



**C O N T E N T S**

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 28:	
Draft International Covenants on Human Rights (continued) .....	135
Award of the Nobel Peace Prize to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees ....	140

**Chairman: Mr. Omar LOUTFI (Egypt).**

**AGENDA ITEM 28**

**Draft International Covenants on Human Rights  
 (E/2573, annexes I, II and III, A/2907 and Add.  
 1 and 2, A/2910 and Add.1 to 5, A/2929, A/  
 2943, chapter VI, section I, A/C.3/L.460 and  
 Corr.1, A/C.3/L.466, A/C.3/L.472, A/C.3/L.  
 475, A/C.3/L.476, A/C.3/L.477) (continued)**

GENERAL DISCUSSION (continued)

*Article 1 (continued)*

1. Mr. D'SOUZA (India) paid a tribute to the efforts of the members of the Third Committee. There was no doubt that the discussions had enabled all concerned to acquire a better understanding of the real implications of the provisions of article 1 of the draft International Covenants on Human Rights (E/2573, annex I). India was especially interested. As one of the authors of the resolution calling for the insertion in the covenants of an article on the right of self-determination which the General Assembly adopted at its sixth session (resolution 545 (VI)), it regarded that right as a prerequisite of the exercise of all the other fundamental rights. It knew from experience that good government was no substitute for self-government; whatever advantages a people enjoyed, freedom was for it the prime desideratum.

2. The independence of India was a striking example of the peaceful exercise of the right of self-determination. In the opinion of India, moreover, independence could and must be achieved only by peaceful and democratic methods.

3. Despite its attachment to the right of self-determination, the Indian delegation recognized that proclamation of the right in the covenants might give rise to difficulties. Those difficulties, however, were not due to the fact that the right was collective rather than individual. Such a distinction could not be taken seriously because, apart from the fact that in the last resort the right was exercised by individuals, the idea of human rights had developed to a remarkable extent. It had been considerably broadened by the decision of the Commission on Human Rights to include social

and economic rights in the covenants. Furthermore, article 1 actually expressed the same idea as article 21, paragraph 3, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, namely, that "the will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government...". He was not convinced by the argument that they were dealing with a principle and not a right, for those were two aspects of a single reality: what was a principle and an obligation for the governors was a right for the governed.

4. It must be admitted that the provisions of article 1 gave the right of self-determination a wider scope than the provisions of resolution 545 (VI). The right of self-determination, which had originally been invoked to safeguard the rights of non-self-governing peoples, could also be applied at the domestic level. Consequently there was apprehension in some quarters lest the provisions in question should encourage separatist movements or revolts by minorities; but he thought the possible dangers were exaggerated and he recalled that article 1 referred to peoples and nations. If an ethnic group which was claimed to be a minority was actually a people or a nation, it would succeed in achieving its independence whether or not the covenant contained an article on the right of self-determination. To refuse that right to minorities would only confirm them in their opposition; on the other hand, to recognize their freedom was the surest means of winning their respect and support. Though he had no intention of discussing in detail the special problem of minorities and the federal principle, he would nevertheless like to point out that the various elements of the population of India, though representing such different cultures, constituted a homogeneous nation, perhaps because the Government gave complete freedom to the different groups in cultural and religious matters.

5. The Indian delegation therefore maintained its position with regard to the inclusion of article 1 in the draft covenants. It was, however, concerned at the apprehension displayed by a number of States which were nevertheless among those which had given ample evidence of their profound respect for human rights. Unanimous ratification of the covenants, or at least of one of them, was necessary not only for the well-being of those who were protected by their provisions, but also for the future of the United Nations. It should be emphasized in that connexion that every international instrument tended, not to restrict national sovereignty, as was feared by some, but to define and delimit the sphere in which it could legitimately be exercised.

6. The Indian delegation would therefore not oppose the Ecuadorian representative's suggestion (650th meeting) which would enable the Committee to take a decision at the current session.

