Committee had cited many cases of the arrest of Polish workers, of brutal treatment by the police and of expulsions without due warning for the mere fact of having taken part in a strike. Although the representative of France on the Third Committee had alleged that those had been isolated cases, it must be pointed out that those so-called isolated cases were increasing to such an extent that they were becoming a system. The mere fact that Polish workers were deprived of the right to strike was a flagrant violation of an essential trade union right. The representative of France had believed he could put matters right by asserting that reprisals for strike activities, especially during the miners' strike in 1948, had been applied equally to the French miners. The feelings which the French working class harboured about the authors of such reprisals were well known. And that attack on the trade union rights of the working class had occurred at the very moment when the French delegation was styling itself the champion of the universality of the declaration of human rights at the Third session of the General Assembly in Paris.

149. In its reprisals against foreign workers who took part in strikes, the French Government had gone so far as to deport such workers from French territory.

150. All those facts served to show the great importance of ensuring equality of treatment for immigrant labour in connexion with the application of trade union rights.

151. Under the Polish draft resolution, emigrant workers had an opportunity to transmit part of

their wages to their families in the country of emigration. The sole purpose of that measure was to mitigate the poverty of those families; it had been one of the recommendations of the World Federation of Trade Unions, designed in the first place to affect Italian workers. The objection had been raised that it should be possible to transmit savings not to the country of origin but to the country where the family of the emigrant worker was living. The representative of Poland would be prepared to accept an amendment to that effect.

152. Finally, the Polish draft resolution proposed repatriation at the expense of the country of immigration; such a measure would serve as a weapon against the iniquitous exploitation of foreign labour.

153. The Polish representative was absolutely opposed to the draft resolution of the Third Committee, based on the draft submitted by the United Kingdom, the purpose of which was to strike the problem from the agenda of the Assembly.

154. The convention of the International Labour Organisation, to which the delegations of the United Kingdom and the United States had referred, would not settle the problem. Like many other instruments of the ILO, that convention would probably be ratified by many of the members of that organization but many Members of the United Nations were not members of the ILO. The convention itself consisted of a basic text, comprising extremely general principles and three annexes dealing with the most important detailed regulations. Yet, according to article 14 of the convention, that instrument might be ratified even if one, two or all the annexes were dropped and the convention as a whole would therefore become useless.

155. The Polish representative wished to point out that his country had ratified ILO conventions and had implemented them. The reason why it had not voted for the convention in question was that it did not consider that it could be effective. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations recommending non-discrimination against emigrant workers would, however, have such extensive moral force that it might contribute to the solution of a highly important social problem.

156. The PRESIDENT declared the list of speakers closed.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.

## TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-THIRD PLENARY MEETING

*Held at Flushing Meadow, New York, on Thursday, 17 November 1949, at 10.45 a.m.*

*President: General Carlos P. RÓMULO (Philippines).*

### **Discriminations practised by certain States against immigrating labour and, in particular, against labour recruited from the ranks of refugees: report of the Third Committee (A/1052) (concluded)**

1. Mrs. CASTLE (United Kingdom), speaking on a point of order, asked how it was that although the USSR had not been among the remaining

speakers on the item under consideration when the President had closed the list at the 242nd meeting, the USSR representative was to be allowed to speak.

2. The PRESIDENT explained that the representative of the Soviet Union had said he had sent his secretary to the administrative officer to place his name on the list of speakers at the time of the closing of the list. The same had happened in the case of the representative of Yugoslavia. The

President had therefore accepted their applications although they had actually registered their names after the closing of the list of speakers.

3. The President announced, however, that thereafter, as soon as the Chair declared the list closed, the list would be considered finally closed whether or not the secretary of a delegation had been sent prior to such a declaration.

4. Mr. TESSIER (France) said that the French delegation wished to emphasize the special importance it attached to the question of possible discrimination against immigrant labour in any country. It must, however, express its regret that when that item of the agenda had been discussed in the Third Committee<sup>1</sup>, the debate, instead of turning on the great humane principles underlying the problem, had been confined to a series of polemical statements, certain delegations having seized the opportunity to bring quite baseless charges against particular Member States. It had not been the fault of the French delegation that the discussion had not been conducted with the sobriety befitting the study of so important a question.

5. As far as it was concerned, the French delegation, through its representatives on the Third Committee and particularly Mr. Jouhaux, President of the *Confédération générale du travail—Force ouvrière*, had refuted the attacks directed against France.

6. As President of another French trade union organization, Mr. Tessier wished solemnly to deny that immigrant workers of any nationality, and *a fortiori* Polish workers, had ever been subjected to discrimination in France, which retained so many historical and sentimental links with Poland.

7. With regard to the deplorable conditions of hygiene in which, according to certain allegations, the Polish workers in France were living, Mr. Tessier would simply point out that the French mines had not recruited labour in Poland for more than fifteen years. The Polish miners working in France had been settled there for many years and had been able to create their own living conditions in keeping with their taste. They had not had to suffer the temporary difficulties with which the French collieries had had to contend in housing workers of other nationalities recruited abroad during the previous few years. Moreover, as Mr. Jouhaux had already said in the Third Committee, the Polish miners, like the rest of the immigrant labour force, enjoyed not only social security benefits on the same footing as French workers, but also all the advantages of the special legislation governing miners.

8. The most irrefutable proof that such workers found favourable living and working conditions in France lay in the fact, previously mentioned by Mr. Jouhaux, that quite a number of miners repatriated to Poland were anxious to return to France, although the French Government could hardly be accused of forcing them to do so.

9. But although it was true that in order to leave their country of origin those workers had to surmount very many difficulties, it was on the contrary absolutely untrue to say that the French au-

thorities prevented the return of mine-workers to Poland. An alien of any nationality could always leave French territory for the country of his choice. Thus, on 19 May 1949, 707 emigrants, with individual visas, had embarked for Poland at Le Havre on the Polish vessel *Batory*. Moreover, those emigrants had included 50 French citizens, the children of Poles born in France or of French men and women married to persons of Polish origin who had been naturalized.

10. The French Government was not placing any obstacles in the way of the departure of Poles wishing to spend their vacation in Poland. It was surprising to hear the Polish representative state the opposite, since it was the Polish Government itself which, at the beginning of 1948, had taken the initiative in refusing return visas to foreigners residing in Poland.

11. Finally, if foreign miners had been deported from France, it was not because of strike action. It was because they had committed reprehensible acts in connexion with a strike which had developed not so much over union rights or claims as for political purposes. Such acts included hampering freedom of work, violence against workers or the representatives of law and order, and sabotage. They were all the more reprehensible in that they endangered the lives of fellow workers, among whom there were, of course, Poles, and in that they constituted attacks not on the private property of a few capitalists, but on the common wealth of the mines, which in France were nationalized. It should also be pointed out that after inquiry into the cases of numerous offenders, only forty-two had been deported, whereas the Polish colony in France numbered nearly 400,000.

