



## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Report of the International Labour Organisation (E/2240 (pages 53 to 57 and annex V, and pages 187 to 257), E/2286, E/2286/Add.1, E/L.419) ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	617
Allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights received under Council resolution 277 (X) (E/2154/Add.18, 20, 21, 30, 34, 39, 41, 43 and 48, E/2222, E/2271, E/L.393/Rev.1, E/L.420, E/L.422) ( <i>concluded</i> ) .....	617
Report of the International Labour Organisation (E/2240, E/L.419) ( <i>concluded</i> ) .....	620
Migration: Report of the International Labour Organisation (Council resolution 396 (XIII)) (E/2235, E/2235/Add.1, E/2240 (pages 126-127), E/L.424) .....	620

**President:** Mr. S. Amjad ALI (Pakistan).

**Present:** The representatives of the following countries:

Argentina, Belgium, Canada, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Observers from the following countries:

Chile, Turkey.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

**Report of the International Labour Organisation (E/2240 (pages 53 to 57 and annex V, and pages 187 to 257), E/2286, E/2286/Add.1, E/L.419) (*continued*)**

**Allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights received under Council resolution 277 (X) (E/2154/Add.18, 20, 21, 30, 34, 39, 41, 43 and 48, E/2222, E/2271, E/L.393/Rev.1, E/L.420, E/L.422) (*concluded*)**

[Agenda items 25 and 15]

GENERAL DEBATE (*concluded*)

1. Mr. CREPAULT (Canada) recalled that the Belgian and Swedish representatives had drawn the Council's attention (648th meeting) to the necessity of considering agenda item 15 as a procedural question

and setting aside any political consideration. That was what had led his delegation to submit jointly with the United States delegation a draft resolution (E/L.422), which related to allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights. The operative part of the draft resolution was so drafted that it had no political implications and merely dealt with procedural questions. He therefore hoped the draft resolution would be adopted.

2. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation had already supported the draft resolution submitted (631st meeting) by the Czechoslovak representative (E/L.393). He would therefore confine his comments to the draft resolution submitted by the Polish representative (E/L.420) and the joint draft resolution submitted by the Canadian and United States delegations (E/L.422).

3. Referring to the Polish draft resolution, he pointed out that the Council was required under the Charter to defend freedom of association. It appeared, however, that the Council was currently attempting to get rid of the question and refer directly to ILO any allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights addressed to it. That attitude must be opposed. Everyone knew that ILO was only too inclined to classify allegations without examining them. Moreover, the United Nations was the only tribunal competent to examine allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights in all countries, whether they were members of the United Nations or ILO or not. The United Nations must not renounce either its obligations under the Charter or its right to act as the champion of freedom of association throughout the world. That was why the Polish draft resolution asked that the Council should

decide to place on the agenda of each of its sessions all allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights addressed to it: his delegation hoped that the Council, desirous of fulfilling the obligations incumbent on it under the Charter, would adopt the Polish draft resolution (E/L.420).

4. For his part, he would vote for the Polish draft resolution.

5. On the other hand, his delegation could not accept the joint draft resolution submitted by Canada and the United States (E/L.422), which implicated the USSR Government. The USSR trade unions would not reply to the slanderous insinuations of the delegation of a country which applied the Taft-Hartley Act.

6. He would consequently vote against the joint draft resolution submitted by Canada and the United States.

7. Without adducing any proof, the United States representative had attempted to discredit the Soviet trade unions. It was necessary to explain clearly what trade unions represented in the USSR. The right to freedom of association was laid down in article 126 of the Soviet Constitution of 1936 which stated, *inter alia*: "In conformity with the interests of the working people and in order to develop the organizational initiative and political activity of the masses of the people, citizens of the USSR are guaranteed the right to unite in public organizations: trade unions, co-operative societies, youth organizations, cultural, technical and scientific societies ...". There was no similar provision in the Constitution of the United States of America, a country where, as stated by Mr. Philip Murray, President of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the semi-fascist reactionary Taft-Hartley Act regulated relations between management and labour.

