

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



AD HOC POLITICAL COMMITTEE 57th

MEETING

Wednesday, 30 January 1952, at 10.30 a.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece : (b)	
Repatriation of Greek children : reports of the Secretary-General and of the international Red Cross organizations (A/1848, A/1932, A/1933, A/AC.53/L.44, A/AC.53/L.51) (continued).....	319

Chairman : Mr. Selim SARPER (Turkey).

Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece : (b) Repatriation of Greek children : Reports of the Secretary-General and of the international Red Cross organizations (A/1848, A/1932, A/1933 ; A/AC.53/L.44, A/AC.53/L.51) (continued)

[Item 19]*

1. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand) observed that the facts placed on record by the Greek representative, the Standing Committee on the Repatriation of Greek Children, the reports of the International Red Cross and many other documents showed that, except in the case of Yugoslavia, all efforts to reunite the Greek children with their parents had failed. It was not easy to speak on the matter with restraint, so strong was the sense of indignation it aroused. But the Greek representative, whose main concern was to help the children and their parents, had given an example of restraint, and the New Zealand delegation would imitate him. It would limit itself to expressing its sympathy with the unhappy victims of that sorry episode, expressing its appreciation of the work of the Standing Committee and the International Red Cross and supporting the constructive draft resolution submitted by the Dominican Republic (A/AC.53/L.51).

2. Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia) recalled that the Czechoslovak delegation's statement in the Standing Committee had purposely been formulated in such a manner as to facilitate discussion and expedite the settlement of the problem. For the same reason, the Czechoslovak delegation had not commented on the statement of the Standing Committee (A/AC.53/L.44). It was obvious from the discussion, however, that the course set by the General Assembly resolutions was now being abandoned and that an attempt was being made, as at the fifth session, to exploit the question for the purposes of propaganda against the countries that had

sheltered the Greek children, whose health and lives had been threatened by the war and terror unleashed in Greece by the Powers which had sought to make that country a new base of aggression against the peace-loving States. The Czechoslovak delegation therefore felt obliged to explain its Government's position once more.

3. The Czechoslovak Government had from the beginning adopted a positive attitude towards the repatriation of the Greek children. That attitude, which had been explained by Czechoslovak representatives on numerous occasions, had received tangible expression when Czechoslovakia had voted for resolutions 193 C (III) and 288 B (IV). At the fifth session, however, it had become apparent that the question of the repatriation of the Greek children was being exploited for the purposes of propaganda against the countries which had given them hospitality. That was why the Czechoslovak delegation had abstained from voting on section C of resolution 382 (V) of 1 December 1950. So far as the two preceding resolutions were concerned, not only had the Czechoslovak delegation voted for them, but its Government had taken practical steps to implement them.

4. Pursuant to the Secretary-General's note of 11 November 1949, the Czechoslovak Red Cross had got in touch with the International Red Cross Committee and the League of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The first meeting between the representatives of the League of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and the representatives of the Czechoslovak Red Cross took place at Prague in February 1949. In September 1949, a list of 138 Greek children who, at their parents' request had been evacuated to Czechoslovakia, had been communicated to the League of Red Cross Societies. The Czechoslovak Government had thus given concrete proof of its willingness to help in the repatriation of the Greek children and comply with the terms of the resolutions for which it had voted. Towards the end of February and the beginning of

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

March 1950, further negotiations had taken place at Prague with the representative of the League of Red Cross Societies, who had also visited one of the homes for Greek children.