7. In conclusion, he urged delegations which were opposed to the inclusion of article 1 to reconsider their decision.

8. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) said that the delegation of the Dominican Republic had followed with the greatest interest the general discussion, which had been as profound and exhaustive as in previous years. None could deny that the right of peoples to self-determination was a subject which gave rise to the most spirited and convincing statements. The United Nations could not ignore a fundamental principle which was the subject of one of the first provisions of the United Nations Charter. Faithful to its country's noble traditions and therefore to its own convictions, the delegation of the Dominican Republic had unhesitatingly supported all the resolutions which provided the clearest and most precise interpretation of the right to self-determination. In the course of the current session, however, the delegation of the Dominican Republic had reached the conclusion that the question of the right of self-determination required a more thorough study. The fact was that members of the Committee were not divided as to the substance of the matter; the difficulty had arisen over form.

9. Despite prolonged discussion, the Committee had not yet found a compromise. That showed that the problem had not been studied in all its aspects.

10. Pointing out that a hasty decision must not be taken, she said that time took revenge for all that was done without its co-operation. Impatience counselled that nothing which could be done today should be put off until tomorrow, but experience advised that anything which could be done better the day after tomorrow should never be done badly tomorrow.

11. She had on various occasions unofficially invited a group of delegations to discuss the item since she wished to submit a compromise text to the Committee. In her opinion, better results would have been reached if article 1 of the draft covenants and item 29 of the agenda of the General Assembly had been considered simultaneously. Duplication of the debate on related items would have been avoided had the group adopted that suggestion. However, the good faith and the co-operativeness displayed by the members of the Third Committee justified the hope that the majority would recognize that the question of the right of self-determination deserved more thorough examination.

12. She hoped that the Committee would adopt the suggestion of the representative of Ecuador or that of the Danish representative (650th meeting) which, while it would delay matters, would by that very fact afford more time for reaching a conclusion that would meet the various points of view expressed during the general discussion.

13. If the Committee decided to vote immediately on article 1, the delegation of the Dominican Republic would vote for paragraph 1, since it contained a statement affirming the pre-existence of an incontrovertible principle. It would have to study the implications of paragraph 2 in the light of the constitutional principles of the Dominican Republic. With regard to paragraph 3, while it was true that her delegation agreed with the first part of the paragraph, it would have to abstain from voting on the second part because it considered that the wording should be carefully revised.

14. Mr. ARAOZ (Bolivia) stressed the importance which his country attached to the right of self-determination; respect for the principle of self-determination was one of the foundations of his Government's domestic and international policy—a position firmly held throughout the American continent. It was only slowly that the principle had been embodied in international law, and the process had been accompanied by suffering and sacrifice of which Bolivia was the more sensible since its history included outstanding instances of the dignity of a people struggling for independence. There could be no question of going back; on the contrary, more emphasis must be placed on that right so that international interdependence and co-operation should become a reality from which the under-developed nations could benefit.

15. The Bolivian delegation therefore entirely agreed with the point of view of those speakers who had shown self-determination to be a living issue. Those States which opposed the inclusion of the existing article 1 in the covenants overlooked the inexorable advance of the peoples towards freedom and independence, and the validity of their arguments was thereby greatly reduced.

16. While the first two paragraphs of article 1 had not given rise to very serious objections, the same could not be said of article 3, which had provoked considerable apprehension. That paragraph, which related to a matter of paramount importance to the under-developed countries, had to be accurately interpreted. Its provisions should be examined in the light of the conditions peculiar to each of the countries concerned. Care must be taken to avoid an *a priori* classification of States into artificial categories, just as an effort must be made to understand that each State was legitimately entitled to protect the interests and well-being of its people.

17. His delegation, with that of Uruguay, had been one of the co-authors of General Assembly resolution 626 (VII), concerning the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources. After reading a number of passages from the resolution, he emphasized the need to ponder its scope and spirit with an open mind. His delegation had proposed the recognition of that right as a result of Bolivia's own experience. The right of political self-determination, that is, sovereignty, had been a fiction throughout Bolivia's history as an independent country, because political power had always been subordinate to the economic power wielded by the large mining concerns.