8. The USSR trade unions recruited their members on a voluntary basis from tens of millions of workers. They were free trade unions, enjoying the most extensive rights, and they concluded collective agreements with the authorities on wages, working conditions and workers' security. According to article 24 (d) of the USSR Trade Union Charter adopted in 1949, the trade unions prepared and submitted for study by the Government drafts relating to labour legislation, wages, workers' security, social assistance, and the establishment of cultural and social services. In addition, the trade unions' social insurance fund was financed by the State. The trade unions administered social insurance funds, which were financed by the State and not by levies on wages. In 1951 those funds already amounted to more than 21 billion roubles. All those facts provided a formal refutation of the remarks of the United States representative, who had slanderously accused USSR trade unions without the least evidence.

9. The principle of socialist competition, which the United States representative had attacked, was a principle formulated by Lenin himself. It was as a result of the socialist competition of millions of Soviet workers and peasants that the USSR had become one of the most advanced and highly industrialized countries in the world. It was as a result of socialist competition that the USSR had been able to apply new techniques and to carry out major projects such as the construction of a canal connecting the basins of the Don and the Volga

in a year and a half. The whole population of the USSR was enthusiastically working to build socialism, because it knew that it was working for peace, while United States military forces were bombing the hydroelectric installations on the Yalu. By attempting to minimize that enthusiasm and by criticizing socialist competition in the Soviet Union, the United States representative had once more proved that he was unaware of the facts; he had struck a blow at the dignity of the Council's work by attempting to put forward a travesty of the true situation in the Soviet Union.

10. His delegation would vote against any proposal to refer communications regarding trade-union rights to the International Labour Organisation because the composition and political complexion of that organization could not ensure an impartial and objective examination of such communications.

11. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America), referring to the Polish draft resolution (E/L.420), said that there was no question of referring allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights to ILO as such. He reminded the USSR representative that the Fact-Finding Commission, composed of persons known for their objectivity, their liberal views and their competence in the matter of trade-union rights, had been set up jointly by the United Nations and ILO and was distinct from ILO.

12. So far as the trade-union situation in the USSR was concerned, he was surprised, in the light of the glowing accounts of the representative of the USSR of the position of trade unions in his country, that the USSR was not willing to have submitted to the Fact-Finding Commission documents which would confirm the USSR representative's statements. It would appear that the USSR was afraid of a careful and impartial analysis of the exercise of trade-union rights in the Soviet Union.

13. Mr. JENKS (International Labour Organisation) thanked the Council for the praise which had been bestowed on his organization. In previous years ILO had derived useful information from the discussions arising out of the examination of its report by the Council. The same would certainly be true at the current session also.

14. With regard to the allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights, he wished to make it clear that the allegations made against his organization at the 648th meeting were devoid of foundation and were in general based on a distortion of the facts. Thus an attempt had been made to attribute to ILO conclusions the text of which had been taken not from ILO documents, but from the complaint of a trade union itself or from the reply of the government accused. The International Labour Organisation had also been wrongly accused of not having protested against certain temporary measures; in fact ILO had asked that the legislation in question, although temporary, should be amended.

15. It was untrue to say that the ILO Fact-Finding Commission showed partiality in its examination of allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights, and studied them according to their origin and not according to their actual substance. It was also un-

true to say that ILO had opposed an international trade-union movement.

16. Those facts would permit the Council to assess the true value of the allegations made against ILO at the 648th meeting. Moreover, it appeared that the critics of ILO were completely unaware of the procedure scrupulously followed by the organization, which was to set aside all political considerations at the outset.

17. He wished to assure the representative of Sweden that ILO could amplify its report in future without detracting from the substance. That task would be made all the more easy as most of the basic documents to which the report related were already familiar to the Council. At the request of the representatives of Belgium, France and Mexico, the forthcoming report would also contain information on the ratifications of the conventions. The conventions already numbered 1,302, and during the previous twelve months a larger number of ratifications had been received than during any other similar period.

