



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 11:	
Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (<i>concluded</i>)	185
Agenda item 8:	
Report of the Commission on Human Rights	188

President: Sir Douglas COPLAND (Australia).

Present:

The representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Australia, China, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, India, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Observers from the following Member States: Canada, Colombia, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Mexico.

Observers from the following non-member States: Federal Republic of Germany, Spain.

The representative of the following specialized agency: International Labour Organisation.

AGENDA ITEM 11

Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (E/2746 and Corr.1, E/2746/Add.1 and Corr.2, E/L.648) (*continued*)

1. Mr. ABDEL-GHANI (Egypt) was prepared to support the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Australia, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom (E/L.684). He hoped that the Council's appeal on behalf of the refugees under the High Commissioner's mandate would meet with a generous response from those Governments which were able to contribute to the United Nations Refugee Fund (UNREF); other Governments concerned with refugee problems of their own would certainly lend their moral support.

2. The two methods of liquidating the refugee problem suggested in the draft resolution—emigration and integration—could not be used without international assistance. Emigration was an excellent solution and deserved encouragement. Integration could not be achieved out of domestic resources alone; it required international assistance, especially financial assistance in re-settlement. Both solutions were suited to the problems of European refugees, but the United Nations should bear in mind the fact that other groups of refugees called for other

solutions, and, indeed, that each group needed to be dealt with on its own merits.

3. It was true that repatriation would be the ideal solution, provided it was freely and voluntarily accepted. It would be inhuman to force any group to go back to a country where its members might be persecuted. Where repatriation was impossible, other solutions would have to be sought. The lowest common denominator of all solutions was international response, since refugees were always the direct victims of international dislocation. The United Nations had recognized that in its very first resolution relating to refugees—General Assembly resolution 8 (I).

4. In addition to the Arab refugees in Egypt, 200,000 of whom were packed into the Gaza strip, there were about 4,000 European refugees. The Egyptian Government had agreed to the establishment in Cairo of a branch of the High Commissioner's Office, and the Egyptian authorities were helping to solve the European refugees' problems. Scores had been helped to emigrate in 1955. The integration of European refugees in Egypt was not feasible, in view of the overwhelming burden of the Arab refugees. The Egyptian authorities were providing facilities for emigration, including the right to return to Egypt within two years if the refugee could not re-settle successfully elsewhere.

5. Mr. MONTOYA (Venezuela) observed that the High Commissioner's report (E/2746) was clear and concise, but was pitched in a somewhat pessimistic key inspired by the fear that there might not be enough money to carry out the projects in full, especially those concerning the European refugees still in camps. It was to be hoped that the improvement in Europe's economic situation would enable more refugees to be integrated. In Venezuela, as in most Latin American countries, the concept of "refugee" was unknown. Once a refugee had been admitted to the country, he found himself on an equal footing with any other immigrant. Thus the 21,000 refugees who had entered Venezuela had no special legal or political status. The High Commissioner reported that about 2,500 had become Venezuelan citizens. That figure had already been exceeded, and was likely to increase greatly in the near future, because the Venezuelan Congress had enacted legislation making naturalization procedures very much simpler. That process had become general throughout Latin America, and the fact that there were still countries into which refugees could immigrate easily should encourage the High Commissioner in his task.

6. His delegation would abstain from the vote on the first operative paragraph of the draft resolution. It did not dispute the fact that the international community bore a responsibility for helping refugees; but it believed

that that responsibility should be properly apportioned. Venezuela had accepted its share by admitting as many refugees as it could, and was continuing to do so. Immigration schemes were strictly a matter of domestic jurisdiction. The best method of promoting the immigration of refugees would be direct negotiations between the High Commissioner and the Governments concerned, in collaboration with the Inter-Governmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM) and the voluntary agencies working for refugees. He would also abstain on the second operative paragraph, since it was not for the Council to urge countries to contribute to UNREF.

