



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 14:	
Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (<i>concluded</i>)	133
Agenda item 10:	
Human rights	135
Agenda item 12:	
Programme of advisory services in the field of human rights	136

President: Mr. George F. DAVIDSON (Canada).

Present:

Representatives of the following States: Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Finland, France, Greece, Indonesia, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia.

Observers for the following Member States: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Laos, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain.

Observers for the following non-member States: Federal Republic of Germany, Holy See, Switzerland.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

AGENDA ITEM 14

Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (E/3138 and Add.1, E/L.804, E/L. 805) (*concluded*)

1. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would reserve its detailed comments on the High Commissioner's report (E/3138 and Add.1) until the report was discussed by the General Assembly at its next session.

2. His delegation still held that voluntary repatriation should be the principal method of dealing with the problem of displaced persons and refugees. Although the High Commissioner, in his report, promised to continue to assist in the repatriation of refugees who expressed a desire for it, the report contained no statement to suggest that that method formed the basis of the High Commissioner's efforts. As could be seen from annexes II and III to the report, the Executive Committee had not considered the question at all. It was nevertheless the duty both of the High Commissioner himself and of the governments of the countries in which the refugees were living to provide every displaced person and refugee with

the opportunity of repatriation and to help them in it. To detain refugees by force, or to place obstacles in the way of their repatriation, would only increase international tension.

3. The High Commissioner and the Executive Committee could most suitably use the funds at their disposal in two ways. First, they could provide material assistance to those who expressed a desire for repatriation. It was essential that the High Commissioner should devote continuous effort to discovering which refugees wished to be repatriated. Second, they could help in settling persons who had not yet decided that they wished to be repatriated. The documents before the Council did not suggest that the High Commissioner and the Executive Committee were basing their financial policy on those two approaches.

4. The Soviet Union admitted all Soviet citizens who desired repatriation. Every year it received a large number of persons who had been displaced during the Second World War and provided them with housing and work according to their qualifications. Such persons were restored to full possession of their social and civic rights.

5. Many pages in the High Commissioner's report were devoted to the question of the Hungarian refugees. To resolve that problem as quickly as possible, the High Commissioner and the countries concerned should regard it as their main responsibility to assist in the repatriation of such refugees. It was essential that all children who had been left behind in foreign countries without their parents, or without their parents' consent, should be returned to Hungary.

6. The Executive Committee had continued to deal with what was described as the problem of "Chinese refugees in Hong Kong". The Soviet Union representatives had stated their opinion on that question on several occasions. The United Nations and its organs had no right to discuss that matter or to adopt any resolutions relating to it since the Chinese citizens in question were not refugees at all. Discussion of the matter either in the Executive Committee or in the Council, especially without the participation of the representatives of the People's Republic of China, who were the only representatives of China, was an act of outright interference in the domestic affairs of the People's Republic of China.

7. Mrs. LEIVO-LARSSON (Finland) said that, although her government had provided some assistance for the Arab refugees and although the Finnish Red Cross Society, with government support, had provided occasional assistance for many refugees, Finland had unfortunately been unable to make any financial contribution to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner,

owing to economic difficulties. Nor was her delegation able to promise contributions in the future.

8. It would like to support the Netherlands draft resolution (E/L.805), but was not prepared to express its views on the subject at present, because it was not quite sure what the financial implications would be. Finland had a large number of evacuees to take care of and was faced with the task of providing for a growing population in a small area. Her government was very glad that the leased area in southern Finland had been restored to Finland by the Soviet Union many years earlier than had been expected, but its restoration had entailed certain additional economic burdens in connexion with the recultivation of the land, the reconstruction of farms and the return of the former inhabitants.

9. Mr. TATTENBACH (Costa Rica) said that, although his country had no refugee problem, it none the less viewed the political refugees and their problems with sympathy and understanding. His delegation accordingly wished to express its satisfaction with the work done for refugees by the United Nations and, in particular, with the High Commissioner's report and his statement to the Council (1040th meeting). The High Commissioner's devotion and competence had already borne fruit in practical achievements, not least among which were solutions to refugee problems in Austria and Yugoslavia.