18. In regard to the question of priorities raised by the United States representative, he was not unaware of the fact that on that subject divergent views had been held by the Economic and Social Council on the one hand and the Governing Body of ILO on the other. The conclusions of the Co-ordination Committee would be duly submitted to the ILO Governing Body. In that connexion he pointed out that the Co-ordination Committee had itself encountered the difficulties foreseen by the ILO Governing Body and had preferred not to give any set order for the items on the list of priorities it had drawn up.

19. Lastly, he wished to take up the statement of one of the members of the Council that ILO had ceased to adhere to the principle of universality. The International Labour Organisation had never been and would never become an instrument of the policies of any one State or group of States. Universality was still its aim. As in the past, it still willingly accepted the co-operation of every Member State of the United Nations desiring to participate in the battle for human freedom and to take measures to ensure the liberty and well-being of its people through genuine international co-operation. It was in that spirit that ILO had approached and would continue to approach its task.

20. The PRESIDENT announced that the general discussion on allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights was closed.

21. He put the draft resolution submitted by the Polish delegation (E/L.420) to the vote.

*The draft resolution was rejected by 15 votes to 3.*

22. The PRESIDENT invited the members of the Council to take a decision on the draft resolution "concerning twenty-seven Spanish trade-unionists" submitted by the Czechoslovak delegation (E/L.393/Rev.1).

23. Mr. JOUBLANC-RIVAS (Mexico) said that his delegation never hesitated to associate itself with a humanitarian gesture, but in the case in question it was disturbed by the title of the Czechoslovak draft resolution, which raised debatable points of law. Moreover, as the Mexican delegation had maintained repeatedly,

relations with the existing Government in Spain were governed by the provisions of resolution 39 (I) adopted by the General Assembly in 1946, which in spirit forbade any United Nations organ, except the General Assembly, to address communications directly to it.

24. He wished to add that in his delegation's view the phrase "competent Spanish authorities" in the draft resolution could only be used to designate the Republican Government of Spain, with which Mexico still maintained diplomatic relations.

25. For all those reasons, the Mexican delegation would abstain from voting on the Czechoslovak draft resolution (E/L.393/Rev.1).

26. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the revised draft resolution submitted by Czechoslovakia (E/L.393/Rev.1).

*The draft resolution was rejected by 12 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.*

27. The PRESIDENT invited the members of the Council to discuss the draft resolution on allegations regarding infringement of trade-union rights submitted jointly by the delegations of Canada and of the United States of America (E/L.422).

28. Mr. JOUBLANC-RIVAS (Mexico) requested that the draft resolution be put to the vote paragraph by paragraph.

29. The Mexican delegation was not opposed to the Secretary-General approaching governments on purely administrative matters, but it feared that some of the steps envisaged might infringe the sovereignty of the States concerned, for the latter, by their very refusal to reply to the communication they had received, seemed already to have taken a position on the matter. The Mexican delegation would therefore abstain from voting on paragraphs 1 and 3.

30. Moreover, for the reasons it had already given in connexion with the Czechoslovak draft resolution (E/L.393/Rev.1) it did not think it advisable to ask the Secretary-General to enter into relations with the existing Spanish Government. It thought that was the responsibility of the Director-General of ILO. If the authors of the draft resolution would agree to amend paragraph 4 in that way, the Mexican delegation would vote in favour of it. Otherwise, it would be compelled to abstain.

31. The PRESIDENT said that no further amendments could be submitted and asked the Council to proceed immediately to the vote on the joint draft resolution submitted by Canada and the United States (E/L.422).

*Paragraph 1 was adopted by 11 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 2 was adopted by 13 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.*

*Paragraph 3 was adopted by 11 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 4 was adopted by 12 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 5 was adopted by 13 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.*

*Paragraph 6 was adopted by 13 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.*

*The joint draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 11 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.*

**Report of the International Labour Organisation (E/2240, E/L.419) (concluded)<sup>1</sup>**

[Agenda item 25]

32. The PRESIDENT called for a vote on the draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom (E/L.419) recommending that the Council should take note with appreciation of the report of the International Labour Organisation (E/2240).