12. Tendentious rumours could not prevail against simple facts, and even less could slander prevail against the invincible force of truth.

13. France had supported in the past, and would continue to support in the future, the efforts made by the International Labour Office since 1927 for the protection of migrant labour, to which Mr. Jouhaux had referred. The French delegation thought that it was for the International Labour Organisation to assume the main responsibility in that regard, as it had been doing more and more during the previous years, either in the sessions of its Conference or in the studies of its technical committees.

14. But it was of the utmost importance that the General Assembly, to which the question had been referred, should communicate the result of its work to the International Labour Organisation. The advantage of the current discussions would be that they had brought out and emphasized the principles which should guide the activities of that great specialized agency in such matters.

15. For that reason, the French delegation, noting with satisfaction that the principles themselves had not been opposed by any delegation, would support, with full knowledge of the facts, the text of the draft resolution proposed to the General Assembly by the Third Committee.

16. Mr. DE ALBA (Mexico) said the Polish delegation's draft resolution (A/1084) was based on a principle which commanded general respect and on which the majority of the members of the Assembly were probably in agreement.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the fourth session of the General Assembly, Third Committee, 249th, 250th and 251st meetings*.

17. The draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee was based on the draft resolution of the United Kingdom and the Mexican amendment thereto. The sole purpose of that amendment had been to place the question under discussion in its proper perspective by reducing it to practical terms.
18. The draft resolution before the Assembly was not a device to evade the problem, but merely a declaration that it was necessary to deal with the matter through the correct channels in order to obtain the best results.
19. It had been repeatedly said that there should be no overlapping of work and that the United Nations and the specialized agencies should be complementary to each other, since many of the specialized agencies had been established for the precise purpose of dealing with certain questions submitted to the Assembly.
20. The Convention concerning Migration for Employment, approved in 1949 by the International Labour Conference in Geneva, was fuller, more comprehensive and more complete than the draft resolution submitted by the Polish representative. Hence the United Kingdom delegation had proposed that those aspects of the question which dealt with working conditions and conventions concerning immigrant labour should be referred to the competent specialized agency. The subject might be considered as being almost exclusively within the competence of the International Labour Organisation.
21. The Mexican delegation gave its support to the convention adopted by the ILO, in the drafting of which it had taken part, although it felt that there were certain omissions, as in the case of medical attention for seasonal immigrant labour. Mexico was trying to remedy those omissions by means of bilateral agreements with the United States, where Mexican seasonal migrant labourers went to work.
22. Referring to paragraph 2 (a) of the Polish draft resolution, Mr. de Alba recalled that a similar provision had been proposed by the Mexican delegation at the International Labour Conference; it had been approved and actually appeared as a clause in the convention. Thus the principle of non-discrimination for which Mexico had striven so long had been adopted by the International Labour Conference and by the respective technical commissions.
23. The recommendation contained in paragraph 2 (b) also appeared in more elaborate form in the convention.
24. With regard to paragraph 2 (c), Mr. de Alba pointed out that, under the convention, employers were required to repatriate immigrant workers.
25. With regard to paragraph 2 (d), it should be recalled that the convention opened the way for bilateral conventions. Mexico had concluded a bilateral agreement with the United States for the protection of seasonal immigrant workers; that agreement was already in force. In the event of non-fulfilment, Mexico would denounce it and would withdraw its workers if they had suffered any discriminatory treatment; that was really the substance of the Polish draft resolution.
26. Mr. de Alba took the view that the draft resolution of the Third Committee fully covered the purposes of the Polish draft resolution.
27. The delegation of Mexico had urged in the Third Committee that a provision concerning non-discrimination in community life and human relations should be included in the draft resolution; for over and above the question of contracts, wages, working hours and social security, which fell within the competence of the International Labour Organisation, there was the human problem of the daily life of the immigrant workers.
28. When the Universal Declaration of Human Rights had been adopted on 10 December 1948, not a few people had regarded it as utopian and rather romantic, thinking it would not have much effect in practice since it was not mandatory upon the States acceding to it. But the experience of the past year had been encouraging. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights had proved to be the living embodiment of a great progressive idea.
29. When the Mexican delegation had proposed, at the International Labour Conference, that the draft convention on immigrant labour should include a provision concerning non-discrimination, it had based its proposal on one of the articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which thus constituted the framework for the new convention.
30. The Mexican delegation had submitted its amendment to the United Kingdom draft resolution in order to confirm the support of the United Nations for the principles of the Declaration; the amendment had been adopted by a large majority of the Third Committee.
31. Mrs. Roosevelt, when speaking on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights at the first part of the second session, had been attacked for the discrimination which existed in the United States. She had admitted frankly that her country had some shortcomings but that it was intended to remedy them.
32. In the city of New York, the ideal of men and women of different races, religions and nationalities living together in a single community was being achieved.
33. Mrs. Roosevelt had worked indefatigably for the final abolition of such discriminatory practices of every kind as might still exist in her country. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, moreover, would have a positive influence in inducing the whole world to abolish forever all discriminatory practices.
34. After the good neighbour policy had been initiated, the United States had performed an act of justice towards the Government of Mexico by recognizing the right of that Government to defend its nationals. Discrimination in social relations and in the treatment of human beings was one of the most deplorable manifestations of ignorance, lack of human solidarity and the absence of a Christian spirit.
35. With regard to working conditions and guarantees covering wages and benefits, welfare, living quarters and medical assistance, it should be recalled that one of the most important actions of the Ninth International Conference of American States had been the Inter-American Charter of

Social Guarantees, which reaffirmed the fact that human work should never be regarded as a commodity but that it should be a right freely exercised by man and a privilege deserving full protection.

36. Mr. de Alba wished to suggest that the reference in the third paragraph of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee should not be to the "adoption" of the ILO Convention, because the Convention had in fact already been adopted. As the representative of the United Kingdom had stated in the Third Committee the reference should be to "ratification" of the Convention, because it was stated in the second paragraph that it had been adopted. The adoption of the draft resolution by the Assembly should encourage Member States to ratify the Convention.

37. Mr. de Alba believed that if the discussion on the subject were confined to the technical and humanitarian aspects of the problem in a spirit of mutual understanding, there would be no occasion for bitter controversy or heated debate because everyone agreed that immigrant workers should be protected and should be guaranteed humane treatment in every respect. The United Kingdom draft resolution and the Mexican amendment thereto filled a just need and perhaps met the desire of the Assembly itself. He hoped that the Assembly would adopt the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee.

