

64. He did not think that the abuse poured by the United Kingdom representative on the USSR deserved any reply. Being unable to deny any of the facts quoted during the discussion, the United Kingdom representative had resorted to the unworthy tactics of heaping lies and slander on her opponents.

65. Mr. KATZNELSON (Israel) moved the adjournment of the meeting.

The motion was adopted by 33 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 2.10 p.m.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Monday, 17 October 1949, at 11 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Carlos E. STOLK (Venezuela).

Discriminations practised by certain States against immigrating labour and, in particular, against labour recruited from the ranks of refugees (A/888 and A/C.3/524) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the general debate was closed, but that, in accordance with rule 104 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the representatives of the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and France would be accorded the right to speak.
2. Mr. ALEXIS (Haiti), speaking on a point of order, explained that owing to a misunderstanding, he had not realized that the Committee would meet on Saturday, 15 October; he had thought that the general debate would be continued at the current meeting and that he would be the first speaker.
3. The Haitian delegation wished to submit an amendment to the United Kingdom draft resolution, and was particularly anxious to state its views on the general question of discriminations practised by certain States against immigrating labour. He would refrain from submitting his amendment if to do so would be contrary to the rules of procedure, but he hoped that he would be permitted to state his views.
4. The CHAIRMAN regretted that there had been a misunderstanding. If there was no objection, he would allow the representative of Haiti to speak, on the clear understanding that he was doing so as an exception, out of courtesy to the Haitian delegation, and that the general debate was not to be reopened.
5. Mr. ALEXIS (Haiti) recalled that, at the end of the 249th meeting, he had protested against the motion for closure of the debate. The question of discriminations practised by certain States against immigrating labour was of the utmost gravity; it affected millions of human beings. The Third Committee should give it the most serious consideration; it could not shirk its responsibilities and follow the line of least resistance by referring the matter to the International Labour Organisation.
6. The delegation of Haiti did not believe that resolutions and pious hopes would suffice to solve the problems of social and international peace which confronted the United Nations. International order and world peace could best be achieved by the establishment of universal justice, which would allow humanity to develop and would bring concord between workers and employers.
7. At the 249th meeting, the Mexican representative had emphasized the need for improving the living conditions of immigrant workers and of the working classes generally, and had added that that would be a long process, the results of which would not be felt until thirty, forty or fifty years had passed, by which time employers would have acquired some social education and conscience. Mr. Alexis wondered whether the millions of workers who were suffering daily and waiting for the recognition of their sacred rights would have to wait for their employers' wisdom to ripen.
8. More than fifty years ago Pope Leo XIII, foreseeing the catastrophes which the exploitation of man by man would bring upon the world, had given a solemn warning in his encyclical *Rerum novarum*. He had said, in effect, that the workers should have a fair share of the products they created by their sweat and blood.
9. In some parts of the world the sufferings of the workers, both immigrant and indigenous, were tragic; he referred to certain Trust Territories and certain colonies. The exploitation of the workers there was appalling, as was proved by incontestable facts and figures. Despite the conspiracy of silence which existed on the subject, all representatives were aware of the true state of affairs in those Territories.
10. He quoted a statement by a great European, Werner Sombart, that the countries of the West had become rich and powerful by ravaging and depopulating whole continents. The peoples of the West had indeed shown ferocious egoism and realism in their treatment of the Africans and Asians, regarding them as ignorant savages belonging to inferior races. In so doing they had forgotten all that modern civilization owed to Egypt, India and Chaldea, to take only a few examples.
11. They had forgotten also that the wheel of history turned and that everything evolved and changed in the course of time. The East was changing from lethargy to fever, Africa was awakening and becoming conscious of its strength. It had become impossible to say where the brain and the heart of the world were to be found.
12. The words "West" and "East" had no longer the meaning they used to have; the word "race", which had been used as a pretext for arrogating certain privileges, had become meaningless. Today there was only Man, unique in his various aspects. A new order was coming into being;

it would be the joint work of a world *élite* gathered together in the United Nations, in which humanity placed its dearest hopes.

13. The solution of the social problem, on which world peace finally rested, was of a moral rather than an economic nature. An ideology could be overcome only by another, better and more humane ideology. What was the ideology of the Western democracies? Was it the domination of the strong over the weak?

14. Peace and happiness could be assured only through justice, love of others and respect for the right of all to life and self-respect. The toiling masses of the world were waiting for justice; to disillusion them would be to place civilization in danger. It could be saved only by granting the workers of the world their fundamental rights.