33. Mr. REYES (Philippines) expressed his Government's gratitude to ILO for its excellent work and in particular for the valuable assistance it had given to the Philippines in its efforts to improve the living conditions of the workers.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 15 votes to 3.*

**Migration: Report of the International Labour Organisation (Council resolution 396 (XIII)) (E/2235, E/2235/Add.1, E/2240 (pages 126-127), E/L.424)**

[Agenda item 10]

34. Mr. DELHAYE (Belgium) expressed his satisfaction with the report of the International Labour Organisation on methods of international financing of European emigration (E/2235), which was a further proof of that organization's interest not only in workers in general, but in migrant workers in particular.

35. The International Labour Organisation had already showed its concern for migrant workers by preparing a remarkable draft convention which the Geneva Conference of Plenipotentiaries in July 1945 had used as a basis for an international convention on refugees. Guided by the same concern, ILO had convened a conference at Naples in October 1951 which had resulted in the establishment of a Consultative Council on European Migration.

36. Moreover, shortly thereafter the Belgian Government had taken the initiative of calling a new conference in Brussels in November 1951, which had been attended by representatives of twenty governments. Owing to the very constructive plans submitted by the United States of America, and with the agreement of the countries directly concerned, the Brussels Conference had resulted in the establishment of the Provisional Inter-Governmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe (PICMME), in which seventeen nations were participating and which was the first international organization to deal actively and practically with European emigration. In four months the Committee had arranged for the transport of 40,000 persons. The experiment might be considered conclusive and, in any case, it deserved to be followed up. Moreover, the usefulness of the programme had been recognized by the Council Co-ordination Committee, which had expressed the wish that close relations should be established be-

tween the United Nations and the migration committee. The Belgian delegation wished to associate itself whole-heartedly with that view.

37. The question was important as emigration from Europe would affect several millions of people in the coming years. The Governments which had set up the migration committee knew that transport was only one aspect of the very complicated problem raised by migratory movements. It was the most urgent one and therefore PICMME had given it priority. The action of the committee had shown that international solidarity was well able to meet certain urgent needs. It was none the less true that in a future perhaps not far off, the need for encouraging emigration would become more and more imperative and the transport of emigrants would then become a secondary international problem. It would therefore be as well to co-ordinate effectively the dissemination of all useful information on opportunities offered by immigration countries, professional training of candidates, the simplification of administrative formalities in connexion with the movement of people, transport properly so-called, the settlement of immigrants and their housing and employment in satisfactory conditions.

38. At the current time governments settled the different phases of immigration among themselves by agreements, which meant a dispersal of effort, difficulties and unnecessary expenditure. Co-ordination was essential there as elsewhere. It could be effected by an adaptable specialized technical organization co-operating closely with various financing and technical assistance bodies, which would in turn assist migratory movements by their work in emigration and immigration countries.

39. Mrs. PEYROLES (France) said that in view of the seriousness of the problem raised by over-population and its effect on the economic and social equilibrium of Europe, her country had always insisted that no effort should be spared in assisting and extending migratory movements from Europe. Such efforts concerned not only emigration and immigration countries, but also countries which, like France, were compelled to take account of the demographic pressure on their frontiers. The French Government wished above all to see effective and prompt action taken as soon as possible to bring into place all the means at the disposal of the community in order to encourage and assist migrants and to ensure their security and well-being.

40. That movement should not, however, compromise the economic recovery of Europe. It was for that reason that European organizations were interested in the question and were trying by inter-European consultations to offer workers who wished to find employment in Europe opportunities to settle there.

41. Encouragement to migrants should for the time being take the form of payment of travel and practical organization of transport. The migration committee, which had profited from the methods and experience of IRO, had proved that it was strong and efficient in that respect. The French Government had wished to prove its interest in it not only by contributing to its funds but also by sending leading experts to it.

