

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Saturday, 15 October 1949, at 10.45 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. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) said that she would support the United Kingdom draft resolution (A/C.3/L.19) for the same reasons as those which that delegation had advanced in its favour at the previous meeting. The Cuban amendment (A/C.3/L.18) to the Polish draft resolution (A/C.3/524), while not objectionable in itself, merely emphasized the fact that, however much the Polish draft resolution might be amended, it would never become so comprehensive as the Convention concerning Migration for Employment adopted by the International Labour Organisation.
2. The Polish representative's argument that many countries might fail to sign and ratify that convention was not valid, because the ILO recommendation accompanying that convention was itself more comprehensive than the Polish draft resolution. The Economic and Social Council, moreover, had adopted resolutions on that subject even before ILO had drafted its convention.
3. With regard to the accusations brought against the United States Government concerning its treatment of immigrants and migrant labour, particularly in connexion with displaced persons, the public record showed that such persons were regarded as eligible for citizenship, enjoyed freedom of movement, free choice of profession and the benefits of social security and had received considerable help in adjusting themselves to their new surroundings. Admittedly, there had been failures; but such failures could be brought to the notice of the authorities through the medium of free expression, and thus remedied.
4. She welcomed the Polish representative's assurances that the previous causes of emigration from his country had been removed as a result of the recent activities of the Polish Government, because in the past Polish immigrants had done a great deal to build up the United States of America. At the same time, the Polish representative should not underrate the part played by the war and by decisions taken as a result of that war in checking further emigration.
5. With regard to allegations about the ill-treatment of migrant Mexican workers in the United States, the Mexican representative had stated that his Government found the results of the bilateral agreements with the United States Government wholly satisfactory. The United States also found them wholly satisfactory. If any dissatisfaction arose on either side in the future, it could be discussed and remedied.
6. Allegations regarding the ill-treatment of immigrants in Louisiana had been investigated by responsible agencies, which had found that immigrants had been recruited on the same terms as local workers; the accusation was therefore invalid. Only one sugar plantation had been found on which conditions were unsatisfactory. The reason for such accusations had undoubtedly been that certain immigrants had falsely stated that they had the appropriate agricultural qualifications and had therefore been unable to adjust themselves to local conditions. They had, however, been free to seek more suitable employment.
7. The Polish representative's complaint that many United States shipping firms used ships sailing under other flags in which living and working conditions were lower than required in the American Merchant Marine was not relevant to the question of immigrating labour but merely showed that labour standards in other merchant marines were lower than those prevailing in the United States. If the standards of other countries were raised, the inducement for American companies to charter vessels under other flags would disappear.
8. The Committee appeared to agree that the General Assembly should not abandon and was not abandoning its right to examine the work of the specialized agencies. The examination must, however, be serious and comprehensive; the Polish delegation, on the other hand, appeared to wish the substitution of a series of generalities for the technical methods of the ILO.
9. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) regretted the attempts made to stifle the discussion of a matter which was of extreme importance to millions of human beings, and which therefore deserved to be most thoroughly examined by the General Assembly.
10. The approaching economic crisis in the capitalist countries and the reduction in the volume of international trade had led to a sharp increase in unemployment and to a general lowering of the living standards of the working masses. The lot of workers was especially hard in the countries of the Marshall Plan which, instead of promoting productivity, was achieving exactly the opposite result. That could clearly be seen from the United Nations *Monthly Bulletin of Statistics*, which showed that between April 1948 and March 1949 unemployment had increased by 187 per cent in Austria, 149 per cent in Belgium, 90 per cent in Denmark, and so on.
11. The economic position of the Latin-American countries was also extremely difficult because of competition from the United States, which was selling manufactured goods at inflated prices while keeping the price of raw materials at a very low level. As a result, those countries were in the throes of inflation; for example, during the year 1948, the cost of living had risen by 360 per cent in Brazil, 292 per cent in Colombia and 280 per cent in Cuba.
12. It was clear, therefore, that the emigration of workers to foreign countries was not due to demographic or biological trends, as had been alleged, but exclusively to economic and social conditions which forced them to seek employment and minimum living standards outside their own countries.
13. That problem did not directly affect the socialist States which had adopted a system of

planned economy; indeed, instead of suffering from unemployment they were rather experiencing a shortage of man-power. They were, however, concerned with the treatment meted out to hundreds of thousands of Soviet citizens, including nearly 100,000 Ukrainians, still detained in displaced persons camps in the Western zones of Germany in violation of international agreements and General Assembly decisions which laid down that they should be repatriated to their homelands as soon as possible.