5. The Czechoslovak Government had given further proof of its goodwill and sincere desire to reach a settlement of the problem by agreeing to participate officially in the Standing Committee's work. At the meeting of the Standing Committee held on 22 January 1952, the Czechoslovak representative had informed the Committee that none of the applications for repatriation satisfied the conditions laid down during the negotiations held at Prague in March 1950 between the representatives of the Czechoslovak Red Cross and the representatives of the League of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. Many of the cases could not be examined because the necessary identification papers had not been supplied. Others required supplementary investigation. In no case had the guarantees been provided as required under the protocol of 2 March 1950 for the protection of the Greek children and their parents against any persecution. The Czechoslovak Government had therefore pointed out that the material presented by the international Red Cross organizations was inadequate and unreliable. Furthermore, the situation had not changed for the better since the resolutions of the General Assembly had been adopted. On the contrary, further brutalities had been inflicted on Greek citizens professing democratic views, and the parents of the children harboured in Czechoslovakia were either kept in prison or concentration camps or subjected to persecution in other ways. The Czechoslovak Government therefore considered that the Committee's principal task should be to induce the Greek Government to remove the obstacles to repatriation. To that end it would be useful to transfer the negotiations to the International Red Cross Committee in conformity with the terms of General Assembly resolution 193 C (III). The Chairman and various members of the Standing Committee had realized the importance of that proposal, particularly the last point, which had also impressed the President of the League of Red Cross Societies.

6. Under the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in 1948 and 1949, the repatriation of the children was to be voluntary, in other words, the parents and children had to express a wish to that effect. Nevertheless, the applications submitted had been dictated by police officials. Photographic copies sent to the Czechoslovak Red Cross showed that the applications had been falsified. For example, persons who had fought for Greek freedom had been forced to speak of their comrades in arms as bandits. Applications from parents in prison or in concentration camps could also be regarded as invalid, for they had been extracted by force. Those inhuman methods were, moreover, being used not only against adult opponents of the régime in power in Greece, but against whole families, including children.

7. The International Red Cross Committee had submitted to the governments of the peoples' democracies, including Czechoslovakia, 9,839 applications for the repatriation of children. That list contained inaccuracies

and irregularities and many cases were purely imaginary. In 552 cases, repatriation had ostensibly been requested by the "father" or "mother" of the child, whereas the real father and mother were with their child in one of the peoples' democracies. In 1,496 cases, the child in question was living with one of its parents in a peoples' democracy. Moreover, 2,223 petitions were in respect of persons over eighteen years of age, most of whom were members of the Greek democratic army and obviously could not be regarded as children. In 189 cases, two applications had been submitted for the same child; in 2,484 cases, the children had never been in a peoples' democracy; lastly, the remaining 2,863 applications were so poorly documented that it was impossible to verify them. All those examples demonstrated beyond a doubt that the Greek Government, having no authentic applications available, had chosen the method of submitting falsified or inaccurate papers in order artificially to inflate the number of children whose repatriation was asked for.

8. In actual fact, it was the Greek Government's attitude which had made repatriation impossible. The Greek Government's aim was to distract public opinion at home and abroad from the events taking place in Greece, from the terrorism prevailing there, and from the merciless persecution of democratic citizens. The Greek children had been sent to the peoples' democracies at the request of their parents, the great majority of them being convinced democrats who had taken part in the struggle of the Greek Army of Liberation and had sought to save their children from death, hunger and terror. Recognition was due to the host countries for the goodwill they had shown and the exemplary way in which they had cared for the children.

9. As regards the living conditions awaiting the Greek children on their return, it was a matter of public knowledge that under Law No. 509, the Greek Government had authority to pass sentence of death on patriots who had fought for peace and democracy; hundreds had been arrested and tens of thousands of prisoners were already languishing in Greek concentration camps. Among those fighters for peace and democracy were to be found most of the parents who had asked the Czechoslovak Government to take care of their children and who were now being compelled by the police to defile the cause for which they had shed their blood and for which their comrades in arms had given their lives.

10. Furthermore, during the negotiations at Prague, Colonel de Meyer, the representative of the League of Red Cross Societies, had stated on 21 February 1950, that the children repatriated to Greece would first be placed in a camp on the island of Samos and then gradually returned to their families. He had repeated that statement on 24 February 1950, but had made it clear that the children would be sent not to camps, but to institutions on Samos. The Czechoslovak Government categorically rejected such a procedure, which was contrary to the General Assembly resolutions and would subjected the children to great suffering, terror and death.