10. Mr. SUBARDJO (Indonesia) said that his government was unfortunately not in a position to give material assistance to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. His delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 1166 (XII) on the understanding that in so doing it would not be assuming any moral or legal obligations with respect to material support. It would be able to support the Netherlands draft resolution on the same understanding. Though the refugee problem was a humanitarian one, it sprang from political tensions, and he hoped there would soon be an improvement in the international situation to simplify its solution.

11. The PRESIDENT declared the general debate closed. He invited the Council to consider the Netherlands draft resolution and the draft resolution submitted jointly by Greece and the United States of America on the executive committee of the programme (E/L.804).

12. Mr. van THIEL (Netherlands) thought that his delegation's draft resolution was a logical sequel to the general debate. He hoped that the delegations of Greece and the United States of America would not object to its being voted on first.

13. Section A required no explanation. Section B reproduced the terms of General Assembly resolution 1166 (XII), and contained provisions designed to bring in the funds which would enable the High Commissioner to complete his camp-closure programme.

14. The Netherlands delegation hoped the draft resolution would command unanimous support.

15. Mr. UQUAILI (Pakistan) also asked that the Netherlands draft resolution should be voted on first. The need for early resettlement of the refugees was

universally recognized. Pakistan had its own economic problems and its resources were already considerably strained. With that observation in mind, his delegation would be happy to vote for the Netherlands draft resolution.

16. The PRESIDENT said that if the suggestion by the Netherlands and Pakistani delegations was acceptable to the Council, he would put the Netherlands draft resolution to the vote first.

The Netherlands draft resolution (E/L.805) was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

17. Mr. MELLER CONRAD (Poland) observed that his government's attitude towards the refugee problem was so well known that it was hardly necessary for him to restate it. He wished merely to point out that his abstention in the vote on the Netherlands draft resolution was in no way intended as a reflection on the High Commissioner, whom his delegation held in the highest esteem.

18. Mr. El BAKRI (Sudan) said that his delegation's affirmative vote should be interpreted as a mark of its sympathy with and appreciation of the work of the High Commissioner's Office. Sudan's economic position, however, was such that it would be unable to make any financial contribution to that work.

19. Mr. RIOSECO (Chile) explained that he had been unable to vote on the Netherlands draft resolution because the text had been circulated so late that he had not had time to consult the head of his delegation about its financial implications.

20. Mr. TATTENBACH (Costa Rica) explained that, though most sympathetic to the work of the High Commissioner's Office, his delegation had been obliged to abstain from the vote on the Netherlands draft resolution for reasons similar to those given by the Chilean representative.

21. The PRESIDENT said that, if no representative wished to speak, he would put the joint Greek and United States draft resolution to the vote.

22. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that at the eighth session of the UNREF Executive Committee his delegation had abstained from voting on the resolution recommending the Council to consider the desirability of increasing the membership of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees from twenty-four to twenty-five (E/3138/Add.1, annex III). For a number of reasons, it did not consider such a step desirable at the moment. First, the Council's decision (resolution 672 (XXV)) that the Executive Committee should consist of twenty-four members had been taken only three months previously; secondly, the Committee had not yet begun its work. On those grounds alone, an immediate change in its composition seemed unwarranted. In addition, there was a positive advantage in leaving a vacant place on the committee against the eventuality of a new and unforeseen refugee crisis in another part of the world. Again, his delegation was not convinced that the new committee, as at present constituted, failed

to meet the request in General Assembly resolution 1166 (XII) that the members should be elected on the widest possible geographical basis from those States with a demonstrated interest in, and devotion to, the solution of the refugee problem. Since the majority of problems falling within the High Commissioner's mandate concerned Europe, it was only natural that there should be a predominance of members from Europe.

23. Furthermore, while the UNREF Executive Committee's resolution had recommended that the Council should consider the desirability of increasing the committee's membership from twenty-four to twenty-five, the draft resolution submitted by Greece and the United States of America assumed the Council's approval of that recommendation and then went on to nominate the Republic of China for the vacancy. In his view, the Council should limit its action to a simple decision on whether or not a twenty-fifth seat should be created. If it decided in the affirmative, the election for the vacant seat could, if need be, be held at the resumed twenty-sixth session, in New York, thus allowing time to bring forward any other States with a demonstrated interest in and devotion to the solution of the refugee problem — a qualification which, incidentally, was not referred to in the joint draft resolution.