14. The British, United States and French occupation authorities in Germany were doing their utmost to force those people to emigrate abroad. They were kept in camps under the supervision of former war criminals, and were subjected to all kinds of pressure and even oppression whenever they showed any desire to be repatriated. They were used as a source of cheap labour and as a means of pressure against the workers in the United Kingdom, the United States and France.

15. The International Refugee Organization was merely a cover for those activities. It was futile to allege that the IRO was anything but an Anglo-American organization doing the bidding of its masters. Many examples could be cited to show that IRO officials were simply agents of the United Kingdom and the United States, who used all possible means of intimidation to prevent displaced persons from returning home and to force them to emigrate.

16. In reply to the CHAIRMAN, who had pointed out that the question under discussion did not include the activities of the IRO, Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) remarked that he had referred to that aspect of the problem in order to illustrate why and how displaced persons and refugees became immigrant workers.

17. In addition to acquiring cheap labour, various countries, such as the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and even some Latin-American States, were also using immigrant workers to bring greater pressure to bear on their own working classes. In many countries there was no legislation to protect such immigrant workers and they were often subjected to the most shameful kinds of discrimination. They enjoyed no social, political or administrative rights and even their so-called contracts, which were often drawn up in languages they did not understand, were violated with impunity. That had been admitted by none other than the Director of the National Institute of Demographic Studies, of Paris, who wrote, in the July 1948 issue of the *International Labour Review*, that the restrictions imposed on immigrant workers were discriminatory.

18. Immigrant man-power was usually forced to do heavy manual work shirked by local workers. The United Kingdom Government, for instance, considered immigrant workers only for employment in the mines, the building industry and agriculture. Furthermore, they had to undertake not to seek any other employment without the consent of the Ministry of Labour. It had been openly stated in January 1949 in the British weekly *The New Statesman and Nation* that British farmers often looked upon European volunteer workers as slave labour supplied by the Government.

19. The same was true of the Netherlands and Belgium where foreign workers were used mainly in the mines, could not change their employment and were paid from 25 to 50 per cent less than local workers. Furthermore, they were often fined for trifling offences such as singing or failure to carry out orders which they did not understand because they were in a foreign language. In some countries, such as the Netherlands, they received no benefits under the existing social security schemes; in others, they received only partial benefits.

20. Another example of discrimination was to be found in the fact that immigrant workers had to work longer hours than local workers. In Canada, for instance, immigrant agricultural workers worked two hours more a day than Canadians. Their wages, however, were lower. Many examples of the wretched existence forced upon immigrant workers could be found in the Canadian Press itself.

21. In addition to everything else, families were often separated; men were enrolled on the promise that their wives and children would follow them soon, but weeks and months went by and their families still remained in German and Austrian camps.

22. It was clear from all those facts that immigrant workers were subjected to all kinds of discrimination in regard to working conditions, wages and social security. The matter could not be overlooked by the United Nations nor could it be claimed that it was covered by the ILO or its convention. Indeed, the convention itself merely laid down some general principles and any State could simply subscribe to those principles without undertaking to carry out the provisions contained in the annexes to the convention. It was difficult to understand why there had been so much opposition to the Polish draft resolution, which recommended Member States to apply the principle of non-discrimination to immigrant labour. If, as had been alleged, there was no discrimination, he could see no reason for any objection to that recommendation, or to any of the other recommendations contained in the draft resolution. In view of the above considerations, the Ukrainian delegation would support the Polish proposal.

23. Mr. PANYUSHKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) emphasized the importance of the entire question of discrimination against immigrating labour, especially labour recruited from the ranks of the refugees. The matter required the widest and most thorough examination by the General Assembly, not only because such discrimination was a violation of the principles of the United Nations, particularly of Article 1, paragraph 3 and Article 55 of the Charter, but even more so because it had been on the increase since the end of the Second World War and was becoming virtually an established system.

24. The Third Committee was particularly competent to study the matter; after a thorough examination it should recommend to the General Assembly a basis for concrete action.

25. The United Kingdom draft resolution had not surprised his delegation, which had always believed that an attempt would be made to dismiss or bury the matter. Any attempt by the Third Committee to evade its responsibilities would be strongly censured by world opinion. The draft

resolution was an attempt to divert the attention of the General Assembly from the problem by transferring action to the International Labour Organisation. Such a solution would be totally inadequate because a number of Members of the United Nations were not members of the ILO. The General Assembly itself must deal with the matter by such methods as those proposed in the Polish draft resolution, particularly in paragraph 2, sub-paragraph (d) and in the final paragraph.