7. Holding, as it did, the view that the responsibility for an humanitarian problem should be equitably apportioned, the Venezuelan Government believed that there were other countries which, for many reasons, should be more directly concerned than itself with the refugee problem. It had abstained from attending the first session of the UNREF Executive Committee because it believed that it might be more appropriately replaced on that body by a Government which was more directly interested in the solution of the refugee problem. Venezuela had been elected almost automatically to the Executive Committee at the Council's nineteenth session¹ and had acquiesced in the election only because its delegation had lacked specific instructions.

8. Mr. VIRA (India) said that India approached the refugee problem with the greatest sympathy, because it had to deal with some eight million refugees of its own, on whose rehabilitation it had already spent some \$600 million. Thus its resources were committed to the utmost. Accordingly, much as it sympathized with the plight of refugees elsewhere, it could not contribute to UNREF, and therefore could not vote for the draft resolution, for it would find it embarrassing to urge others to do what it could not manage itself. He would therefore abstain from the vote.

9. Mr. RONCAROLO (Argentina) drew attention to the contribution his country had made towards the solution of the refugee problem by admitting a very large number of refugees and granting them the same privileges as Argentine citizens, except for the exercise of civil rights. Although he appreciated the laudable motives that had inspired the submission of the draft resolution, he would have to abstain from the vote on it.

10. Mr. HARRY (Australia) wished to pay a particular tribute to ICEM with regard to the assistance it had given with the special fund for Trieste. Had ICEM been a United Nations body, he would have suggested that the tribute be incorporated in the draft resolution.

11. The High Commissioner, at the 888th meeting, had been rather too emphatic in his warning of the dangers of special funds such as that for Trieste. Admittedly, such funds created difficulties and tended to upset the comprehensive system of priorities; and it was also true that everything should be done to avoid raising unfounded hopes among the refugees. That, however, was a general problem, common to all refugee projects.

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Nineteenth Session*, 837th meeting, para. 14.

The special fund for Trieste had been established because the contributing Governments had felt that the circumstances warranted the giving of priority to the problem of refugees in that area. The fact that those funds had been made available would relieve the High Commissioner of the responsibility for making a special effort there, and would release money for other areas. If funds were made available, opportunities would be created not only for the difficult cases, but also for other refugees, through the allocation of sponsorships by the voluntary agencies concerned. If the High Commissioner required advice, it might be to the effect that funds should be available before a project was initiated. It would depend on the particular case whether the funds would be better administered by ICEM or by the High Commissioner, but once Governments had put up the money the two agencies must co-ordinate their efforts. He hoped that the High Commissioner would not stand aside in such cases, but would co-operate in working out satisfactory arrangements. The subject was complex and would be more appropriately discussed by the UNREF Executive Committee than by the Council. If the High Commissioner required immediate guidance, the matter could be discussed in September by the Executive Committee's standing Programme Sub-Committee.

12. Mr. ENNALS (World Federation of United Nations Associations), speaking at the invitation of the PRESIDENT, said that WFUNA was only too well aware that the refugee problem had been on the Council's agenda from the very outset. It had every sympathy with the High Commissioner's efforts to find a final solution to that problem. The 300,000 refugees in Europe whose problems had not yet been solved were few by comparison with the millions in the under-developed countries in need of United Nations assistance, but the organization had accepted responsibility for them, and the Governments and agencies concerned must accordingly do their utmost to solve the problem. Of the three possible solutions—repatriation, migration and integration—the first had disposed of but few refugees, although the present relaxation of political tension might possibly lead to more refugees being repatriated or at any rate to fewer persons becoming refugees. Migration was undoubtedly a popular solution with the refugees themselves, but it was a costly one. He agreed that there was a danger in raising false hopes that all refugees might eventually be able to migrate, but hoped that the Governments of the countries of immigration and ICEM would give the High Commissioner all possible assistance. Economic integration, either in the country where the refugees were or in neighbouring countries, was also a good solution. WFUNA appreciated the efforts of west European and other countries to that end, and the High Commissioner's emphasis on integration as the most feasible solution.