38. Mrs. CASTLE (United Kingdom) joined the representative of Mexico in hoping that the General Assembly would reject the Polish draft resolution and approve the Third Committee's draft resolution with, perhaps, the small alteration which the representative of Mexico had so aptly proposed. The United Kingdom delegation agreed that it might be better to substitute the word "ratification" for the word "adoption" in the draft resolution adopted by the Third Committee.

39. The Polish draft resolution had been fully discussed in the Third Committee and had been rejected there by substantial majorities, the Committee having felt that it did not provide the best way of achieving the purposes which it was ostensibly designed to promote. In that connexion Mrs. Castle wished to emphasize that there had not been a single representative in the Third Committee who had not agreed that discrimination against immigrant labour was contrary to principles of the United Nations and that steps should be taken to eradicate it where it was found to be practised. The United Kingdom delegation had admitted in the Third Committee that there was much in the Polish draft resolution with which, in principle, all should agree. The reason the United Kingdom delegation had asked the Committee to reject the Polish draft—and it would ask the General Assembly to endorse that rejection—was that it did not offer the best way of dealing with the problem, and that there was a much more constructive course open to the Assembly.

40. In addition, it had been pointed out to the representative of Poland that many of the individual recommendations in his draft resolution were quite undesirable in their existing form, even within the context of the purposes he was trying to achieve. It had been pointed out, for example, that the recommendation contained in paragraph 2 (b) was clearly a quite inadequate safeguard for the immigrant worker who was a displaced

person and who, if he wished to transfer savings to his family, would presumably not wish to send them to his country of origin, to which he might have no intention of returning.

41. That was only one of a number of constructive criticisms made in the Committee which the representative of Poland had ignored. He had shown no interest in producing a resolution which would really achieve the safeguards for immigrant workers with which the United Nations should be genuinely concerned. Mrs. Castle could only conclude, therefore, that the representative of Poland, by reintroducing his original draft resolution—in the identical words, except that he had agreed at that late hour to consider one possible amendment on the point she had mentioned, which he clearly saw was unanswerable—was not interested in achieving the effective protection of migrant labour but merely wished to create another opportunity to make sweeping and violent attacks on other countries for propaganda purposes.

42. All were agreed that workers should not be exploited economically or socially in the countries to which they went for employment. The representative of Poland had accused the United Kingdom of trying to shelve the matter by submitting the alternative draft resolution upon which the Third Committee had based its final decision. The truth was exactly the contrary. The question of migration had been discussed at length in the Economic and Social Council, which maintained general responsibility for co-ordinating and supervising action taken in that field. After consultation with the specialized agencies and the subsidiary organs of the Economic and Social Council, agreement had been reached on the allocation of functions in the matter between the various bodies concerned. It could truthfully be said that the main responsibility for taking action in the field relating to migration for employment had been laid upon the International Labour Organisation. One of the considerations which the Economic and Social Council had undoubtedly had in mind in reaching that decision had been that the ILO was a body representing not only Governments but also trade unions and managements, a fact which was of special importance in connexion with a subject of that kind.

43. It was in that spirit of practical co-operation that the ILO had applied itself in the preceding two years to an intensive study of the problem of migration for employment and had taken important action. Preparatory work of a most valuable kind had been carried out in the Permanent Migration Committee which was composed of experts from the chief countries concerned. That preparatory work had been followed by discussion of the question at the full ILO Conference in Geneva in June and July 1949. Authoritative representatives from fifty States, representing trade union and managements as well as Governments, had taken part in those discussions.

44. The discussions had been extremely successful and the Conference had adopted both a convention and a recommendation on the question of migration for employment and the protection of migrant workers. Those instruments were most comprehensive and precise, covering every aspect of that complex problem which could profitably be covered by international agreement. There could

be no doubt that they represented an immense advance in providing, at the international level, safeguards against discriminatory practices. It was because that work had already been done so fully by a body so well equipped to perform it that the Third Committee had decided that it was preferable to endorse the work of the ILO in that field and to request the ILO to expedite the adoption or ratification and application of the convention, as the best way of ensuring that the immigrant worker would be protected against discrimination and given the just treatment to which he was entitled.

45. The representative of Poland had dismissed the work of the ILO as valueless, for two reasons. His first reason was that the membership of the ILO did not comprise all the Members of the United Nations. In reply, Mrs. Castle would point out that there were indeed very few Members of the United Nations which were not members of the ILO and the failure of certain States to join it was certainly not its fault, as Poland, a member of the ILO, must well know. Secondly, the Polish representative had expressed the fear that the ILO convention would become a dead letter because the States most concerned would refuse to ratify it. That was indeed a strange argument from a representative whose country although a party to the discussions of the ILO had voted against the convention when it had been adopted by an overwhelming majority. Surely a country which was anxious to see the convention ratified would at least have strengthened the moral pressure on the countries concerned by voting for it.

46. That, then, was the general case for rejecting the Polish draft resolution. Even if that general case were not so strong, however, the Polish draft was clearly unacceptable on other specific grounds. The preamble, for example, which claimed that discriminations were practised in many States against immigrant labour, was far too sweeping to warrant the approval of the General Assembly. It might be true that there were individual cases of discrimination against immigrant labour as compared with national labour; Mrs. Castle could only say that such discriminations did not exist in the United Kingdom, which had received some one hundred thousand European volunteer workers into employment since the war. Great care had been taken by the United Kingdom Government, under the watchful eye of the British trade union movement—a free trade union movement—to see that those workers were guaranteed exactly the same conditions of employment in all industries for which they were recruited as British workers. They had therefore received the same treatment in wages, hours of work, holidays and food rationing, including entitlement to the extra rations for heavy work where appropriate European volunteer workers came under the British social insurance scheme; they paid the same contributions and received the same benefits. Until such time as they became eligible for the scheme, special arrangements were made for their protection in the event of sickness or unemployment. They were accommodated either in well-equipped, comfortable hostels or in private homes of their own choice. The Ministry of Labour, through its welfare organization paid special attention to their welfare, collaborating in that concern with many voluntary organizations including various national organ-

izations run by or on behalf of the displaced persons themselves. As a result of the care taken to make them happy and to help them to settle down, only a small fraction of them had left the country, although they were of course free to do so at any time they might so desire.

47. During the debates in the Third Committee, the representatives of Poland, the Byelorussian SSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Soviet Union had tried to build up a picture of widespread discriminations practised in many countries, including the United Kingdom. No doubt they intended to do so again in the Assembly. But the evidence they had adduced in support of their sweeping statements had been quite inadequate to justify the wording of the preamble to the Polish draft resolution, even if that evidence could be accepted as reliable, which in the case of the United Kingdom it certainly was not.