11. In that connexion, Mr. Ullrich quoted a statement by Mrs. Gage-Colby, a United States citizen and per-

manent observer of the International Union for Child Welfare accredited to the United Nations. The statement had been made in writing on 9 January 1952 to the Telepress correspondent accredited to the United Nations. She had stated that in the summer of 1948 she had visited a Greek children's home in Moravia and had found that the children's health was improving rapidly and that it could be seen from photographs taken on their arrival that their recovery was little short of miraculous. The children had been given new clothing and demonstrated great affection for their attendants. In the same statements she had described a visit in 1949 to a number of Greek, government-aided institutions. Nutrition, medical services and living conditions in general were very much below standard. Many young babies were starving to death. She had had the very definite impression that the funds intended for the purchase of food, the upkeep of premises and medical care had been withheld from the children and misappropriated. On at least three occasions she had found evidence of the glaring incapacity and utter irresponsibility of the directors of those institutions. The nurses had given her instances of gross neglect and unbelievable discrimination against babies and children on political grounds. Mrs. Gage-Colby had concluded by saying that in her opinion none of the Greek children who were now in the peoples' democracies, and one or both of whose parents were there, or still in prison or in exile, should be repatriated. She had added that Queen Frederica had repeatedly told the International Union for Child Welfare that she would prefer the Greek children now in the peoples' democracies not to be sent back to Greece, but to some neutral country such as Switzerland or Sweden.

12. Mrs. Gage-Colby's evidence, whose qualifications were indisputable, was not the only one; a few other instances might be quoted. In the camp on the island of Trikkeri there were 573 women, living in conditions of great hardship, though they had never been tried or even charged with an offence. Most of them were accompanied by their children. In the Kifissis prison in Athens there were 200 girls, all under 21 years of age. Although the Union for the Relief of Prisoners and Exiles and their Families was officially recognized and permitted, the President and Secretary had been arrested soon after its establishment. Mr. Ullrich quoted a letter from the mother of an imprisoned boy on Yiura describing the living conditions of the prisoners who were isolated in cells without light or windows, sick and underfed and never allowed a visit from relatives or friends.

13. Cruel persecution of children in Greece and the policy of terror and persecution practised against the fighters for peace and democracy were the reasons why the Greek children had not yet been repatriated. It was understandable from a humane point of view that parents, as far as they were really living in Greece and were neither in prison nor in a concentration camp, hesitated to ask for the repatriation of their children. It was all the more understandable that the parents who were living in the peoples' democracies refused to return to Greece with their children. They knew that children

were taken care of in an exemplary manner in the peoples' democracies. In Czechoslovakia the children were taught in Greek or Macedonian, and school-books and quantities of magazines and books in Greek were available to them. Greek teachers ensured that the children would be brought up to love their homeland and respect its cultural heritage. Their material conditions were excellent and their homes were equipped with all modern conveniences. The children were under careful medical supervision. The representative of the League of Red Cross Societies had, moreover, found, during his visit to Prague in March 1950, that the many Greek mothers living in the peoples' democracies had been surprised to learn that they were supposed to have asked for the repatriation of their children, when they themselves were not even in Greece. They had declared vehemently that they were happy in Czechoslovakia and that they refused to return with their children until Greece was free.

14. It was to be seen, therefore, that the Czechoslovak Peoples' Democratic Republic extended to the Greek children the same privileges, care and love it extended to its own children, whereas on the evidence of an international observer children in Greece were living in conditions of misery and torture. The Czechoslovak Government was still willing to repatriate the Greek children, but under the conditions laid down by the General Assembly resolutions of 1948 and 1949. If they had not yet been repatriated, the entire responsibility rested with the Greek Government which had not been guided by humanitarian considerations but had tried to make use of the repatriation of Greek children in the interests of hostile propaganda against the people's democracies. The Greek Government was not observing the terms of the General Assembly's relevant resolutions, but was subjecting the children to the same methods of brutal terror and persecution as it applied to the fighters for peace and democracy.