42. The French Government was following with the greatest interest all international action, especially that

<sup>1</sup> See 646th and 647th meetings.

aimed at co-ordinating migratory movements with efforts to raise the standard of living of workers all over the world by systematic organization of the labour market, the progressive improvement of employment services and professional training in the immigration country. No organ was better qualified for that work than ILO, and that was why the French Government had advocated that the Consultative Council on European Migration, set up by the Naples Conference, should be convened in the near future. The Council's first task would be to organize information for migrants.

43. There were too many different publications, none of which was really complete or likely to supply information to migrants. The United Nations Department of Social Affairs should certainly be congratulated on its monthly bulletin on that subject and a tribute should also be paid to ILO, which had just published the review *Migration*. It would, however, be to a migrant's advantage if he could consult a brochure which would give him clear economic, legal, social and technical information. That gap should be filled before the ever-increasing number of technical publications made it impossible to fill it.

44. The French Government would follow with sustained interest the development of the migration problem and the efforts of international organizations, especially ILO, which had already done a great deal of work.

45. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) also recalled the extent of the work done by ILO. It not only co-ordinated the work of various United Nations bodies and the specialized agencies dealing with migration, but also took concrete action by ensuring that migrants were protected and by assisting governments to choose, train and place foreign workers settling in their countries.

46. The Provisional Inter-Governmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe, which had been working since the beginning of the year, could be proud of the results it had achieved in the transport of migrants in so short a time. Such a beginning was very encouraging.

47. As the ILO report had shown, migration was a long-term problem. The United States delegation hoped that the specialized agencies and the Council's commissions and committees would carry on their studies and efforts in that field unceasingly.

48. He would willingly support any draft resolution expressing the Council's satisfaction with the excellent ILO report.

49. Mr. MORALES (Argentina) said that Argentina had studied the ILO report with special interest because it owed a large part of its economic development to European immigrants. Argentina had felt so far that the most effective way to solve the problem of immigration was to conclude bilateral treaties, similar to that which it had concluded with Italy. It was ready, however, to consider any international collective action undertaken in that connexion.

50. He wished to draw the Council's attention to certain general aspects of the question. The most important was the link between migration and economic development. It was clear that in emigration as well as in im-

migration countries the extent of economic development greatly influenced the strength of migratory movements. Over-populated countries under strong demographic pressure would certainly be relieved if they expedited their own economic development.

51. A great deal of importance had always been attached, and rightly so, to the question of European emigration. The bulletin published by the Department of Social Affairs showed, however, that in other continents, especially Asia, serious problems were caused by displacement of peoples and demographic pressures. Such problems should also be carefully studied.

52. Argentina would greet with interest any international action to consider methods which guaranteed the well-being of the migrants and took account of the respective interests of the emigration and immigration countries.

53. Mr. SANTI (World Federation of Trade Unions) recalled that the Council had studied the migration problem at its thirteenth session, when it had examined the Secretary-General's report on methods of international financing of European emigration (E/2019).<sup>2</sup> The report, which had made several recommendations on measures to be taken by governments and international organizations, had not been warmly welcomed. The representatives of India, Pakistan and the Philippines had pointed out that it dealt only with the problem of European migration to Latin-American countries. Other representatives had said that the report had reached them too late and that their governments were therefore not in a position to express a definite opinion on it. At the end of the discussion on the Secretary-General's report the Council had rejected a joint draft resolution submitted by Chile, Mexico and Peru<sup>3</sup> suggesting that only one international organization should be asked to co-ordinate migration measures. The Council had, however, adopted a United Kingdom draft resolution<sup>4</sup> inviting ILO to report to the Council at its next session on measures it had envisaged or adopted in order to carry out the recommendations of the Naples Conference.