48. Apart, however, from the sweeping nature of the preamble, the Polish draft resolution was quite unsatisfactory in other respects. Its detailed recommendations were so phrased as to be unacceptable as they stood. In the case of the recommendation contained in paragraph 2 (b), for example, the question of granting immigrant labour the right to transfer savings to the country of origin had been considered very carefully at the International Labour Conference in June 1949 and was dealt with much more effectively and more in accordance with the realities of exchange control under article 9 of the ILO convention.

49. The recommendation contained in paragraph 2 (c) of the Polish draft resolution was also unacceptable in its existing form. It was clearly out of the question to expect the country of immigration in all cases and in all circumstances to pay the cost of repatriation of a returning immigrant. There again, the ILO instruments provided a much better treatment of the problem. It went without saying that there must be sympathetic treatment of all cases where the immigrant worker wished to go home and, as far as the United Kingdom was concerned, that sympathetic treatment was already given. In all cases where a Government-sponsored migrant wished to leave the United Kingdom, for some reason which was not his own fault, the United Kingdom Government paid the cost of repatriation for him and his family, and even where he wished to leave for personal reasons the Government assisted him financially if he had not the means to pay the cost of his own repatriation. Further, in the case of migrants who came to the country by private arrangement, it was a condition laid down by the United Kingdom Government that the employer must pay the cost of repatriation if called upon to do so by the competent authority. The United Kingdom delegation therefore opposed the recommendation contained in draft paragraph 2 (c), not because the United Kingdom was callous towards the needs of the immigrant worker but because it was anxious that the Assembly should endorse and sponsor the far more precise and far more constructive proposals of the ILO convention.

50. Although other detailed criticisms could be made of the Polish draft resolution, Mrs. Castle would not weary the Assembly by repeating all the arguments advanced during the discussions in the Third Committee. She hoped she had said

enough to show that by rejecting the Polish draft resolution, the General Assembly would not in any way be shelving the important problem of how to secure equal treatment between immigrant labour and the home worker. It would, on the contrary, be showing its belief that what mattered in every field of humanitarian action was not propaganda speeches but practical progress, not accusations but achievements.

51. Confident that that was the spirit of the Assembly, the representative of the United Kingdom asked representatives to endorse the draft resolution of the Third Committee as it stood.

52. Mr. STEPANENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the question submitted for the General Assembly's examination concerned the interests of millions of people scattered throughout the world and far from their native countries. Moreover, the discriminatory measures practised by certain States against immigrating labour had been of such a hideous nature that the United Nations was obliged to examine and solve the problem, which was closely connected with the problem of refugees and displaced persons.

53. It was common knowledge that the only reason—a reason which was more cogent than ever before—why certain countries took an interest in immigration was that they wished to acquire cheap labour in order to develop thinly populated to an increase of unemployment in those countries economy of the "Marshallized" countries, had led areas and in order to be able to use the immigrants in agriculture and for particularly heavy industrial work. It must not be forgotten that the cheap labour provided by immigration had played a great part in the enrichment of many States, above all of the United States.

54. The reasons for the migration of labour must be sought in the economic, social and political structure of the capitalist countries. Millions of workers were unemployed and, having no possibility of finding employment in their own countries, were compelled to go abroad. Thus a flow of migration was established due to the abnormal economic and social conditions under which the population of certain countries existed.

55. It was well known that before the Second World War, the flow of emigration had come principally from Europe. After the Second World War the sources of emigration in Europe had dried up to a large extent for as a result of the victory of popular democracy in many central and southeastern European countries, those countries had ceased to form part of the international labour exchange. The enormous economic and political progress achieved by those countries and the planning of their national economy had created conditions of life and work favourable to the population. The workers no longer needed to seek work and well-being abroad.

56. In other European countries, on the other hand, a so-called labour surplus had been formed during the post-war years; that surplus was composed of the thousands of unemployed whom the Governments, in view of the existing social structure of those countries, were unable to absorb into the national economies. That situation had been still further aggravated by the implementation of the Marshall Plan. The latter had had unfavourable results for the development of the national

and thus had created a source of migration. Those countries had devoted much attention to the question of migrant labour. They had even gone so far as to assess the potentialities of the various countries for sending workers to other countries. Italy, with its very large number of unemployed, and Western Germany, had thus appeared as reserves of labour. Moreover, a potential reserve of labour had been found in the camps of displaced persons.

57. But neither with respect to the countries of emigration nor with respect to the displaced persons were the plans drawn up for the migration of labour based on humanitarian considerations, as the authors of the various schemes averred. All those plans were based on a simple economic calculation, the aim of which was to obtain cheap labour. It must also be remembered that post-war migration plans also pursued clearly determined political objectives.

58. Inspired by selfish considerations, a number of Governments had decided to draw up plans for the migration of labour on an international basis. That was the origin of various projects in which specialized agencies and even organs of the United Nations had participated. Displaced persons and refugees had become the first victims of that artificial migration policy.

59. The United States, the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Canada and certain Latin-American countries had been interested in securing the immigration of refugees and displaced persons. It was sufficient to recall that according to the figures published by the International Refugee Organization on 30 July 1949, 638,000 refugees and displaced persons had been sent to those countries.

60. The delegations of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and other countries which made use of migrant labour, had attempted, in the Third Committee, to present their migration policy as a charitable undertaking dictated by humanitarian considerations. They had not succeeded, however, for the facts indicated exactly the opposite, namely, that those countries were following purely selfish aims—the obtaining of cheap labour deprived of any legal protection. Everybody knew that in the United States, the United Kingdom and other countries, many immigrants worked in industry and agriculture and that they were the most oppressed and exploited section of the working class.

61. They were forced to carry out the hardest work, while their wages were lower than those of national workers engaged in the same work. Moreover, the exploiters made use of that labour to lower the wages of the national workers, to exploit them more severely and to obtain greater profits.

62. Mr. Stepanenko wished to illustrate his contentions by some examples of discriminatory measures taken by States against workers recruited from among displaced persons.

63. Vassili Ivanovitch Voichouk, a citizen of the USSR, who had returned to his country from the United Kingdom, had stated that he had been in a camp in Scotland with 400 Soviet citizens. All those men worked in the mines and earned 5 pounds a week. For the same work, British workers received one and a half times as much.



64. Another Soviet citizen who had returned to his country at the end of 1948 had stated that more than 300 displaced persons of Soviet nationality were working in the brick-works near Petersburg, that they lived in badly furnished, dirty huts, 8 miles from their factory and earned 4 pounds 5 shillings a week, whereas British workers, doing exactly the same work, earned 6 pounds. Moreover, 50 per cent of their wages was withheld to pay for their rent, transport and various taxes.