15. He had intended to submit an amendment to the United Kingdom draft resolution. As he was unable to do so, for procedural reasons, he reserved the right to reopen the whole question at a plenary meeting and to make proposals which he considered to be in the interests of justice. He reserved his position with regard to any decisions which the Third Committee might take on the question under discussion.

16. Mr. PANYUSHKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he did not intend to give a detailed reply to the slanders against the Government and people of the USSR uttered by the United Kingdom representative during the general debate on the question of discriminations practised by certain States against immigrating labour. He would nevertheless observe that when the United Kingdom delegation was not in a position to advance concrete arguments based on facts in reply to representatives who did not depict the "British paradise" in the most favourable light, it resorted to lies and slander concerning countries whose representatives endeavoured to speak impartially.

17. The representatives of the USSR and of a few other delegations had cited facts, based on official documents, statements made in the House of Commons and extracts from the British Press, all showing that the United Kingdom did take measures of discrimination against immigrant labour. Being unable to refute the accusations, the United Kingdom delegation had had recourse to a favourite Nazi propaganda method, used more particularly, though without success, by Goebbels, namely, the propagation of lies and slander.

18. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) was of the view that the slander hurled by the United Kingdom representative in every way resembled that of Nazi propaganda. If the United Kingdom delegation wished to follow in Goebbels' footsteps, it should remember his shameful end. That was the only possible reply to the slander uttered against the USSR.

19. Mr. KAYSER (France) regretted that the general discussion, which should have been concerned with the broad humane principles at the basis of the matter under discussion, should have been obstructed by a succession of controversial statements.

20. During the 249th meeting, Mr. Leon Jouhaux, who had some claim to speak on behalf of France and the French workers, had refuted the

sweeping allegations made by the representative of Poland. It might have been thought that his statement revealing the democratic and non-discriminatory character of French policy towards foreign workers, would have put an end to the controversial discussion. That had not been the case, however, and, during the 250th meeting, the representative of Poland had retorted by citing further individual cases.

21. He had no intention of replying point by point to the Polish delegation, as he had no files on individual cases with him; moreover, as Mr. Jouhaux had said, it was wrong to draw general conclusions from a few individual cases.

22. None of the cases cited by the representative of Poland dated from 1949; they all went back to a period extending from mid-October of 1948 to early November of the same year. All the members of the Committee would remember what had occurred at that time. The third session of the General Assembly was then being held in Paris. A certain trade union had decided to give to a miners' strike a political and insurrectional character. By a decision which had been strongly condemned by the other trade unions, and for the first time in trade union history, instructions had been given to the miners that they were no longer to carry out safety precautions in the mines. Devastating destruction might have resulted. That attitude was all the more incomprehensible because the sabotage so directed would affect the property of the nation itself and no longer the property of capitalists, in view of the law nationalizing the mines. Even during the Nazi occupation, when the mines had not yet belonged to the nation but were still owned by private interests, such sabotage had never been contemplated.

23. The law nationalizing the mines provided for penalties against persons carrying out sabotage; the saboteurs had, therefore, violated that law—a law which all the trade unions had vehemently demanded and for which they had fought so long.

24. The French Government had decided that it would itself ensure that safety precautions were carried out in the mines. The forces of law and order had been attacked, there had been outrages and sabotage. The Government had then announced, through the intermediary of the prefects and over the radio, that foreigners taking part in such attacks would be expelled from the country; the Minister of the Interior had stated that when the person expelled had a family, he would be willing to arrange for his wife and children to be taken to the frontier with him.

25. Where Polish miners had been arrested, as had been French miners, it had been for committing sabotage during a political strike. The French authorities had observed the principle of non-discrimination, since the foreign saboteurs could not have been permitted to enjoy immunity from the law. The Poles who had been deported had been so treated because they had offended against a wholly legitimate governmental regulation, which had previously been brought to their notice.

26. When the debate on those problems had come before the National Assembly, the Minister of the Interior had stated that France welcomed, and would continue to welcome, foreigners who came to work, on the clear understanding that

they were not to interfere in the domestic life of the country or take part in political agitation. Mr. Kayser thought that no other attitude could be upheld; he would be surprised if the Polish representative, for example, were to speak of freedom for foreigners, to say nothing of nationals, in Poland to carry out demonstrations, strikes and insurrections.