26. A survey such as that proposed in the Polish draft resolution was all the more essential as millions of persons forcibly enslaved during the war by the Nazis were still being held in camps, among them nearly half a million citizens of the USSR. The countries maintaining those camps were using them as a source of cheap labour, aided to some extent by the IRO.

27. It was not a fact that the refugees enjoyed ideal conditions in the countries to which they emigrated. The United Kingdom representative had claimed that such ideal conditions for immigrant labour existed in her country. Questions in the House of Commons had, however, elicited official statements that European workers were contracted only when no national labour was available, that refugees authorized to enter employment in the United Kingdom could not leave or change their employment without the permission of the Ministry of Labour and that in agriculture and heavy industry such immigrants were given employment only in work which United Kingdom workers found undesirable.

28. Soviet citizens who had worked in the United Kingdom had confirmed the existence of what he must describe as an official policy of discrimination against immigrant labour. That had been confirmed in the United Kingdom Press, which had also found that farmers frequently regarded so-called volunteer European workers as slave labour given to them by the Government. The existence of such conditions might explain the intention behind the United Kingdom draft resolution.

29. In the United States of America, the situation was equally unsatisfactory. The *New York Herald Tribune* had reported that displaced persons worked on Louisiana sugar plantations at lower than the prevailing rates and under conditions that were tantamount to peonage. The *New York Times* had stated that the 50,000 displaced persons permitted entry into the United States would not prejudice the position of United States workers, since they were directed only to employment which the latter were unwilling to accept. The representative of the United States had failed to rebut the evidence brought forward by the Polish representative in that connexion. The mere fact that the United States Government's attention had been drawn to the existence of such conditions was not in itself a guarantee that they had been remedied.

30. With regard to conditions in France, it was true that the French workers had not themselves discriminated against Polish workers; the French Government and certain trade union officials, however, had failed to imitate that example. The French representative himself had admitted that Polish workers had been expelled from France by order of the French Government for taking part in strikes. That was not only discrimination

but an official sanction to employers for gross exploitation of immigrant workers.

31. The General Assembly must see to it that such abuses were ended or, at the very least, remedied to a very great extent. The Polish draft resolution indicated methods of achieving that purpose; he would therefore support it.

32. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said that the problem under discussion was an extremely vital one. The discrimination referred to in the Polish draft resolution constituted a violation of the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter. The adoption of that draft resolution would lead to a constructive solution of the problem and he therefore supported it.

33. On the other hand, the United Kingdom draft resolution would not lead to any solution whatever. The United Kingdom representative had argued, in defence of her proposal, that any action taken by the Third Committee on the subject of migrant labour would simply be a duplication of the work of the International Labour Organisation. He pointed out, however, that the Third Committee of the General Assembly was the highest authority on social questions and was thus the competent organ to deal with the subject. Any arguments to the contrary would simply serve to undermine the authority of the General Assembly in the eyes of the world. He therefore urged the Committee to accept its responsibilities and to adopt the Polish draft resolution.

34. The CHAIRMAN announced that, since he had closed the list of speakers at the previous meeting, with the Committee's consent, the general debate was closed. He would, however, grant the right of reply to certain representatives in accordance with rule 104 of the rules of procedure.

35. Mrs. WILSON (Canada), replying to the remarks made by the representative of the Ukrainian SSR concerning conditions for immigrant labour in Canada, said that any study of the real situation would show that the conditions for immigrants were comparable to those for Canadian nationals who had the same qualifications and did the same type of work.

36. During the previous session of the General Assembly, the Canadian representative to the Third Committee had received a letter from one of the displaced persons who had emigrated to Canada and started work in the mining industry. That miner, having read of the Polish accusations in the Third Committee, had written especially to say how happy he was in Canada, to describe the excellent living conditions and the perfectly adequate wage of seven dollars a day which he received. That letter was a proof in itself that all the accusations made by the representative of the Ukrainian SSR were utterly unfounded.

37. Furthermore, a group of Ukrainian displaced persons had held a mass meeting in Manitoba and had expressed their gratitude to the Western Powers for giving them the opportunity of finding useful employment in a new country and of living a life of freedom.

38. Mrs. CASTLE (United Kingdom) said that her delegation had attempted to keep the discussion on a practical basis and to find a concrete solution to the problem. She had deliberately refrained from directing any accusations at other

Governments in her opening speech, and she regretted that other representatives had not followed her example. The accusations that had been brought against her Government were familiar and her delegation had answered them on previous occasions. Her delegation had been accused of trying to shirk the issue in bringing forward its draft resolution, but the United Kingdom could have no possible motive for such action. In her opinion, it was the countries of Eastern Europe which were trying to avoid any concrete solution and to cover up the fact that workers tended to flock to the West rather than to the East, by making unfounded accusations against the Western Powers.