65. Thousands of such facts concerning the situation in the United Kingdom could be cited. He would not cite them, however, because a great deal of information on the subject had been furnished to the Third Committee.

66. In Belgium, Canada, Australia and other countries which employed immigrant labour on a large scale, discriminatory measures of the same sort were carried out.

67. Piotr Berouska, a Soviet citizen who had returned to the USSR from Belgium, had stated that when he had arrived in Belgium with numerous other workers, they had been sent to work in a mine where they had had to toil more than eight hours a day underground. They had been paid 110 francs per day while, for the same work, Belgian workers had received 250 francs. When they had complained of such inequality of wages, they had been told repeatedly that since they were not Belgians, they had no right to complain.

68. Mr. Youdine, a Soviet citizen who had been sent to Canada in April 1948 and had returned to the USSR in August of the same year, had stated that he had worked in a casting shop of an aluminium mill near Arvida. The workshop in which he had been employed had had no ventilation. On several occasions the concentration of poisonous gases had caused him to faint. In the mill, displaced persons had received lower wages than Canadian workers, which was generally the case in Canada. He had been paid 82 cents per hour, while, for the same work, a Canadian worker had received one dollar 10 cents. His work in the mill had disabled him and he had been discharged without any compensation for the honest work he had done.

69. Another Soviet citizen, Mr. Popov, had stated that displaced persons arriving in Canada were burdened with the heaviest work and that they were paid much less than Canadian workers. At the time of the signing of the contract in the camps of the British occupation zone of Germany, the representative of the Canadian lumber company had promised to pay 6 dollars for a working day of nine hours. When the workers had arrived in Canada, however, they had been paid only 4 dollars, 95 cents.

70. Discriminatory measures affected not only working conditions and wages; they applied also to professional status. Whatever training the immigrant workers had had, they were as a rule employed as manual labourers. Thus, in the United States, the United Kingdom and certain other countries, for example, women doctors or professors were employed as domestic workers. Engineers, technicians and musicians worked as industrial workers or farm labourers. As an example, Mr. Stepanenko referred to the statement of the Soviet citizen, Goudaitis, who had

said that the British made no distinction between displaced persons, whether they were intellectuals or manual labourers. Each one had to do the work assigned to him. Thus jurists, professors and musicians were doing non-specialized work. Mr. Gailiavicius, for instance, a well-known pianist of the Kaunas opera, was working as a weaver in a textile mill in Coventry.

71. A young Ukrainian, Katherine Kirik, had written from Australia to one of her friends that she often shed tears when thinking of Poltava. She was working thirteen hours a day as a manual labourer on a farm, for which she received a mere pittance. She added that Mr. Peterson, an engineer, was working with her; his work was to milk the cows, while his wife, a teacher, scrubbed floors.

72. It was therefore useless to speak of humanity in connexion with the manual labour of immigrant workers. To do so was only an attempt to deceive public opinion. The only aim of the governing circles of the countries which were importing thousands of immigrant workers was to obtain cheap labour on the best possible terms. The discussion which had taken place in the Third Committee had shown that discriminatory measures were taken against immigrant labour in numerous countries and especially in the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Canada and Australia.

73. Several delegations had mentioned facts which confirmed that that was true. No contradiction was possible. The representative of the United States had been forced to admit that there was discrimination against displaced persons on the plantations of Louisiana. The representative of France had had to admit that discriminatory measures were applied in regard to the participation of immigrant labour in strikes. As the delegation of Poland had shown, immigrant workers who had taken part in strikes had been expelled from France.

74. The representative of the United Kingdom had by implication admitted the existence of such measures when she had said in the Third Committee that the United Kingdom had expelled immigrant workers when it found they were unacceptable. That means that those who protested against discriminatory measures became unacceptable and were deported.

75. The Polish delegation had submitted to the Third Committee a draft resolution designed to prohibit any discriminatory measures against immigrant labour and to grant the latter the same rights as nationals, a proposal which was strictly in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

76. In order to prevent a practical solution of that question, the United Kingdom had submitted its draft resolution providing that the General Assembly would not take a decision in regard to the substance of the matter, but would merely transmit the report and the records of the discussions on the question to the International Labour Organisation. That meant that the question would be buried. Every one knew that the International Labour Organisation had considerable experience in that field; the questions which it had buried were legion.

77. The representative of Mexico had stated in the Third Committee that the United Kingdom draft resolution was too weak and that it would have to be strengthened by appropriate amendments. But notwithstanding the Mexican amendment, the draft resolution remained as weak as ever.

78. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR therefore vigorously opposed the United Kingdom draft resolution, which had been adopted by the Third Committee, and would vote against it. It would cast its vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the Polish delegation.

79. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) stated that millions of people and a number of Members of the United Nations were interested in the solution of the problem which the General Assembly was discussing. The crisis in the economy of capitalist countries and the ever-increasing reduction of trade and production were continuously swelling the army of the unemployed, raising living costs and lowering real wages and the purchasing power of the masses.

80. It was precisely the increase of unemployment and the constant lowering of the workers' living standards which were the basic factors in labour migration. In order to obtain relatively decent living conditions, the workers of a large number of capitalist countries were compelled to leave their homes. Thus, the true reason of such migration should not be sought, as bourgeois science did, in demographic or biological factors, but rather in the very structure of capitalist society. That that was in fact so could be seen by studying the entirely different situation in the countries organized along socialist lines, namely the USSR and the people's democracies. Those countries had handed back to the people the ownership of the means of production, had planned their economy and had organized the exploitation of their resources. They had therefore raised the living standards of the workers; the number of jobs available in production had increased to such an extent that those countries not only had no unemployment, but were even faced with a shortage of labour.

81. In the socialist countries there were thus no domestic problems connected with immigration and emigration. Nevertheless, the people of the Ukrainian SSR were disturbed by the forcible immigration which the authorities in the American and British occupation zones in Germany and Austria, with the co-operation of the International Refugee Organization, were imposing on those citizens who were regarded as displaced persons. As was well known, the American and British occupation authorities, despite the agreements concluded, were opposing the repatriation of displaced persons and were still detaining beyond the frontiers of their countries hundreds of thousands of displaced persons, among whom there were nearly one hundred thousand Ukrainians. Hundreds of thousands of Soviet citizens had already been transported to other countries where they constituted a source of cheap labour.