15. The Czechoslovak Government rejected the slanders directed against it, and would insist on the strict maintenance of the principles established by the General Assembly resolutions and on the granting of full guarantees for the protection of any children repatriated. The Czechoslovak delegation believed that the Committee would substantially contribute to the settlement of the whole question if it were to appeal to the Greek Government to change its policy and to fulfil the conditions imposed upon it by United Nations resolutions.

16. Mr. VAN HEEMSTRA (Netherlands) stated that the feelings of his Government regarding the question of the repatriation of Greek children remained unchanged. Like most members of the Committee, the Netherlands Government considered that question to be one of the greatest post-war scandals, and it shared the feelings of profound sorrow and sympathy already expressed by various delegations with those children, their families and the great country which seemed obliged to add those child victims to the long list of its sons lost in the supreme effort to defend the country's freedom and independence. His delegation sincerely regretted the almost total lack of co-operation shown by

certain governments which made it appear impossible to find a solution to the problem. It ardently hoped that a solution might be found before the problem solved itself by the simple and shameful fact that the Greek children had ceased to be children and had grown up to be young Bulgarians, Romanians or Hungarians who had lost all ties with their native soil, all love for the parents who had reared them and for the country which had once prided itself on their future citizenship.

17. The Netherlands delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the Dominican Republic, and it fervently hoped that the mediatory work of the Standing Committee on the Repatriation of Greek Children, the International Red Cross Committee and the League of Red Cross Societies would bear fruit and that the governments which had so far frustrated all their efforts would give proof of a spirit of conciliation and co-operation.

18. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) observed that the Belgian representative had concluded his statement at the 55th meeting with an appeal that the discussion might be kept on a purely humanitarian level and that political allusions might be avoided. But the Belgian representative had himself failed to observe the attitude he had recommended, and had attempted in his statement to use the problem of the Greek children's repatriation for obscure political ends. His whole statement had suggested that repatriation of the Greek children and the endeavour to find a solution to the problem had not been his sole object; he had appeared more anxious to advance his own political career by putting the question in a tendentious light. Such an approach did not help to create an atmosphere conducive to fruitful discussion. The problem had to be examined with detachment if a solution were genuinely sought. That was what Mr. Lewandowski himself would try to do.

19. The Polish delegation had made an extensive analysis of the question at previous sessions of the General Assembly. In November 1950 it had proved in the First Committee that the situation in Greece, and the manner in which the lists were drawn up, precluded repatriation along the lines laid down in the resolutions already adopted by the Assembly. The discussion in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee had merely confirmed that view.

20. It was necessary to remember the reasons for the children's evacuation from certain parts of Greece in 1948. The children had been in dangerous areas and threatened with starvation. They had been evacuated with the consent of their parents, who had accompanied them in many cases. The States that had received them had thus performed a humanitarian act.

21. The Polish delegation had always maintained that the children evacuated from Greece must be allowed to rejoin their families; the Committee would remember the statements made by the Polish delegation when resolution 193 C (III) laying down the exact conditions of repatriation was drawn up in 1948. Mr. Lewandowski was sorry to see that those conditions had not been fulfilled; the provisions of the General Assembly resolution had actually been violated, more especially when

the Government in Belgrade had organized the repatriation of a certain number of Greek children with the purpose probably of obtaining concessions from the Greek Government in other matters.

22. The Committee would remember the fears expressed during the discussions in the General Assembly about reprisals against the repatriated children on the part of the Greek authorities. Events had shown, unhappily, that the children had suffered ill-treatment and that young patriots had been sentenced to death for the sole crime of professing democratic opinions. The fears had thus been justified; and it had been found that despite the repeated assurances of the Greek representatives the safety of the repatriated children was by no means certain. There was no guarantee that the children repatriated to Greece would ever see their parents again or that they would not be victimized.

23. The Polish representative said, in concluding, that the return of the Greek children to their families was constantly being hampered by difficulties due to the attitude of certain Member States and of the Red Cross organizations, which were helping the Greek Government to use the repatriation question as an instrument of political propaganda against the host countries. The Committee ought, therefore, to censure the attitude of those who were exploiting the fate of the Greek children for political ends. It was necessary to put the interests of the children above everything else and to refrain from introducing baseless charges into the text of resolutions.

24. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the General Assembly resolutions provided for the return of the Greek children to their families in cases in which the child himself, or its parents or relatives, desired it. The text of those resolutions was unambiguous. But the Greek delegation had tried to give that purely humanitarian question a political twist; and it had also tried to present the question as if it were a matter of a general return of [the children to Greece and not of their return to their families. On 5 December 1950 and 12 November 1951 the Greek representative had stated that he was anxious for the children to return to Greece in order that they might be re-educated before it was too late. Other delegations had tried to present the problem of the children's repatriation in a political light.

25. Such attempts notwithstanding, the Greek children who had found refuge in the peoples' democracies had, in thousands of letters, shown their appreciation of the welcome they had received. The letters very frankly declared the children's intention not to return to Greece so long as the terrorism continued and efforts to protect peace and democracy remained unavailing. Mr. Tsarapkin substantiated his statements by quoting extracts from letters written by pupils at a railway technical school in one of the peoples' democracies, pupils at a medical school and pupils at a metallurgical school. He also quoted from a letter signed by sixteen students at a university in one of the peoples' democracies. He felt that those documents disposed of the malicious accusations and calumnies levelled against the host countries.

26. Responsibility for the delays in the repatriation of the Greek children could not be laid at the door of the governments of the democracies which had given the children refuge. It had been stated at the fifth session that in certain cases responsibility for the delays lay solely with the Greek authorities and the Greek Red Cross, which had supplied lists found subsequently to be incorrect. The USSR delegation had given numerous examples of the falsification of lists. Investigation had shown that certain applications had been forged, while some related to children whose parents were living in the territory of the peoples' democracies, others to people over eighteen years of age, yet others to children who were not in the peoples' democracies. Some children's names, moreover, had appeared on the lists twice. That was why repatriation had been delayed, and under the circumstances there were no grounds for accusing the peoples' democracies.

27. Democrats and former partisans were being victimized by the police in Greece. The Greek children to be repatriated included a large number of children of former Greek partisans and democrats who were being persecuted. The greatest caution therefore was called for in repatriating those children. A group of Greek children repatriated by Yugoslavia in November 1950, for example, had been sent to the Hagios Demetrios concentration camp. Moreover, the international organizations concerned with the repatriation of the Greek children, though they had manifested anxiety for the children to be handed over to the Greek authorities, had not objected to seventy-nine Greek children being sent from Yugoslavia to Australia. Nor had they made any attempt to ensure that Greek children living in Yugoslavia were returned to their parents in cases in which the latter lived in one of the peoples' democracies. He drew attention in that connexion to paragraph 55 of the report of the International Red Cross Committee (A/1932) and to series of communications sent by his Government to the United Nations (A/1969).

28. The problem of the repatriation of Greek children had to be regarded in a purely humanitarian light, and not exploited for political ends. A specific undertaking had to be given that the children repatriated would really rejoin their parents and live with them without being victimized by the police. That was solely a matter for the Greek authorities, not for the host countries.

29. Mr. HOOD (Australia) wished to be as specific as possible in dealing with the question of the repatriation of Greek children. He would not go again over the arguments that had been advanced. The fact that the question of the repatriation of Greek children was being considered under the item entitled "Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece" clearly showed that the problem was the result of a situation that had been before the General Assembly for a considerable time and on which the Assembly had passed judgment. The General Assembly had found that *prima facie* other countries than Greece were responsible for that situation. It was not the intention of those who supported the Dominican Republic's draft resolution to pass any criticism or allot blame. The draft merely requested the countries

concerned to meet together in order to reach a final solution of the problem. If errors had crept into the lists drawn up by the competent authorities, further attempts should be made to correct them. He was therefore in favour of asking a neutral body such as the International Red Cross Committee to undertake the necessary inquiries for ascertaining the truth.