18. Once the principle at the basis of the right had been put into effect, the Bolivian Revolutionary Government had nationalized the large mining concerns, not as a general measure, but as a political necessity, under the pressure of public demand and of the circumstances. Accordingly, the measure had been applied only to three large mining concerns whose economic and political interests were contrary to those of the country's development and to the free operation of the democratic system, and the concerns expropriated had received compensation. That was what Bolivia had done in nationalizing the mines, in accordance with its Constitution and the mines expropriation act. It had also followed that policy in carrying out its land reform. It opposed any expropriation or confiscation which was unaccompanied by compensation and had always respected foreign interests. That traditional

policy found new expression in the Act of 17 October 1945 which extended to foreign capital invested in the country guarantees with respect to income and amortization as well as convertibility.

19. The differences of opinion on article 1 related much more to form than to substance and the arguments against it were not conclusive. Virtually all delegations recognized the importance of the right of peoples to self-determination. Co-operation between States would become closer when that right was embodied in the covenants, and that was a further reason why its inclusion should be approved by a large majority if not unanimously.

20. That being the case, his delegation opposed the deletion of any of the paragraphs of article 1. It would support any proposal which would enable the Third Committee to reach a satisfactory result reflecting the general spirit of co-operation. It would like to see a solution which, without involving too much delay, would enable fresh factors to be brought into account, and was prepared to examine with the greatest care any proposal likely to speed up the Committee's work and bring about agreement between Member States.

*Miss Bernardino (Dominican Republic) took the Chair.*

21. Mr. ABDEL-GHANI (Egypt) said that his delegation had already explained the Egyptian Government's position on article 1. He now wished to reply to some of the arguments presented by representatives who had participated in the general discussion. Before doing so, however, he wished to say that he had listened to all statements with an open mind and that it was in the same spirit, frankly and quite objectively, that his delegation would study any ideas which might be put forward during the discussion.

22. The Committee had before it a number of ideas, which could be summarized in the following five proposals: first, to substitute article 1 and other related articles by a declaration on self-determination to be made by the General Assembly; secondly, to draw up a third draft covenant on self-determination; thirdly, to draft a protocol as an annex to the existing draft covenants; fourthly, to retain article 1 subject to re-drafting; and fifthly, to delete article 1 completely. It was safe to say that those possible solutions included all the ideas that had been advanced which should be examined, as they had been supported by weighty arguments.

23. The first idea had been introduced by the Secretary-General in his statement of 11 October (633rd meeting) and had been supported by several delegations, including the Danish and Swedish delegations. The idea was not new. It was certainly not new to his own delegation which, during the past two or three years, had been asked by various non-governmental organizations to support it. But his Government could no more support the idea then than it could in the past, for two quite simple reasons.

24. First, in view of the importance assumed in international relations by the right of peoples to self-determination, a mere declaration would be nothing but a hazy shadow of existing realities. To be content with a declaration would be to ignore the great phenomenon of the century, the liberation of peoples long subject to foreign domination and colonialism. Many European peoples had achieved independence after the

First World War. Since the Second World War almost 600 million people had been able to enjoy their right of self-determination and had taken their places in international life as nationals of independent and sovereign States. Among the States which had signed the Charter of the United Nations at San Francisco were some whose status as independent nations had only just been recognized, while during the ten years of its existence the United Nations had witnessed the birth of two new States, Indonesia and Libya. The Danish Government's attitude towards Greenland and the agreement reached between Egypt and the United Kingdom in 1953 allowing the people of the Sudan to exercise their right of self-determination at the proper time and with the necessary safeguards were also matters for congratulation.

25. After so much progress and when there were some Governments which agreed, without pressure of any kind, to allow the peoples they administered to exercise their right of self-determination, it was difficult to see how the United Nations could be so lukewarm and reduce its obligations to a mere declaration which would have no binding force. In view of the march of events, a mere declaration would mean that the United Nations was behind the times, and in any case it was too late to decide that the aspirations of so many peoples should not be given a means of expression in an effective international instrument.