82. Those occupation authorities, assisted by the IRO, were compelling displaced persons by threats and violence to go to other countries, and were thereby augmenting in a totally artificial way the army of immigrants in a large number of capitalist countries. The Governments of the

United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, France, Australia and certain Latin-American countries were forcibly recruiting those displaced persons, and were increasing the industrial reserves in their territories, which enabled them to put pressure on their own working class because, in many of those countries, the exploitation of the labour of immigrants was not subject to any form of regulation. Moreover, that situation made it possible for disgraceful discriminatory measures to be taken against immigrant workers. Those immigrants had no administrative, economic, social or political rights whatever; the laws of the countries into which they had immigrated had no regard for their interests; employers could break labour contracts with impunity, although agreements of that kind had been concluded at the time of recruiting.

83. That fact had been admitted even by the Director of the National Institute of Demographic Studies in Paris, who had written in the *International Labour Review* of July 1948 that in some countries certain employment and residence conditions were still imposed on immigrants and that since the authorized occupations were naturally those which had been abandoned by national workers, often owing to a difference in wages, there was still an inequality which at first sight appeared to be in contradiction to the general principle of non-discrimination.

84. If discriminatory measures were directed against immigrant workers who had come allegedly of their own free will to other countries, it was only natural that the situation should be even harder for displaced persons shipped under compulsion, like slaves, to foreign countries.

85. The discriminatory measures with regard to immigrant workers took certain specific forms.

86. First, the immigrants were assigned manual labour of a more difficult, more tiring and less reputable nature than that assigned to national workers. The representative of the United Kingdom had told the General Assembly that there were no discriminatory measures of that kind in her country but that statement bore no relation to the facts. The United Kingdom Government considered that immigrants were a labour force which should be employed only on the hardest work, namely, in the mines, in the building industry and in agriculture. The United Kingdom Ministry of Labour compelled immigrant workers to sign a document in which they bound themselves not to change their occupation without the authorization of the Ministry.

87. A good example of that state of affairs was provided by the *New Statesman and Nation* which, in an issue of January 1949, had stated that farmers often regarded agricultural labourers in the category of European volunteers as serf labour very conveniently put at their disposal by the Government.

88. The Netherlands and Belgium also employed immigrant labour only in the mining industry.

89. Secondly, the wages of immigrant workers were, as a rule, from 25 to 50 per cent lower than those of the national workers. Thus, if the average weekly wage of an English miner was from seven to eight pounds, the immigrant worker in the category of displaced persons received for the same work only from four to five pounds. The



situation was similar in the sugar-cane plantations in Australia.

90. Thirdly, the working day of immigrant workers was usually longer than that of national workers. In confirmation of that statement, Mr. Demchenko referred to a letter published on 4 September 1949 in the Ukrainian Nationalist paper *Ukrainskii Vestnik* which appeared in Germany and could not be suspected, in Mr. Demchenko's opinion, of sympathy for the Ukrainian SSR, since that paper carried on propaganda for the sending of displaced persons to other countries. In that letter, which came from a group of Ukrainians transported to the United States, it was stated that the Ukrainians worked fourteen hours per day on American farms, whereas United States workers worked only nine to ten hours per day.

91. Fourthly, in case of illness, the amounts paid to immigrant workers for social security were smaller than those paid to national workers; frequently nothing was paid at all. Despite the assertions of the representative of the United Kingdom, who alleged that in her country there was an absolute equality in the field of social security, it was an established fact that the British worker who was disabled in the course of his employment received a pension, whereas the displaced person received only a single payment which, moreover, was inconsiderable. In the Netherlands, displaced persons received no sick relief.

92. There was also a system of fines to punish so-called lack of enthusiasm for work, as well as such crimes as singing Soviet songs or reading Soviet newspapers. Thus Soviet displaced persons returning from Belgium had stated that a fine, which varied from 10 to 50 francs in accordance with the temper of the manager, was imposed on the worker for leaving his pick or shovel at his place of work. A fine was also imposed for talking about the difficulties of working at the mines.

93. Refusal to work in dangerous places was punished by a fine or two weeks' imprisonment. Foremen often fined workers merely because they did not understand orders given in French.

94. Lastly, immigrants were being separated from their families. The Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Australia recruited only men, who were given a promise that their families would be allowed to join them later in their new country. Years, however, went by and their families remained in displaced persons' camps in Germany and Austria. Men who had been fortunate enough to emigrate with their families were separated from them when assigned to various places of work.

95. Mr. Demchenko said he had given only a few examples of discrimination against immigrant labour. As a matter of fact such discrimination covered a much wider field.

96. It was the duty of the United Nations to take up the defence of immigrant labour. The draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee, however, shirked the question and provided no solution whatever. At the suggestion of the United Kingdom delegation, the Third Committee had proposed that the matter should be referred to the International Labour Organisation. It should be noted that the United Kingdom dele-

gation had always acted in that way in connexion with all questions affecting the working masses. It had always done its utmost to prevent any solution of those problems. It was not difficult to understand why the United Kingdom representative had deemed it necessary to sing the praises of the ILO in the General Assembly. Certain delegations, that of the United Kingdom in particular, had acquired the habit of trying to refer to that organization all questions which they wanted to clear out of the way or to bury forever. That view was fully confirmed by all the activities of the ILO throughout the thirty years of its existence.

97. The International Labour Organisation had adopted over thirty conventions and about the same number of recommendations. Only a very small proportion of them had been ratified and most of them had been accepted by two or three Governments only. Twenty conventions and eighteen recommendations had been adopted since the Second World War., but with the exception of the convention relating to the modification of the ILO constitution, not one had been ratified by any government. Furthermore, the only document which had been ratified did not deal with any essential question; it provided that all references to the League of Nations in the constitution of the organization should be replaced by references to the United Nations.

98. The ILO constitution stated that the organization would defend the interests of women workers; yet it was the ILO which was opposing the proposal submitted by the World Federation of Trade Unions to the Economic and Social Council for the establishment of the principle that men and women should receive equal pay for equal work.

99. Mr. Demchenko was convinced that the ILO would not deal with the question of discriminatory measures in the field of labour any more effectively.

100. For all those reasons, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR could not vote for the draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly by the Third Committee and would, on the contrary, vote against it.

101. It considered that it was the duty of the General Assembly to appeal to the Member States of the United Nations asking them not to allow any discrimination against immigrant workers on grounds of nationality, race or religion, and also requesting that immigrant workers should be treated in the same way as nationals of the country in regard to wages, conditions of work, social security and living conditions.

102. It was also essential for the General Assembly to appeal to Member States asking them to recruit immigrant workers only on the basis of bilateral agreements between the immigration and emigration countries. Further, the Secretariat of the United Nations should examine the economic, social and legal position of immigrant workers in the Member States and report thereon to the General Assembly at its following session.

103. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR believed that the draft resolution submitted by Poland met all those requirements, and it would therefore vote for that draft resolution.

104. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said that the Polish delegation had been perfectly justified in deciding to reintroduce in the Assembly its draft resolution concerning discrimination practised by certain States against immigrant labour and, in particular, against labour recruited from the ranks of refugees. In the first place, an analysis of the votes taken on the individual paragraphs of that draft resolution in the Third Committee would show that it had actually been defeated by a minority of the Member States, since many delegations had abstained from voting. In the second place, the United Kingdom counter-proposal, requesting the General Assembly to refer the problem to the International Labour Organisation, neglected the social and humanitarian importance of the problem. That proposal, which had been adopted by the Third Committee, represented an attempt to avoid a clear-cut solution of the problem in the General Assembly by transmitting it to a specialized agency of a predominantly technical character.

105. Already in the Third Committee the Czechoslovak delegation had expressed its reasons for supporting the original Polish draft resolution. The problem of discrimination practised by certain States against immigrant labour was very serious and the type of discrimination referred to in paragraph 2 of the Polish draft resolution was a violation of the basic principles of the United Nations Charter and of fundamental human rights.

106. A problem of such importance should be solved by the highest international authority, namely, the General Assembly of the United Nations. The resolutions and recommendations of the General Assembly should serve as directives for the specialized agencies. It was hardly conceivable that a body such as the International Labour Organisation would be able to deal with such an important problem without receiving instructions and the guidance of a clear-cut decision from the General Assembly.

107. The Polish draft resolution was constructive and its recommendation to Member States was exactly what was needed to solve the problem. At the same time, in paragraph 2 (d), it excluded the possibility of abuse of the principle of non-discrimination on the part of any war criminals, traitors or quislings among the refugees and displaced persons. Such a possibility was excluded by the provision that immigrant labour could be recruited only on the basis of bilateral conventions concluded between the countries of immigration and emigration and on the basis of negotiations between the trade unions of the countries concerned. The existence of such a provision was a clear refutation of the assertions made in the Third Committee by the representative of Yugoslavia, who had tried to create the impression that the Polish draft resolution might give protection to quislings, war criminals and traitors.

108. It was for those reasons that the delegation of Czechoslovakia wholeheartedly supported the Polish draft resolution and considered that its adoption was the only possible means of solving the grave problem of discrimination against immigrant labour.

109. Mr. PANYUSHKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that it was essential for the United Nations to adopt a resolution to improve

the position of foreign workers. It was all the more necessary to find a solution for the problem in view of the fact that discriminatory measures against immigrant labour were being applied on a vast scale, while certain countries did not even regard such measures as contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter.

110. Every one knew that during the Second World War millions of people of various nationalities had been driven from their countries by force and sent as serfs to Nazi Germany. After the defeat of fascism, many of those unfortunates had returned to their countries, but some had found themselves in displaced persons' camps in the western occupation zones of Germany and Austria. They were still being kept in those camps by force. Hundreds of thousands of them had been resettled in other countries. To make displaced persons immigrants in that way was simply to continue the policy of transfer by violence, inaugurated ten years previously, which had reduced millions of men to serfdom. The only difference was that previously armed force had been used to enslave people in Germany, whereas now they were taken in the guise of displaced persons to the United States, the United Kingdom, Belgium, France, Canada, Australia and other countries, where they were ruthlessly exploited.

111. The Governments in question, it should be noted, were carrying out that policy through the International Refugee Organization. It would be interesting to know the real position of foreign workers in certain Member States.

112. In the United Kingdom, where there were more than 100,000 displaced persons, discrimination was applied quite openly in regard to working conditions, wages, social security and living conditions. Those statements were confirmed by official documents.

113. For example, on 12 March 1949, the Minister of Labour, Mr. Isaacs, had said in answer to a question in the House of Commons that workers coming from Europe on a voluntary contract were placed in industrial employment when no British worker came forward to fill the job. On 10 May 1949, in answer to a question in the House of Commons, Mr. Edwards, Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Labour, had said that none of the so-called voluntary workers arriving in the United Kingdom from European countries could leave their jobs without the permission of the Ministry of Labour. On 1 January 1948, Mr. Brown, Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture, had said in answer to a question by a Labour member of Parliament, Mr. Hynde, that when vacancies were being filled, British nationals must come first, and then the Poles and other workers who had arrived in the United Kingdom from countries in continental Europe, ostensibly of their own free will. Those statements showed that foreign workers were given unpleasant and ill-paid jobs.

114. Discriminatory measures were also applied in another form: thus foreigners were not allowed to work at their special trade or to change their jobs.

115. The meaning of the term voluntary worker in the United Kingdom needed a little explanation.

116. The British authorities used that term for all displaced persons recruited under false pre-

tences in displaced persons camps and sent to work in the United Kingdom. In June 1949, Oulinda, a Soviet citizen, had returned from the United Kingdom. He had been recruited under those conditions. He had lived in a camp where there were more than 50 Soviet citizens. All had worked as agricultural labourers on British farms. In that camp there had been a propaganda drive to prevent displaced persons from returning to their homeland. The British authorities persecuted all Soviet citizens who wanted to go home or who listened to Soviet broadcasts.

117. Youchkevitch, another Soviet citizen, had said that he had been employed in coal mines where displaced persons were paid 4 pounds 8 shillings a week, while British workers received 7 pounds a week for the same work.

118. A regulation published by the Ministry of Labour, dated 19 April 1947, showed that the policy of refusing immigrant workers the right to work in their skilled trade enjoyed the support of the authorities. That regulation stated that preference would be given for entry into the United Kingdom to those who were willing to work as labourers or miners, British nationals being unwilling to work in the coal mines because the work was hard, safety measures were defective and the wages poor.

119. The British Press further confirmed the existence of discriminatory measures, which showed that those measures were widely applied and quite official.

120. In the United States, similar methods were used. Thus, in the *New York Times* of 29 May 1949, Mr. Berg had stated that the displaced persons working in the sugar-cane plantations in the State of Louisiana received 2 dollars and 90 cents for nine hours of work per day, which was below the prescribed minimum wage.

121. It was well known that during the discussion of the question in the Third Committee, the representative of the United States had admitted that discriminatory measures existed in that country and had alluded to the unsatisfactory situation of the displaced persons. Mrs. Roosevelt had explained that such unsatisfactory working conditions in the plantations in the State of Louisiana had resulted from the fact that immigrants had falsely stated that they were acquainted with certain agricultural skills and that owing to their ignorance they had not been able to adapt themselves to local conditions. It was quite obvious that that was no explanation.

122. In France, in Belgium and in a number of other countries, discriminatory measures were also being taken. For example, the Belgian Government and employers recruited displaced persons for work in the mines below the surface only. The majority of Soviet citizens who were in Belgium as displaced persons were employed on heavy labour. Their wages were lower than those of Belgian workers. Thus, in mine number 2 in the Liège region, the wages of displaced persons working below the surface was from 30 to 40 per cent lower than the wages of Belgian workers doing the same work.