30. Mr. Hood deplored the fact that some of the countries that had received and were harbouring Greek children should, for various reasons, be unwilling to co-operate in a solution of the problem. It was difficult to think of any valid justification for such refusal.

31. He also deeply regretted that the Standing Committee had not been successful, but in view of that Committee's failure, it was difficult to see what other procedure should be adopted.

32. The draft resolution submitted by the Dominican Republic was reasonable because it merely recommended maintenance of the Standing Committee with the same terms of reference and requested all countries harbouring Greek children to take appropriate action for their early return to their homes. Their return could be facilitated by the action of impartial and neutral investigators, provided the latter were authorized to enter the territory of the harbouring countries. Mr. Hood hoped the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee would adopt the draft resolution by a large majority and that the objective in view would be attained with the co-operation of the countries concerned.

33. Mr. SEVILLA SACASA (Nicaragua) recalled that the question of the repatriation of Greek children had been before the General Assembly for three years, and yet it was still unsolved. All attempts by the United Nations and the international Red Cross organizations to settle the problem had failed. Reports from those organizations showed that the national Red Cross societies of the countries harbouring Greek children had not given the competent authorities the co-operation they had expected.

34. Member States of the United Nations could not but feel great uneasiness at the fact that, with the exception of Yugoslavia, no country harbouring Greek children had yet repatriated one of them. His delegation considered that it was imperative for the children to be repatriated. It involved the moral prestige of the United Nations, which must never fail in the pursuit of its humanitarian efforts. His delegation therefore unreservedly supported the Dominican Republic draft resolution which contained proposals likely to bring about a speedy settlement of the problem. It hoped that the draft would be supported by a substantial majority in the Committee.

35. Mr. MAKIEDO (Yugoslavia) wished to reply to the malicious remarks of the representatives of countries which were the very countries that had not only failed to comply with the terms of the General Assembly resolutions but were also trying to prevent other countries from fulfilling them.

36. He mentioned cases of Yugoslav children who had inadvertently strayed into Bulgarian and Romanian

territory and had since been detained by the Governments of those countries, without any information being vouchsafed as to their fate. Again, sixty-three Yugoslav children who were attending school in the Soviet Union were being detained against their will and the will of their parents in that country where they provided the Soviet authorities with a means of bringing pressure to bear on the Yugoslav Government.

37. The CHAIRMAN, interrupting the Yugoslav representative, pointed out that his statement should be kept within the limits prescribed by the right of reply.

38. Mr. MAKIEDO (Yugoslavia), continuing, referred to the communication from the USSR Government to the Secretary-General (A/1969) which the Soviet Union representative had mentioned in his speech. It seemed useless to discuss the substance of that communication and he would confine himself to stating that, contrary to what took place in the countries of the Soviet bloc, every duly qualified person in Yugoslavia had free access to the homes where Greek children were housed. There was, moreover, in Yugoslavia, a representative of the Swedish Red Cross acting on behalf of the international Red Cross organizations, and he had never been a witness to facts such as those mentioned in the documents sent to the President of the General Assembly by the permanent delegation of the Soviet Union to the United Nations.

39. Mr. LAMALLE (Belgium) protested against the Polish representative's allegations against Mr. Van Glabbeke. The Committee's discussions had so far remained dignified—which was a matter for congratulation—and while some fairly lively remarks had been exchanged, they had never been of a personal character. It was regrettable that the Polish representative had thought fit to break that rule of courtesy.

40. Contrary to what the Polish representative had alleged, Mr. Van Glabbeke had had in mind only the sorrow of the poor Greek mothers. He had simply expressed his honest indignation at the lot of the unfortunate Greek children still awaiting repatriation.

41. His delegation once more made a pressing appeal to all countries harbouring Greek children to collaborate without any reservation in solving the problem of their repatriation.