27. The French delegation did not regret the debate which was taking place and was even grateful to the Polish representative for having started it. The discussion had, in fact, proved that France was a country of free democracy, whose institutions allowed the Polish Government to obtain all the information it required concerning its own nationals in France. Such information was obtained from the Press, which was completely free; from the verbatim reports of the free parliamentary debates in an Assembly where members of the opposition had precisely the same rights as members of the majority; from Polish correspondents who were free to report as they wished from France to Poland; and from investigators who could move freely throughout France and freely make contact with each of the Poles living there. The Polish Government also obtained information from those Poles who agreed to return to Poland and who could be traced while they were in France, and during the return journey, but were often untraceable once they had crossed their country's frontier.

28. Mr. Kayser concluded that none of the allegations made during the debate could be used to refute the fact that the French Government was applying with scrupulous honesty the mandate it had received in November 1948, from the majority in the National Assembly during a political strike of an insurrectional nature. That mandate had been that it should ensure, through respect for the law and its application, the protection of the national heritage and of republican order.

29. Mr. DE ALBA (Mexico) was most gratified with the discussion that had just taken place. Far from having wasted its time, the Committee had reached constructive and generous conclusions regarding a problem the moral implication of which was obvious; it had unanimously affirmed its conviction that all discriminatory treatment in the employment of immigrant labour should be abolished, in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

30. The disagreement in the Committee related only to a matter of procedure and was therefore of only secondary importance. His delegation's support of the United Kingdom draft resolution (A/C.3/L.19) did not mean that it favoured a simple postponement of the problem. In its view, the problem should be resolved without delay; it could not be shirked when what was at stake was the redress of an injustice.

31. Reference to the International Labour Organisation would seem to be the logical procedure in the circumstances, as that organization had already considered the problem and reached a solution generally accepted as satisfactory. However, since the United Nations had been seized directly with the question, it must not expose itself to the suspicion that it was shirking its responsibilities; it was in duty bound to support with the full weight of its prestige a principle dear to all its Members.

32. Consequently, the Mexican delegation proposed to add to the United Kingdom draft resolution a few simple sentences (A/C.3/L.20) the meaning of which would be clear to all the workers of the world and which would indicate the social and moral importance that the United Nations attached to the question, and the spirit in which it would like to see it solved.

33. Mr. LÓPEZ (Cuba) stated that in view of the course taken by the debate, his delegation had decided to withdraw its amendment (A/C.3/L.18) to the Polish resolution.

34. Mr. DEDIJER (Yugoslavia) considered that the Third Committee was the competent organ to consider the discriminatory treatment to which migrant labour was unfortunately subjected in many parts of the world and that it was undoubtedly its duty to try to remedy that situation.

35. Nevertheless, his delegation could not support the Polish draft resolution although he was in accord with its spirit. The resolution did not draw any distinction between regular migrant labour on the one hand, and refugees and displaced persons on the other. His delegation was aware of the often pitiful lot of the refugees, many of them Yugoslavs, who were lured to certain countries by false promises. On the other hand, his delegation also knew that the ranks of refugees and displaced persons were filled with political criminals who, in the country where they sought refuge, formed the vanguard of strike-breakers and were at the service of anti-democratic forces. Consequently, his delegation could not agree that the United Nations should lend the weight of its moral authority to measures which would result in extending full social, economic and trade union protection to such traitors and quislings.

36. For those reasons, the delegation of Yugoslavia would abstain from voting on the Polish resolution. It would also vote against the draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom.

37. Mr. JOCKEL (Australia) said that it was not without hesitation that his delegation would vote against the Mexican amendment. At the International Labour Conference, Australia had voted for the adoption of the Convention concerning Migration for Employment. It had signed agreements with the International Refugee Organization concerning displaced persons and it was admitting representatives of the IRO in Australia to supervise the application of those agreements. Hence it was wholly in sympathy with the Mexican amendment. His delegation had, however, come to the conclusion that, in its new form, the United Kingdom draft resolution fully met the desire of the Committee which was to hasten the ratification of the Convention concerning Migration for Employment.

38. The Mexican amendment introduced no new factor, yet its wording was far from clear, at least in the English version. The expression "social relations", in particular, had no very clearly defined administrative or legal meaning; furthermore, Governments would find difficulty in accepting the obligations embodied in the Mexican amendment when they concerned questions falling within the competence of private organizations.

39. Mr. MENESES PALLARES (Ecuador) emphasized the fact that the Constitution of Ecuador gave complete equality of rights to foreign immigrants who, in their work, enjoyed not only con-

stitutional guarantees, but those embodied in the labour laws.