39. In reply to the accusations against her country, she referred to the statement made by the representative of the Byelorussian SSR at the previous meeting to the effect that some three hundred of the workers who had emigrated to the United Kingdom had subsequently returned to their countries of origin. That was in itself a proof of the fact that the immigrant workers were free to return to their countries of origin if they so desired. It also showed that only a minute percentage of those who had immigrated had failed to settle down to a happy life in the United Kingdom, since only 300 out of 100,000 had decided not to settle in the country.

40. Her country had further been accused of exploiting the immigrants as cheap labour. In reply to that accusation, she pointed out that the trade unions in the United Kingdom were very powerful and would certainly never have tolerated the importation of cheap labour, which would have lowered the standards of all the workers in the country.

41. Immigrant workers were treated on a footing of absolute equality with the citizens of the country. They were paid at the same rate, they worked the same hours, they had the same rations including the extra rations for those doing heavy manual labour, they shared in the social security schemes and good accommodation was provided for them. Contrary to the allegations of the representative of Poland, the hostels provided for the immigrant workers were perfectly comfortable. Moreover, the workers were not obliged to live in those hostels; they could, if they wished, make arrangements to live with private families. As a result of the war, there was a housing shortage in the United Kingdom and it was therefore not always possible to accommodate the immigrant workers in private homes.

42. She emphasized that the European Volunteer Workers were not volunteers only in name. They were informed of the conditions of work before they came, they knew what type of employment was open to them and they were always free to return to their own countries if they wished. Much had been made of the fact that most of the immigrant labour worked in the agricultural, mining or textile industries. Those were the basic industries of the United Kingdom and it was strange that the USSR representative should consider employment in them to be an unworthy occupation. The constituency that she herself represented in Parliament was situated in one of the textile regions and she had frequent opportunities to become acquainted with the workers. All the workers in the textile mills, both the immigrants and the United Kingdom citizens, were proud of their work in one of the country's basic industries.

43. It had been alleged that there was a conspiracy among the Western Powers to prevent the repatriation of displaced persons. She firmly denied that allegation and, as an example of the work that had been done, she mentioned the Polish Resettlement Corps which had been set up in the United Kingdom to facilitate the repatriation, emigration or resettlement of Polish troops who had fought in the West. Repatriation had been actively encouraged and nearly 10,000 members of the corps had been repatriated in addition to the 100,000 Polish troops who had been repatriated previously. Many others had emigrated to foreign countries with their dependents at the expense of the United Kingdom Government, and several thousand had found employment and settled in the United Kingdom, where they received the same wages and worked under the same conditions as British workers.

44. It would, indeed, be more appropriate for the Polish representative, instead of making accusations against the United Kingdom, to turn his attention to the fate of his countrymen who had been forced to emigrate to the USSR. They had been sent to the most remote and inhospitable regions of the USSR, where they were forced to do the most arduous work under the most terrible conditions. If accusations of importing cheap labour were to be made, that was surely an example which defied comparison. In fact, the whole economy of the arid zones of the USSR was based upon obtaining cheap labour through compulsory immigration.

45. For years the USSR Government had been carrying on a policy of enforced migration to quell the opposition of the small nations it wished to absorb. That policy had been followed in the case of the Moslem peoples of the Caucasus and the Crimea who had for long been hostile to the USSR Government, and the recently acquired Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania had also been subjected to it.

46. The Chechens, the Crimean Tartars, the Kalmucks, the Karachas, the Balkars and the Kizlyars, comprising in all about a million and a half people, had already been broken and dispersed. She quoted a decree of the USSR Supreme Council, published in *Izvestia* on 26 June 1946, under which the Chechen-Ingush and the Crimean Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics had been abolished and their populations deported wholesale. The decree showed the genocide habit of mind very clearly in the mere fact that it judged and condemned, not individuals, but whole nations, out of hand. The victims of those mass deportations had been set to work on State forced labour projects under dreadful physical conditions and the small but historical nations of the Crimea and the Northern Caucasus were rapidly dying out.

47. The CHAIRMAN requested the United Kingdom representative to confine her remarks to reply to any accusations that had been made against her Government and not to re-open the discussion by making any counter-accusations.

48. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. PANYUSHKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in view of the remarks made by the United Kingdom representative, they too would have to request the Chairman to accord them the right of reply.

49. Mr. LÓPEZ (Cuba) proposed the adjournment of the meeting.

The proposal was rejected by 14 votes to 3, with 21 abstentions.