42. Mr. KYROU (Greece) did not propose to reply at length to the statements just made by the Czechoslovak, Polish and USSR representatives because, in accordance with their normal procedure, they had simply repeated word for word the arguments they had been using for the past three years to prevent the repatriation of the Greek children. Furthermore, he had replied in advance to all those arguments in his statement at the 55th meeting, when he had done his best to deal with the question in a purely humanitarian spirit, free from all political and ideological considerations, and avoid any polemics. The Czechoslovak, Polish and USSR representatives had shown once again that they did not wish to discuss the question in a humanitarian spirit, and they had not hesitated to indulge in cheap polemics. The USSR representative—implicating Mr. Politis, head of the Greek delegation to the General

Assembly's fifth session—had maintained that the Greek delegation had stated on that occasion that the Greek Government would subject the children to a process of re-education before returning them to their families. That was quite untrue. The Greek delegation, on the other hand, had already refuted the USSR representative's assertion that the requests for repatriation submitted by Greek families had been extorted under pressure.

43. The arguments which he himself had advanced on the previous day had been based on the report and the memorandum submitted by the international Red Cross organizations. The Polish representative, however, had not hesitated to accuse the International Red Cross Committee and the League of Red Cross Societies of having entered into some sort of conspiracy with the Greek Government to prevent the children's return.

44. As for the allegations regarding inaccuracies in the lists of children to be repatriated, obviously some errors might have crept into the lists. It was also quite possible that some applications might not have been drawn up in due form, but it would be easy for the national Red Cross societies of the countries harbouring the children to get in touch with the international Red Cross organizations on those points.

45. It was quite untrue to allege, as the USSR representative had done, that certain Greek children repatriated from Yugoslavia had been put in a concentration camp. The third general report of the international Red Cross organizations (A/1932) stated that all the children repatriated from Yugoslavia had been handed over to their parents a few days after their arrival in Greece. It was also quite untrue to allege, as the Polish representative had done, that there were 15,000 Greek children in concentration camps in Greece.

46. The Soviet Union representative had drawn attention to certain letters which were supposed to have been sent by Greek children studying in vocational training schools in the USSR. He had however failed to mention some 8,000 Greek children who were being held against their will in Soviet military schools.

47. In conclusion, Mr. Kyrou urged the members of the Committee to support the draft resolution submitted by the Dominican Republic so that it might be adopted by an overwhelming majority.

48. Miss STRAUSS (United States of America), exercising the right of reply accorded by rule 114 of the rules of procedure and referring to the Czechoslovak representative's statement, pointed out that the official reports of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans and the International Red Cross had made it clear that the repatriation of the Greek children had been carried out under perfectly satisfactory conditions. Moreover, the moral issue—that the Greek children should be returned to their families—was more important than the material issue and, consequently, the question of the physical conditions in which the children were living in Greece or elsewhere was a minor point.

49. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that, in

the first paragraph of the preamble and paragraph 4 of the operative part of the Russian text of the draft resolution submitted by the Dominican Republic the word "interned" was used in connexion with the Greek children. That term had never been used before and he asked to which children it referred.

50. Mr. SALAZAR (Dominican Republic) said that the original text in Spanish of his draft resolution used the expression "*niños internados*" but, in the French text, the word "*hébergés*", which corresponded to the English "harboured" should be used, and an equivalent expression should be found for the Russian text.

51. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) protested emphatically against the wording of the telegram addressed to the President of the General Assembly by Mrs. Anna Pauker, Foreign Minister of Romania. According to that telegram, the General Assembly had violated its own previous decisions by setting up, by its resolution of 1 December 1950, the Standing Committee in order to use the question of the Greek children to promote a slander campaign against the countries harbouring them. Mr. Lopez felt he was speaking both for the other members of the Standing Committee and for himself in saying that that Committee had acted with all due objectivity and impartiality and its sole purpose had been to facilitate the repatriation of Greek children on the basis of the highest principles of justice and humanity. If the Committee was retained, it would continue its efforts in that direction.

52. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by the Dominican Republic (A/AC.53/L.51), incorporating the drafting change previously indicated.