40. Immigrant manpower thus raised no problem of discrimination where Ecuador was concerned. The delegation of Ecuador was nevertheless deeply interested in the matter, which it hoped to see satisfactorily solved.

41. The Polish draft resolution was unquestionably inspired by lofty thought and had many points of value. It seemed, however, that if immigrant man-power were to be effectively protected, a binding international convention would be desirable. The provisions of a resolution might not be so binding, and might be disregarded.

42. The Mexican amendment had the advantage of drawing attention to one of the most serious forms of discrimination against immigrant labour, namely, that which the individual encountered in his social life, which prevented him from adapting himself to his environment and which was detrimental to his dignity.

43. The delegation of Ecuador would therefore vote for the United Kingdom draft resolution, as amended by the Mexican delegation.

44. Mr. CONTOUMAS (Greece) thought that the Mexican amendment added nothing to the United Kingdom text. It might even result in limiting the interpretation of the purposes of the convention drawn up by the International Labour Conference, owing to the presence of the word "offensive" which would imply that only discrimination of that kind was condemned.

45. He was sure that migrant workers throughout the world knew of the existence of the convention adopted at Geneva; if they did not, the Press would certainly give them that information simultaneously with its account of the adoption of the United Kingdom draft resolution by the Third Committee, which clearly showed the interest taken in the question by the United Nations.

46. He appealed to the Mexican representative not to insist upon his amendment. Otherwise, Mr. Contoumas would be obliged to vote against that amendment to avoid overloading the very explicit United Kingdom text.

47. Mr. KAYSER (France) expressed the embarrassment of his delegation in having to choose between the United Kingdom text, which was perfectly satisfactory from the logical point of view, and the Mexican amendment, which had its attractions from the humanitarian viewpoint.

48. He wished to reconcile those two aspects, and wondered if the Mexican delegation might still agree to accept, in place of its amendment, a modification of the last part of paragraph 2 of the United Kingdom draft resolution, to read as follows:

"... adopted a convention and a recommendation, founded upon the principle of non-discrimination, which should ensure such non-discrimination in practice."

49. Mr. Kayser said he would formulate that suggestion only if the Mexican and United Kingdom representatives agreed to accept it.

50. The CHAIRMAN ruled that no further amendments could be submitted, since the Committee had reached the voting stage.

51. Mr. FREYRE (Brazil) considered that the Polish draft resolution contained certain excellent

provisions, such as those laid down in sub-paragraph (a) of the recommendations. He recalled in that connexion that the principle of non-discrimination with regard to immigrant labour was recognized by the Brazilian Constitution.

52. On the other hand, certain other provisions of the Polish draft resolution were unacceptable, in particular the provision that the country of immigration should assume the expense of repatriating immigrant labour (sub-paragraph (c)). That particular question should rather be the subject of bilateral negotiations between the countries concerned.

53. He was consequently unable to vote in favour of the Polish draft resolution. On the other hand, he would vote for the draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom delegation since, in his opinion, that text offered the best and most intelligent solution for the current difficulties.

54. Mrs. CASTLE (United Kingdom) was unable to accept the amendment submitted by the Mexican delegation since it emphasized certain special points which might as a result be taken into consideration in preference to other equally important aspects of the question, whereas, under the United Kingdom draft resolution, all the relevant problems would receive the attention they deserved.

55. She recalled that, as could be seen from the draft resolution submitted by her delegation, the Committee could and should formulate an opinion regarding the importance it attributed to the principles involved; it would then be the duty of the International Labour Organisation to supervise the application of those principles, through the convention it had adopted, taking into account the opinion expressed by the Third Committee.

56. She did not think that the change suggested by the French representative added anything, from the humanitarian point of view, to the text of the United Kingdom draft resolution, since the latter already clearly enunciated the principle of non-discrimination.

57. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said that her delegation was in favour of the United Kingdom draft resolution and the Mexican amendment thereto.

58. In the case of the Polish draft resolution, on the other hand, certain allegations, and even serious accusations, had been made on both sides. Certain of the facts mentioned remained unproved and certain arguments unanswered. In the opinion of the Iraqi delegation, the situation was really too serious for the Third Committee to dismiss it.

59. If the United Kingdom resolution were adopted, the International Labour Organisation would be seized of the question of discrimination and would have every opportunity of finding a solution, as was highly desirable.

60. Mrs. WILSON (Canada) approved the intention behind the Mexican delegation's amendment and its general content, but she was unable to vote for that text for the same reasons as those put forward by the Australian representatives. The Canadian delegation would therefore abstain from voting on the Mexican amendment.