26. Secondly, his delegation could not accept the idea of a declaration on self-determination because it would be valueless to most of the countries concerned. Quite recently many countries had made such declarations or subscribed to similar ones in international instruments, constitutional texts, resolutions or recommendations of international conferences, or in bilateral or multilateral declarations made at important moments in history. The most recent example was a resolution which the United States Congress had adopted on 14 July 1955 and which dealt essentially with the right of peoples to self-determination. The Final Communiqué of the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, adopted by twenty-nine States, also proclaimed that all the participating countries firmly believed in that right, which had been proclaimed on many occasions in recent times and explicitly stated in the Atlantic Charter, to which the United Nations owed its existence. In fact there was not a single Member of the United Nations that had not declared, in some document or another, its belief in the right of self-determination. The United Kingdom and the United States of America were the authors of the Atlantic Charter, and the principle of self-determination contained in it was spelled out in the Washington declarations of 1942, the Moscow declarations of 1943 and the Cairo declarations of 1943. The Constitution of France, the home of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, laid down that no territory could be added to the Republic without a clear and definite expression of the will of the people. The Soviet Union had frequently stated, through its authorized representatives, that its Constitution was based on the right of peoples to self-determination. The nations of Latin America, as the Salvadorian representative had said, were bound by a series of declarations of that right and they owed it to the memory of the great men who had guided them to liberty and independence, to ensure the victory of the cause for which they had heroically struggled.

27. In those circumstances, a declaration of the kind proposed by the Secretary-General would add nothing to the obligations already assumed by Member States, which by signing the Charter of the United Nations had accepted Articles 1, 55, 73 and 76, and thereby recognized the right of peoples to self-determination.

28. The second idea was to draft a separate covenant on the right of peoples to self-determination. The new covenant could be opened for signature either simultaneously with the other two related covenants or separately. If the first course were taken, States which found the two existing covenants unacceptable would be unable to accept the third and would abstain completely; if the second course were taken, the same States might find the third covenant unacceptable and so the purpose would not be achieved. His delegation did not in principle oppose the drafting of a covenant on the right of peoples to self-determination provided that the three covenants were closely linked.

29. The third idea, advanced by Brazil, was very serious. It meant that everything relating to the rights of peoples to self-determination and everything which would enable the people of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories to enjoy the other rights proclaimed in the covenants would be taken out of the covenants. It involved the deletion of article 28 of the draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and article 53 of the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which provided for the extension and application of the covenant to all peoples, independent or not, and regardless of whether they belonged to a metropolitan country or to a colonial or Trust Territory. That proposal was dangerous because it would mean that almost 200 million people would be deprived of all the rights enjoyed by the rest of mankind. The Brazilian proposal in fact invited the United Nations to accept the antiquated idea that freedom and democracy were the exclusive prerogative of citizens and denied to all other persons. If the free peoples of the world were to be the only ones to benefit from the covenants and if the rights of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories were to be relegated to an annex, there would be grave discrimination and the peoples concerned would feel that the United Nations regarded them as second-class citizens.

30. The fourth idea was to re-draft article 1 in order to render it more acceptable. That proposal had been put forward by the representative of Venezuela (644th meeting) but the delegations which took exception to the wording had suggested no specific changes. There was still time to submit suggestions for improving the wording. The representative of Pakistan had compared (646th meeting) the text adopted by the General Assembly with the text drafted by the Commission on Human Rights; it might therefore be useful to review the history of the article.

31. In resolution 545 (VI), the General Assembly had adopted—by 36 votes to 11, with 12 abstentions—an article on the right of peoples to self-determination which differed from the text before the Committee. In voting against the draft resolution, the United States delegation had explained that it was opposed to the wording, not the principle, of the article. He read out a passage from the summary record of the 374th plenary meeting of the General Assembly at its sixth session to show that the United States delegation had no objection to the inclusion of an article on the right of peoples to self-determination in the draft

covenants, but preferred that it should be drafted by the Commission on Human Rights. The question had been referred to the Commission and the United States delegation had proposed amendments which had resulted in the wording of paragraphs 1 and 2 of the text before the Committee. A United States amendment restricting the right of self-determination had been rejected, but the other two paragraphs were still largely as the United States delegation had drafted them. The representative of Pakistan had said (646th meeting) that he would have preferred to retain the text which the United States delegation had found faulty. The Egyptian delegation would be prepared to support the representative of Pakistan if he made a proposal to restore the original General Assembly text.