The draft resolution was adopted by 44 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

53. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had abstained from voting for three reasons. Firstly, the first paragraph of the preamble implied an unwarranted accusation against the countries harbouring the Greek children. Secondly, paragraph 4 of the operative part stated that those countries had declined to enter into consultations with the Standing Committee, whereas their real reason for not wishing to collaborate with the Greek authorities and the international Red Cross organizations had been that those authorities had submitted falsified lists of the children to be repatriated. Finally, paragraph 7 of the operative part of the draft resolution contained a decision to continue the Standing Committee with the same terms of reference, while the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in 1948 and 1949 laid down a definite procedure which made it the duty of the national Red Cross societies to facilitate the repatriation of the Greek children. The Standing Committee established in 1950 was merely another cog in the machinery of repatriation and was not calculated to help in disposing of the problem. The only parts of the draft resolution which his delegation might have supported were the second paragraph of the preamble and paragraph 8 of the operative part. As the draft resolution had been

put to the vote as a whole, his delegation had therefore had to abstain from voting.

54. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Greek draft resolution (A/AC.53/L.52) concerning the repatriation of all those members of the Greek armed forces detained by partisans who expressed the wish to be repatriated.

55. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, observed that that question was not on the agenda. It came under item 19 (a) of the General Assembly's agenda, the discussion on which had long been completed. If the Greek representative had wanted to raise the question, he should have done so when the report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans was under consideration. His proposal was therefore out of order now.

56. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) supported the USSR representative's views.

57. The CHAIRMAN quoted a passage from the verbatim record of the Committee's 7th meeting, held on 26 November 1951, at which the Greek representative had said that, with regard to the members of the Greek armed forces captured by Greek guerrillas and removed to the territories of the northern neighbours of Greece, his delegation would like to see the question discussed apart from political polemics. It had therefore reserved the right to revert to the matter when the Committee had completed discussion of the question of the repatriation of Greek children. The delegation of El Salvador had made a similar statement at the same meeting. Furthermore, the agenda item under consideration by the Committee was entitled "Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece: (a) Report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans; (b) Repatriation of Greek children".

58. The General Assembly, at its fifth session, and under the same agenda item, had considered not only the report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans and the question of the repatriation of Greek children, but also the problem of the Greek prisoners of war and had adopted resolution 382 A (V) on that question.

59. In his view, the Committee was perfectly in order in considering the Greek draft resolution, unless the majority decided otherwise.

60. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that neither the reservations previously made by the Greek representative nor the statements made at that time by the representative of El Salvador authorized the Committee to deal with a question not connected with the repatriation of Greek children. The Committee had completed discussion of item 19 (a) and now had merely to dispose of item 19 (b). Moreover, the agenda for the current meeting published in the *United Nations Journal* for 30 January 1952 indicated only the item "Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece: repatriation of Greek children". The Greek draft resolution was therefore out of order. If the Greek representative wanted the item included in the agenda, he must follow

the normal procedure which was to submit it to the General Committee, which would make recommendations to the General Assembly ; it would then be for the latter to take a decision.

61. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) thought that three questions were involved : first, whether the Greek draft resolution came under the agenda item, " Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece " ; second, whether the Committee could at the current session discuss the question raised by the Greek representative ; and, third, whether the Committee could discuss the Greek draft resolution at the current meeting.

62. As regards the first question, there seemed to be no doubt that the draft resolution did come under agenda item 19 (a).

63. With regard to the second question, it would be appropriate to know what decision the Committee had

taken when deferring consideration of the matter and whether the Committee's silence when the Greek and Salvadorean representatives had expressed their reservations, could be taken to mean that it had tacitly decided to revert to the question later on.

64. Lastly, as regards the third point, the USSR representative appeared to be right, since the agenda for the current meeting provided only for consideration of the question of the repatriation of Greek children, and the topic raised in the Greek draft resolution clearly did not relate to the repatriation of Greek children.

65. It therefore appeared that the Committee could not consider the Greek proposal at that meeting, still less vote on it.

66. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee would meet at 10.30 a.m. on the following day.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.