54. The foregoing brief history of the matter made the reasons for the failure of the Naples Conference more understandable. The conference had begun auspiciously with twenty-seven governments, nine inter-governmental organizations and thirty-three non-governmental organizations being represented but it had been torpedoed by the principal States, which had refused to support the programme submitted by the Director-General of ILO which had provided for the transfer of 1,700,000 Europeans to Latin-American countries, Canada and Australia over a five-year period. The principal States participating in the conference had declared that that was too ambitious a programme, the conference had not even examined in detail the various recommendations in the Secretary-General's report and nothing had come of it. The International Labour Organisation was an organization with certain experience and although as the WTFU had indicated in its intervention concerning ILO it had certain reservations to make with regard

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Thirteenth Session*, 513th, 515th and 520th meetings.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, *Annexes*, agenda item 35, document E/L.223.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, document E/L.224.



to its work. ILO had been charged with the protection of workers, including, naturally, migrant workers. The proposals made by ILO with respect to migration envisaged full collaboration with the United Nations, other specialized agencies, interested non-governmental organizations, and others.

55. The States which had caused the failure of the Naples Conference, had set up PICMME two months later and had granted it the resources which they had not been willing to use to implement the ILO programme. Their constituent resolution made no reference to ILO.

56. Workers were not represented on the Committee, which was a purely governmental organization, and the Asian and African countries had no chance of stating their views. But such a body ought to operate under United Nations control and all countries should be represented on it. The States which had set up the Committee were Members of the United Nations and ILO, and therefore should not forget the principles of the Declaration of Philadelphia relating to migration and migrant workers.

57. As a general conclusion with respect to migration, the WFTU held that it was unjust that human beings should be compelled to abandon their families and countries to seek means of livelihood in distant and unknown countries, often at the cost of many sacrifices and humiliations. Before resorting to emigration as a solution for the problem of excess labour, governments should therefore take all the measures necessary to safeguard the right to work for their nationals. Emigration, unemployment and poverty were closely related. Although such transitory causes as excessive demographic pressure or, as was currently the case, the war economy might contribute to unemployment, there was no doubt that its basic cause lay in bad social organization. Every government should therefore carry out the economic and social reforms which alone would make a solution of the problems of excess labour and emigration possible. To use emigration as a remedy for a country's economic difficulties was to attack the symptoms, not the sickness itself.

58. The migration problem would exist as long as certain forms of social organization remained. That being so, it was the duty of a trade-union organization to suggest all the essential measures for guaranteeing economic, social and trade-union rights to emigrants under the same conditions which prevailed for workers of the receiving country. That was why the WFTU had repeatedly stated that the emigrant should be able to obtain information on such matters as the living and working conditions, current social legislation and social insurance in the receiving countries. The placing of emigrants in jobs should be done through official services. Emigrants should enjoy economic and social rights, in particular the right to belong to a trade union and to receive the benefits of social insurance, public assistance, collective contracts and such measures. They must be assured that they would not be the object of any discrimination on grounds of nationality, race, religion or sex. The emigrant should have the right to transfer all or part of his savings to his family in his country of origin. Reimbursement of travelling expenses for himself and his family must be guaranteed,

and migrant workers must be assured of receiving the old age insurance benefits they had acquired by the time of their departure from the country of emigration or immigration. Lastly, trade-union organizations in the countries of emigration or immigration must participate in the preparation of any agreement relating to migration.

The WFTU had adopted its basic position on migration at its congress in Milan in 1949; it called attention also to the work of the conference of international non-governmental organizations interested in migration in which it had participated.

59. An information service would have saved large numbers of Italians who had gone to Argentina from bitter disillusionment. During the first nine months of 1951, 42,974 emigrants had entered Argentina, but the number repatriated in the same period had been 11,018. It was clear, therefore, that Argentina was not the earthly paradise described to Italian emigrants. In that connexion, the Italian Senator Carmagnola, one of the negotiators of the migration agreement between Argentina and Italy, had said that 80 per cent of the Italians who had emigrated to Argentina after the war that he had encountered there wished to return to Italy.