24. His delegation was accordingly opposed to the joint draft resolution, particularly as the text embodied a decision which, in its view, it would be wrong in principle to take at the present juncture. It therefore requested the Council, in accordance with rule 66 of the rules of procedure, to take no decision on the substance of the proposal at the present session.

25. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) said that he found the arguments advanced by the United Kingdom representative unconvincing. It was clear from statements made by the present High Commissioner that, like his predecessor, he did not consider the scope of his activities to be limited to any particular part of the world. Yet, as at present constituted, the Executive Committee of the Programme represented almost every part of the world except Asia.

26. He failed to see that the omission of any direct reference in the draft resolution to States with a demonstrated interest in and devotion to the solution of the refugee problem was in any way serious, since the references to General Assembly resolution 1166 (XII) and Council resolution 672 (XXV) covered the point implicitly if not explicitly.

27. He would urge the Council not to defer action on the substance of the proposal, since the participation of the Republic of China in the new committee's work would permit the High Commissioner's Office to handle any foreseeable emergency, and should any new crisis arise the General Assembly would, he was convinced, act with due promptitude to make any necessary changes in the High Commissioner's mandate.

28. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) said he agreed with the United Kingdom representative that consideration of the question dealt with in the joint draft resolution should be deferred; in the Polish delegation's opinion, however, it should be deferred not until the resumed

session, towards the end of 1958, but until the Council's thirty-first session, in conformity with the provisions of operative paragraph 1 (c) of Council resolution 672 (XXV).

29. He would therefore be unable to vote for the draft resolution if it were put to the vote.

30. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) wished to make it clear that he was proposing, not that the matter should be taken up at the resumed twenty-sixth session, but that no decision of substance should be taken at the present session. It was for the Council to decide separately, in accordance with its normal procedure, if and when the item should be placed on the agenda again.

31. In accordance with rule 66 of the rules of procedure, the PRESIDENT put to the vote the United Kingdom representative's procedural motion that no decision should be taken at the present session on the draft resolution submitted by Greece and the United States of America.

The motion was rejected by 10 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

32. The PRESIDENT put the joint draft resolution to the vote.

The joint draft resolution (E/L.804) was adopted by 10 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Human rights

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/3160 and Corr.2)

33. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote separately on draft resolutions A to F contained in the report of the Social Committee (E/3160 and Corr.2), taking last draft resolution A, which merely requested it to take note of the report of the Commission on Human Rights on its fourteenth session (E/3088).

B. TEACHING OF THE PRINCIPLES OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Draft resolution B was adopted unanimously.

C. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Draft resolution C was adopted unanimously.

D. YEARBOOK ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Draft resolution D was adopted unanimously.

E. SECOND CONFERENCE OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS INTERESTED IN THE ERADICATION OF PREJUDICE AND DISCRIMINATION

Draft resolution E was adopted unanimously.

F. TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADOPTION OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Draft resolution F was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

A. REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS (FOURTEENTH SESSION)

Draft resolution A was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 12

**Programme of advisory services
in the field of human rights**

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/3163)

34. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution appearing in paragraph 5 of the Social Committee's report (E/3163).

The draft resolution was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

35. Mr. VUKMANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that, in the Social Committee's debate on advisory services in the field of human rights, the Yugoslav delegation (382nd meeting) had urged the Council to study not only the possibility of organizing international seminars but also that of the participation in regional seminars of

representatives of countries outside the region in which the particular seminar was held. Although the draft resolution in the Committee's report had not taken his delegation's wishes into consideration, he had nevertheless voted for it because the existing methods of work and organization of seminars might assist the countries in the regions in which the seminars were held.

36. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) said that he had abstained from voting on the draft resolution for the reasons which he had explained in the Social Committee (384th meeting). At that juncture, he could do no more than state the Polish delegation's view that the rejection of its proposal (E/AC.7/L.315) to enable countries not in the regions in which the seminars were held to send observers to those seminars was not calculated to further international co-operation and understanding.

The meeting rose at 3.50 p.m.