61. Mr. STEPANENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) noted that the majority of the Committee had recognized that discrimination against immigrant labour was an attack on the dignity of the human person, and the Committee

as a whole seemed to have condemned such practices, while making it clear that the application of the principle of non-discrimination should be the basis of any solution of the problem. The draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom delegation, however, limited itself, *inter alia*, to mentioning item 30 of the agenda of the General Assembly regarding discriminations practised by certain States against immigrating labour without expressly condemning such discrimination, an omission which might almost imply that the practice had not in fact been verified. The Byelorussian delegation could not agree to so serious and consequently so important a matter being thus lightly treated. He would, therefore, vote against the United Kingdom draft resolution.

62. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) wholly approved the comments of the representative of Iraq. However, he dwelt particularly on the fact that certain parties had brought charges of genocide and that those who were the subject of those accusations had not been in a position to refute them. That state of affairs was disquieting—the alleged victimization of Moslem population would be a matter of great concern to his people and his Government—and he hoped that the parties concerned would soon seize an opportunity of explaining or refuting the arguments put forward during that weighty discussion, so that the important matter thus raised could be elucidated.

63. Mr. ORTIZ MANCÍA (El Salvador) was glad that the Committee had broached the question of discrimination against migrant workers, since such practices were a disgrace to the whole world. The delegation of El Salvador had of course been unable to remain indifferent in the face of such a serious problem and it had resolutely taken part in the struggle.

64. He was happy to note that all the representatives were agreed in condemning the practices in question, thus establishing the universality of the principle of non-discrimination with regard to migrant workers. The differences of opinion which had emerged during the discussion really concerned only the procedure to be adopted, certain parties being of the opinion that the General Assembly itself should intervene directly and positively, whereas others considered that the International Labour Organisation was the appropriate agency to deal with that type of question.

65. The delegation of El Salvador would vote for the United Kingdom draft resolution and the Mexican amendment thereto.

66. Mr. OTAÑO VILANOVA (Argentina) agreed that discrimination against immigrant labour constituted a flagrant violation of fundamental human rights. He explained that the development of Argentina had, to a large extent, been due to immigration and that, under the country's constitution, immigrants automatically acquired citizenship after a few years of residence and had the same advantages under national law as the native inhabitants.

67. Mr. Otaño Vilanova approved the principles expressed in the Polish draft resolution but was unable to accept sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) of the operative part. For that reason, he would be unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution; he would, however, vote in favour of the United Kingdom draft resolution and of the Mexican amendment.

68. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) recalled that accusations had been made both by the United Kingdom and by the Ukrainian SSR in connexion with the cruel treatment allegedly meted out to Moslems in various parts of the world. It was not easy for small countries to know exactly where the truth lay or to ascertain the facts, but the Committee itself could not remain in doubt when it was a question of alleged violations of fundamental human rights. Could it be tolerated for the United Nations to make a distinction between one human group and another when the issue was the recognition of human rights? In the circumstances, Mr. Baroody would abstain from voting on all the draft resolutions under consideration; he also wished to know whether it would not be possible for the Chairman to find means of verifying the accuracy of the allegations made in the course of the discussion.

69. Mr. MORGAN (Guatemala) would vote against the Polish draft resolution, but he would vote in favour of the United Kingdom draft resolution, if the Mexican amendment were adopted.

70. Mr. KATZNELSON (Israel) stated that he would abstain from voting on the Polish draft resolution, since the question it raised was far from clear and in view of the fact that contradictory allegations had been brought forward. He approved the Mexican amendment, but suggested a slight modification which would make the wording clearer. He would, however, accept the Mexican amendment even if the modification he had suggested were not adopted.

71. The CHAIRMAN pointed out to the Israeli representative that it was too late to submit amendments to the texts under discussion.

72. Mr. PITTALUGA (Uruguay) stated that he would vote in favour of the United Kingdom draft resolution and of the Mexican amendment, for the same reasons as the representative of Ecuador.

73. Mr. ALTMAN (Poland) asked that each section of the operative part of his draft resolution should be put to the vote separately.

74. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Cuban delegation had withdrawn its amendment and that a vote should consequently be taken first of all on the Polish draft resolution, which would be put to the vote by parts as the Polish representative had requested.