32. He had no intention of defending the text of the Commission on Human Rights against that of the General Assembly. But he was surprised that the representative of Pakistan could not understand the meaning of the words "cultural status" and "social status". It was a matter of common knowledge that certain nations of the world had been able to attain statehood only by reason of a social and cultural structure that was peculiar to them and distinguished them clearly from their immediate neighbours. The United Kingdom representative, too, had criticized the words "economic, social and cultural status" and had taken exception to the word "nations". He wondered whether the elimination of all those words would enable the United Kingdom representative to vote for the remainder of the text. His delegation also wondered whether the Pakistani and Lebanese representatives had been right in criticizing that part of paragraph 2 which began with the words "including" and ended with the words "by another people". That phrase had been introduced on the initiative of the United States delegation in order to extend the right of peoples to self-determination beyond Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories. Its purpose was to apply the principle of universality, and the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, at which Pakistan and Lebanon had been represented, had laid special emphasis on that principle.

33. However that might be, his delegation was prepared to accept the Ecuadorian proposal (A/C.3/L.477) favouring the establishment of a working party for the revision of article 1. It proposed that the working party should consist of the representatives of the United Kingdom, Belgium, Pakistan, Lebanon and Ecuador, that is, the representatives of those delegations that had levelled the strongest criticisms against the wording of the article.

34. Lastly, the fifth idea before the Committee was the proposal for the elimination, pure and simple, of article 1 and the omission of any reference in the covenants to the right of peoples to self-determination. The supporters of that proposal had advanced important arguments which his delegation felt it was its duty to challenge. One of those arguments was that the right of peoples to self-determination was not proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations. For some, self-determination was only an ideal, for others it was a principle, for yet others it was simply a goal to be attained. In short, self-determination, it would seem, was anything but a right. All those assertions seemed to disregard one unfortunate historical fact, namely that the right of self-determination had passed through three different stages before being included

in the Charter. The Atlantic Charter and the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, which had preceded the United Nations Charter and paved the way for it, had expressly recognized the right of all peoples to self-determination. At the time of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals in 1944, when victory had become assured, some nations had attempted to go back on a promise made at a time when the issue of the war was uncertain. At the San Francisco Conference many nations which had only recently attained independence, or had for long been under the influence of more powerful nations, had nevertheless succeeded in finding room in the Charter for self-determination in the form in which it now appeared there. In any case, the attempt to prove that free determination was either a principle or a right was futile because, as the Greek representative had rightly pointed out, the most eminent jurists disagreed on that point.

35. Another argument advanced by those who were opposed to article 1 was that the right of peoples to self-determination was a collective, not an individual, right. There were, however, many jurists who held the contrary to be true. In fact, the right in question was exercised mainly in elections and plebiscites in which an attempt was made to ascertain the will of individuals. As certain representatives had pointed out, that right was both collective and individual, and the representative of El Salvador had done well to emphasize that the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen promulgated in France in 1789, which dealt essentially with the rights of individuals, had not neglected the right of self-determination. In any case, even assuming that the right should be considered a collective right, there was nothing either illogical or unjustified in placing it side by side with individual rights, and article 48 had been included in the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights because the implementation of self-determination might require a special procedure.

36. Finally, those who wished to eliminate article 1 maintained that the word "people" would have to be closely defined before the right of peoples to self-determination could be recognized. However, the notion of "people" was not a static one. It had undergone rapid evolution. It was possible that the first human groups which had attempted to preserve the character of a free entity had been families. Gradually, ever larger groups had established themselves and looked upon themselves as "peoples". That evolution, which had resulted in the emergence of nations, almost all of them at first composed of disparate elements, was not yet completed and might take a new direction in view of the current tendency to an ever greater interdependence among nations. It would be unwise to attempt to define for all time what was and was not a people. Moreover, the word would be as difficult to define as the word "State", which the International Law Commission had given up trying to define, or the word "aggression", on which the League of Nations had laboured a long time and which the General Assembly was still vainly seeking to define.

37. In conclusion, he quoted a passage from Mr. Wickham Steed's book *The Fifth Arm*, dealing with the almost miraculous way in which the situation had changed in favour of the Allies at the end of the First World War; it showed the decisive influence exercised by the proclamation of the right of peoples to self-determination contained in President Wilson's

Fourteen Points. For him, that lesson of history was more eloquent than all speeches and all arguments, and the recognition of the right of peoples to decide their own future constituted the best weapon in war and the best policy in peace.