60. Similarly, Italian colonists engaged to work in Brazil had been abandoned in the interior of the country in the state of Goyaz and had suffered from famine. During the first nine months of 1951, 1,747 emigrants had arrived in Brazil but the number repatriated had been 1,657. The corresponding figures for the same period in Venezuela were 10,675 and 4,141, with a repatriation rate of 40 per cent.

61. It was essential that trade-union organizations should take part in the various stages of migratory movements and in the drafting of all bilateral agreements. Emigrants must not be used as strike-breakers, nor their arrival in the country of immigration be allowed further to aggravate the situation on the labour market. If the trade-union organizations of the countries concerned had taken part in drafting the agreements between the United Kingdom and Italian Governments, it would undoubtedly have been possible to avoid the deplorable Odyssey of the Italian miners in the United Kingdom. According to the *New York Times* of 18 May 1952, the British miner feared that the employment of foreign labour might cause over-production and unemployment.

62. If States Members of the United Nations accepted the fair humanitarian principles which he had set forth, there would no longer be any gaps in legislation on migration.

63. He wished also to draw the Council's attention to the McCarran Act in force in the United States of America. Considering the nature of that Act, it was difficult to see how the United States could justify its participation in the work of the Provisional Inter-Governmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe, without speaking of other international organizations that proclaimed the equality of all people without distinction as to race, nationality, religion, language, or sex. Indeed, the resolution setting up that Committee had stipulated that its members must have given evidence of their concern for the principle

of the freedom of movement for individuals. The McCarran Act was absolutely contrary to that principle and on 25 June 1952 President Truman had made a statement disapproving of it. Editorials in the *New York Times* had spoken of it as really monstrous and had said that it was based on racial conceptions.

64. Migratory movements which concerned millions of workers merited the vigilant attention of the Economic and Social Council. Many international institutions were concerned with them but, under Articles 1 and 62 of the Charter, the Council clearly had fundamental obligations in the matter. It should take all necessary measures to ensure that migration was effected with the participation of the most representative trade-union organizations, in order to safeguard the economic and social interests of emigrant workers. The suggestions submitted by the WFTU might constitute the main elements of an international charter on migration to be formally approved by the Council and which it would be the duty of Member States to respect.

65. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) stated that before taking note of the ILO reports (E/2235 and E/2235/Add.1) on the question of migration, his Government wished to reserve its position concerning the possible financial implications of the recommendations in the reports. The Egyptian Government was not directly concerned with the migration problem, but was always ready to co-operate with ILO in the matter.

66. Mr. SUMMERS (Canada) submitted a draft resolution (E/L.424).

67. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) said that the remarks of the representative of the WFTU were irresponsible. As Mr. Santi was probably quite aware, trade unions in the United Kingdom had been consulted and were consulted in connexion with wages and terms and conditions of employment relating to foreign workers.

68. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) also declared the WFTU representative's statements groundless. Argentina had always given a very good reception to immi-

grants and placed them on an equal footing with its own nationals by providing them with satisfactory living conditions.

69. Mr. BUSTAMANTE (Uruguay) recalled from personal experience that in some countries, particularly the Soviet Union, the reception conditions were very different from those offered by the Latin-American countries. In the latter, immigrants lived a normal life and enjoyed human rights and fundamental freedoms.

70. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that he would like to give his delegation's views on migration at the next meeting.

71. The PRESIDENT asked the Pakistani representative to give his views when the Council took up the report of the Social Commission, which contained a chapter on migration.

72. He invited the members of the Council to vote on the Canadian draft resolution (E/L.424).

73. Mr. CHA (China) pointed out that the Canadian draft resolution mentioned the ILO report on migration. The International Labour Organisation had presented two reports. He therefore proposed that the symbols of the two documents (E/2235 and E/2235/Add.1) should be added in brackets at the end of paragraph 1.

*It was so agreed.*

74. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) asked that the draft resolution be put to the vote in parts.

75. The PRESIDENT put to the vote, by parts, the draft resolution submitted by Canada (E/L.424).

*Paragraph 1 was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 2 was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

*The draft resolution, as a whole, was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.