75. He put the Polish draft resolution (A/C.3/524) to the vote.

The two paragraphs of the preamble were rejected by 18 votes to 8, with 21 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (a) of the operative part was rejected by 18 votes to 8, with 21 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (b) was rejected by 22 votes to 6, with 18 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (c) was rejected by 25 votes to 6, with 15 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (d) was rejected by 22 votes to 7, with 19 abstentions.

The final paragraph of the draft resolution was rejected by 22 votes to 7, with 18 abstentions.

76. The CHAIRMAN stated that it would be unnecessary to take a vote on the Polish resolution as a whole, since each part of it had been rejected.

It was so decided.

77. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote upon the amendment submitted by the Mexican delegation (A/C.3/L.20) to the United Kingdom draft resolution and subsequently upon the draft resolution itself (A/C.3/L.19).

The amendment was adopted by 23 votes to 9, with 15 abstentions.

The draft resolution, thus amended, was adopted by 37 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.

78. The CHAIRMAN, replying to the request made by the representative of Saudi Arabia, stated that, under the rules of procedure, he himself was not able to take a decision or to make a recommendation. It was for the delegations to make

proposals with regard to the procedure to be followed and to raise the question in the General Assembly.

79. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) wished to make it clear that he had not meant to ask the Chairman himself to find a solution and to put it into effect, but that he had merely invited him to study possible means of verifying the accuracy of certain allegations, particularly those which raised the question of violations of human rights.

80. The CHAIRMAN replied that, in any case, it was for the General Assembly to decide whether it wished to include the question in its agenda or not.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Tuesday, 18 October 1949, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Carlos E. STOLK (Venezuela).

Advisory social welfare services (A/975 and A/C.3/521)

1. The CHAIRMAN opened discussion on the question of advisory social welfare services and drew attention to the resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council (A/975).

2. Mrs. MYRDAL (Secretariat) said that the advisory social welfare services had been instituted in 1946 as a result of General Assembly resolution 58 (I) and had been continued subsequently on a year-to-year basis. An ever increasing number of Governments had participated in the programme and it had been possible to extend the services rendered without additional expenditure on the part of the United Nations, thanks to the increased financial participation of the recipient countries. At its ninth session, the Economic and Social Council had decided by its resolution 243 (IX) E, that the services should be placed on a continuing basis. It was not for the Secretariat to pass judgment on the value of the services; she wished, however, to point out that the existing year-to-year basis did involve certain practical difficulties in administration, in that all activities had to be both planned and concluded within a single budgetary year. In conclusion, she stated that all the relevant information would be found in the Secretary-General's note on the subject (A/C.3/521).

3. Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand), speaking on behalf of Mr. Thorn, the President of the Economic and Social Council, who was unfortunately unable to be present, warmly advocated the adoption of the resolution recommended by the Council. After referring briefly to the origin of the advisory social welfare services, he said that the programme had been extremely popular among the recipient countries and had also been heartily endorsed by the countries providing facilities. The programme was, indeed, one of the activities of the United Nations which fulfilled the ideal of co-operative assistance in the solution of problems facing any Member. The information given in the note by the Secretary-General was an overwhelming proof of the need for the services. The annex to the

Report by the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolution 58 (I) of the General Assembly¹ contained expressions of appreciation from many recipient countries. Both in the Social Commission and in the Economic and Social Council, his delegation had supported the recommendation that the services should be placed on a continuing basis and it would continue to do so in the General Assembly.

4. Sixty-one countries had participated in the programme during the three years of its existence. Some, among them Australia and Belgium, had both provided and received assistance. The scope of the programme had also widened considerably for the items it covered had increased from eighteen in 1947 to forty in the year 1948-49.

5. During the discussions in the Economic and Social Council, some representatives had expressed the opinion that the recipient countries rather than the United Nations should meet the cost of the services. He agreed that the recipient countries should bear at least a part of the cost, for they would themselves be more actively concerned in the success of the programme and the funds allocated by the United Nations would go further. On the other hand, it would be a mistake to insist that all the services should be paid for by the recipient countries, because those most in need of the services might then be eliminated. That was why the Economic and Social Council had simply requested the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to bring about increased financial participation on the part of recipient Governments. The results had been very successful, and had enabled the programme to be extended considerably without any additional expenditure on the part of the United Nations. Indeed, because of that increased participation, the average cost of a fellowship to the United Nations had decreased from \$3,000 in 1947 to approximately \$2,000 in 1949. He was confident that the recipient Governments would continue to increase their financial participation and he therefore hoped that there would no longer be any opposition to the scheme on that score.

¹ Document E/828.