123. It should be noted that on 14 October 1949 the representative of Belgium in the Third Committee had admitted the existence of discriminatory measures in his country. He had admitted that foreign workers were being deported from Bel-

gium under the pretext that they were causing a public disturbance or committing acts prejudicial to the national interest or were refusing to comply with the provisions of their contracts of employment. The Belgian representative had not, however, been able to state the exact nature of those offences.

124. It could be seen, therefore, that in a number of countries discriminatory measures against immigrant labour, and particularly against workers recruited from the ranks of refugees and displaced persons, were leading to grave exploitation of immigrant workers by the countries which recruited them. That showed that the question before the General Assembly was of vital importance for millions of workers who were dragging out a miserable existence in foreign lands, far from their homes.

125. During the examination of the problem in the Third Committee, the USSR delegation had opposed the adoption of the United Kingdom draft resolution, because the purpose of that draft had been to prevent the General Assembly from solving the question. The delegation of the Soviet Union had stated that the adoption of that draft resolution would only reduce the prestige of the United Nations in the eyes of world opinion. It had insistently begged the Committee to adopt the Polish draft resolution under which the Members of the United Nations assumed a number of obligations towards immigrant labour, including the abolition of discriminatory measures; that would have been in conformity with the principles concerning human rights laid down in the Charter.

126. The draft resolution submitted to the Assembly by the Third Committee was a mere repetition of the United Kingdom draft resolution, with an amendment proposed by Mexico which did not alter the meaning of the original text.

127. The USSR delegation believed that, in order to find a just solution of the question, the United Nations should state clearly that Member States employing immigrant labour should take steps to put an end to all discriminatory practices, for reasons of nationality, race or religion, against workers who had immigrated and should proclaim the equality of such workers with national workers. The delegation of the Soviet Union believed that the resolution to be adopted by the General Assembly should provide that immigrants were to receive the same wages and the same working conditions as national workers. That step should be taken, not by means of abstract and general statements, as was usually the case in agreements concerning immigration of labour but by the provision of precise measures applicable to each worker who was seeking employment.

128. The USSR delegation believed that the recruiting of immigrant labour and the fixing of their living and working conditions should proceed exclusively on the basis of bilateral agreements between the countries of which the immigrants were nationals and the immigration countries. Moreover, the trade unions of the countries concerned should be entitled to take part in the negotiations.

129. As the draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly by the Third Committee did

not fulfil the conditions which Mr. Panyushkin had stated and was in flagrant conflict with the principles laid down by the United Nations, the USSR delegation would vote against it. By contrast, it regarded the Polish draft resolution as offering a satisfactory approach to the problem, and would vote for it.

130. Mr. DEDIJER (Yugoslavia) stated that since the right of the representative of the Yugoslav delegation to be included in the list of speakers had been challenged, he would withdraw his request to be included in that list so as to counter any suspicion that Yugoslavia was breaking the rules of procedure. The general debate being closed, however, he would like to give a brief explanation of his delegation's vote on the Polish draft resolution, in accordance with rule 80 of the rules of procedure.

131. The Yugoslav delegation had recently enunciated the principle that countries giving asylum to refugees and displaced persons should not use them as cheap labour. It had made that statement in view of the discriminatory treatment accorded to European refugees and displaced persons after the war in some countries, and on the basis of data at its disposal.

132. It would nevertheless abstain from voting on the Polish draft resolution because that draft incorrectly linked the problem of discrimination against immigrating labour with that of discrimination against refugee labour, and because it did not differentiate between refugees and displaced persons, on the one hand, and quislings and war criminals on the other but gave the same rights to both categories. The Yugoslav delegation had quoted figures showing that only 1.2 per cent of 600,000 prisoners of war and persons forcibly deported from Yugoslavia had not returned to that country. On the other hand, it had quoted additional figures concerning quislings and war criminals who had left Yugoslavia together with the German Balkan army. Those facts proved that the majority of Yugoslavs who remained abroad were war criminals and quislings and had been proclaimed by the IRO to be refugees solely on the basis of the fact that they did not wish to return to their country.

133. Those were the reasons why the Yugoslav delegation would abstain from voting on the Polish draft resolution.

134. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the slight drafting amendment which had been suggested by the Mexican delegation, namely, the substitution of the word "ratification" for the word "adoption" in the last paragraph of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee.

135. In the absence of any objection, he would consider that amendment adopted.

*It was so decided.*

136. The PRESIDENT put the draft resolution of the Third Committee, as amended, to the vote.

*The resolution was adopted by 45 votes to 6, with 2 abstentions.*

### **Advisory social welfare services: report of the Third Committee (A/1068)**

137. Mr. VRBA (Czechoslovakia), Rapporteur of the Third Committee, presented the report of that Committee and the accompanying draft resolution (A/1068).

138. The Third Committee was submitting for the approval of the General Assembly a draft resolution which, first, authorized the Secretary-General to place the advisory social welfare services on a continuing basis; secondly, directed the Secretary-General to make appropriate technical provisions; and, thirdly, requested the Economic and Social Council to review the terms of General Assembly resolution 58 (I), which had originally authorized the establishment of advisory social welfare services on a year-to-year basis.

139. Mr. Vrba pointed out that the draft resolution had been recommended to the General Assembly by the unanimous vote of the fifty-two members of the Third Committee who had participated in the voting. He therefore hoped that the General Assembly would not find it difficult to approve the Committee's decision.

140. The PRESIDENT stated that if there were no objections, he would declare the draft resolution of the Third Committee adopted.

*The resolution was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

## **TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-FOURTH PLENARY MEETING**

*Held at Flushing Meadow, New York, on Thursday, 17 November 1949, at 3 p.m.*

*President: Gen. Carlos P. RÓMULO (Philippines).*

### **Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece: report of the First Committee (A/1062) and report of the Fifth Committee (A/1092)**

1. Mr. DE DIEGO (Panama), Rapporteur of the First Committee, presented the report of the Committee and the accompanying draft resolution (A/1062). He stated that, in accordance with the General Assembly's instructions, the First Committee devoted twenty-five meetings to the discussion of the agenda item concerning threats to

the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece.<sup>1</sup> The report recorded the Committee's discussion and decisions on that subject, omitting considerations or opinions expressed in the debate, which might detract from the desired objectivity.

2. The First Committee had decided to recommend to the General Assembly the two draft resolutions A and B which appeared at the end

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the fourth session of the General Assembly*, First Committee, 275th, 276th, 280th, 282nd to 284th, and 293rd to 311th meetings inclusive.