38. Mr. NAJAR (Israel) felt that at the current stage of the discussion he should define his Government's views on certain points.

39. He recalled, first of all, that the right of peoples to self-determination, if taken in the limited sense given to it in article 1 of the draft covenants, was undoubtedly a human right; the conditions under which it might be exercised were merely more difficult to define. Its obvious individual aspects should certainly not be overlooked on account of its collective aspect. It was by no means the only right in the draft covenants which presented that twofold character; yet none of the other articles raised a problem comparable to that of article 1. The conclusion therefore suggested itself, as he had pointed out in an earlier speech (643rd meeting), that the distinction between individual and collective rights did not have the importance that was being attributed to it and that the deadlock reached by the Third Committee was due less to the existence of ideological misunderstandings than to the difference in substance between the right laid down in article 1 and the other rights set forth in the draft covenants. A State might very well undertake by treaty to respect human rights inside territories placed under its authority and, without any inconsistency, refuse to subscribe to obligations—for example, the obligations under article 1 of the two draft covenants and article 48 of the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights—which might affect the scope of its own sovereignty. The principles and interests involved were different in the two cases.

40. Such considerations explained the attitude of certain States which, though strongly attached to the principle of self-determination, did not wish to accept article 1. If they refused to do so, there was little chance that the efforts at redrafting the article would provide the desired solution. It was no doubt because the drafting problem was not the real problem that the debate which had just taken place in the Committee had frequently become submerged in points of detail and had even sometimes smacked of casuistry. The real problem had not been solved by criticism, however ingenious, of the terms of article 1. If there were weaknesses and gaps in the text, they could surely be remedied. The real difficulty was not one of drafting; the question was whether, at the current stage of political thinking in the different countries, it was, or was not, possible to conclude an international convention which would take its place beside the Charter of the United Nations and regulate the right of peoples to self-determination. Great minds and important countries believed that, for the time being, all that could be done was to work out a declaration of principle which would complement the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Committee should, therefore, not allow itself to be lured into a labyrinth of exegesis and formal dialectics but should try to look at the question as a whole from a higher plane.

41. He noted that the Lebanese representative had thought fit to criticize the text of article 1 mercilessly and had tried to reduce the problem of the right of peoples to self-determination to that of the self-



determination of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories. He had also found it necessary to justify his efforts by attacking, in connexion with the expression "cultural status", the cultural self-determination of Israel, which, according to him, was linked with the problem of the Palestine refugees.

42. It was strange that the Lebanese representative invariably preceded his attacks on Israel with a statement that he had no intention of criticizing that country. Nevertheless, he (Mr. Najar) had no intention of reviewing for him the history of the Jewish people, which was closely linked with the Biblical word and the land of the Bible. He would confine himself to pointing out that the sixty Member States of the United Nations each had their particular culture and the Charter required each one of them to respect the sovereignty of the others, in all fields. The problem of the Palestine refugees, a problem engendered and kept in being by war, was a matter for the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, not for the Third Committee, because it did not raise cultural problems for Israel, but vital problems of defence and security.

43. He doubted whether a modification of the form of article 1 would serve to bring about the desired agreement among States; nevertheless, he saw no objection to the establishment of a working party such as that mentioned by the Ecuadorian representative at the previous meeting. If such a body were set up, it should not be overlooked that the difficulty facing the Committee derived less from article 1 of the two

draft covenants than from article 48 of the draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which related to the implementation of the rights. A drafting committee would therefore, it seemed, have to study the two texts side by side; a compromise could be found and accepted only in such simultaneous examination.

44. In conclusion, he emphasized the importance which his Government attached to the adoption of the covenants. His delegation had attempted to dispel any misunderstandings likely to hamper the conclusion of the covenants because it wished to prepare the way for their signature.

45. The CHAIRMAN declared the general discussion on article 1 of the draft covenants closed and added that she would accord the right of reply to those representatives who asked for it under rule 116 of the rules of procedure.

***Award of the Nobel Peace Prize to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees***

46. Mr. AABREK (Norway) said he was happy to announce that the Nobel Peace Prize for 1954 had been awarded to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

47. The CHAIRMAN expressed gratification at the choice, which redounded to the honour of the United Nations as a whole.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.