50. Mrs. CASTLE (United Kingdom) said that, in view of the Chairman's ruling, she would refrain from giving any more evidence of conditions in the USSR. It was, however, the representatives of the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR who had originally gone beyond the scope of the item on the agenda and had raised the whole problem of forced migration. She wished, therefore, to point out that the whole vast problem of displaced persons had its origin in the conditions in the countries of Eastern Europe. The movement of countless refugees towards the West had placed an almost intolerable burden upon the Western Powers, and they were doing their utmost to solve the problem on a just and humanitarian basis. The draft resolution submitted by her delegation was designed to achieve a constructive solution to the problem by recommending the speedy application of the convention adopted by the vast majority of the members of the International Labour Organisation.

51. Mr. ALTMAN (Poland) said that the General Assembly could not decline responsibility for a tragic and rapidly deteriorating situation by referring the problem to the ILO.

52. In France, for example, despite the French representative's assertion that Polish workers were treated in exactly the same way as French citizens, cases of discrimination had become so frequent that they might almost be termed systematic. Mr. Altman cited a number of individual cases of discrimination against Polish miners, particularly in the Moselle region, in October and November 1948.

53. Furthermore, the French Government had failed to reply to official Polish protests against the difficulties placed in the way of the repatriation of Polish workers and of Polish children resident in France who had gone to Poland for their holidays.

54. In Belgium there was some evidence that Polish displaced persons were badly housed, but access to certain places for the purpose of verifying complaints had been refused to the Polish Red Cross.

55. Information about conditions in Latin America and the United States had been taken principally from the local Press, which might be regarded as unbiased in that instance.

56. Statements about conditions in the United Kingdom had been gleaned from the Polish-language Press published in that country; that Press was hostile to the existing Polish Government and could therefore be regarded as an objective source.

57. The United Kingdom draft resolution could be construed as an attempt to remove the matter from the agenda of the General Assembly under the pretext that the International Labour Organisation was more qualified to deal with it; that was a not unprecedented misuse of procedural methods. The adoption by the ILO of the Convention concerning Migration for Employment could at best have been only a partial solution, because ILO conventions were usually not ratified by the States most affected by them. That particular convention, moreover, permitted any signatory State to avoid putting into operation the

principal regulations for the protection of migrant labour. As a result of the proposals of the United States delegation to the International Labour Conference in June 1949, the convention contained a basic text, which made only general statements, and three annexes in which the detailed regulations were set out. Under article 14, any ratifying State was permitted to append a declaration that it would not ratify all or any one of the annexes.

58. The Polish delegation had voted against that convention because it had desired an instrument far stronger than a questionnaire dealing merely with the legal and technical aspects of the problem without any obligation that concrete measures would subsequently be taken. The questionnaire mentioned in the last paragraph of the Polish draft resolution before the Committee was intended as one capable of giving a comprehensive picture of all aspects of the situation.

59. With regard to the United Kingdom representative's misunderstanding of paragraph (b) of that draft resolution (249th meeting), the transfer of savings mentioned therein referred to the transfer of part of their wages by workers living abroad to their families which had remained in their country of origin. The fact that the World Federation of Trade Unions had laid particular stress upon that question in its social programme for the protection of migrant labour was an indication of its great importance.

60. The Cuban amendment to the Polish draft resolution could not be accepted because it restricted the rights of migrant labour unduly.

61. Mr. STEPANENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) remarked that the United Kingdom representative had misinterpreted the statement he had made at the previous meeting. He had referred to the Secretary-General's *Report on the Progress and Prospect of Repatriation, Resettlement and Immigration of Displaced Persons*¹ which showed that 323 persons had returned to the Western zones of Germany from the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom representative had quoted that statement to prove that immigrant workers were free to leave the United Kingdom if they so wished. It seemed as if she were proud that they were not actually put in chains. It was clear, however, that if working and living conditions in the United Kingdom were as ideal as had been alleged no one would wish to return to bug-ridden hovels in German camps. It was known that immigrant workers in the United Kingdom were housed in former garages and had to sleep in bunks, to do extremely heavy work and to exist on a paltry pittance far away from their families.

62. According to an official United Nations document, there was an extremely high rate of mortality in the United Kingdom and in the British zone in Germany; he wondered if that was also a result of the excellent living and working conditions said to prevail in those areas.

63. Regarding the alleged freedom to leave the United Kingdom and to return home, it was common knowledge that all kinds of obstacles had been used to prevent the repatriation of Poles, for instance. Some of those who wished to return had actually been so ill-treated that the Polish Government had had to intervene.

¹ Document E/816.

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;