13. The financial situation was distressing. It was to be hoped that the Governments which had pledged contributions to UNREF would honour their pledges. WFUNA welcomed the spirit of the draft resolution, as it seemed a step towards a final solution. Many non-governmental organizations had been able to help the High Commissioner and to receive help from

him. WFUNA was doing what it could in connexion with legal protection, refugees in the Far East and camp schemes, but the refugees' plight was essentially an inter-governmental concern.

14. Mr. van HEUVEN GOEDHART (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees) said that the Czechoslovak representative, at the 888th meeting, had cited two General Assembly resolutions (8 (I) and 62 (I)); however, those resolutions were not directed to his Office, which was governed solely by its Statute. There were only two references in the Statute to repatriation. One was to the effect that his Office should, when possible, help to facilitate voluntary repatriation; that it was continuing to do, and he had never failed to take every possible step whenever a refugee had expressed a desire to be repatriated. The other reference was negative, to the effect that the High Commissioner's Office should not engage in repatriation without a specific decision to that effect by the General Assembly; no such decision had ever been taken.

15. The United Kingdom representative, at the 888th meeting, had cast doubt on the usefulness of counselling. The High Commissioner's Office, however, felt that in the prevailing circumstances counselling was of extreme importance, since many cases remained which, although not technically "difficult cases", were giving rise to difficulty. Refugees who had spent a very long time in camps became apathetic about their future and needed sound advice. Counselling for emigration and counselling for integration were two distinct operations. A counsellor for emigration needed to talk with the refugees, to tell him about the kinds of country he could go to and what possibilities they offered. Integration was a very different matter. The counsellor needed a thorough knowledge of the language and economy of the country of integration, and of the employment pattern into which the refugee could fit. Such counselling called for a profound knowledge of the conditions, circumstances and possibilities of the area concerned. His Office would be most strict in its selection of counsellors, who would need a good professional background.

16. He would also strongly urge the usefulness of aid to students. When a young man who had nearly completed his studies was prevented from doing so because he became a refugee under the High Commissioner's mandate, he lost the opportunities to which he had a right. There was no intention to finance students who wished to begin their studies, but only to help those who were on the way to graduation. Everything possible should be done to prevent refugees from sliding down the social ladder. The tragedy of a highly educated person compelled to earn a bare living with his hands was not always sufficiently appreciated, and his office was anxious to prevent such disasters.

17. The United Kingdom representative had also referred to the Austrian naturalization project. That was a modest scheme to meet half the cost for refugees who would otherwise not be able to afford naturalization. The plan had not yet been discussed in detail by the UNREF Executive Committee.

18. The Australian representative had raised the question of the special fund for Trieste. It was always a

matter for satisfaction when funds were made available for assistance to a specific category of refugees, but in the interest of co-ordination an organization entrusted with certain particular work should not be asked to do something different. ICEM had no special constitutional responsibility for the difficult cases, whereas his Office was required to deal with them under the specific terms of the Statute. He would stress that point, because he would like to see added to the advice suggested by the Australian representative the proviso that full co-ordination should at all times be ensured. That had not been the case with the special fund for Trieste, as he had been unable to agree with ICEM's method of administering it, and had felt that any agreement about difficult cases should first be concluded with the Governments immediately concerned. He hoped that whenever further funds were made available there would be appropriate consultation, and that account would be taken of precisely what role each agency was to play.

19. He had gone closely into the difficulties about the UNREF target, which had been causing him deep concern. Of the non-member States from which contributions might be expected, only three—Switzerland, the Holy See and the Republic of Korea—had in fact contributed, although most of the other twenty-three non-member States had valid reasons for not doing so. Unfortunately, he had no reason to suppose that any non-member States other than those which had already contributed would give any appreciable assistance in the future. Of the sixty States Members of the United Nations, thirteen had contributed, the rest having claimed good reasons for not doing so.

20. The Venezuelan representative had rightly stated that contributions could also take the form of admitting refugee immigrants. If each Latin American country could see its way to accepting a reasonable number of refugee families, the problem would be virtually solved. He would take good note of the Venezuelan representative's suggestion that he should approach the Latin American Governments, which had been most helpful in the past, to see whether there was any possibility of reaching an agreement on the admission of more refugees.

21. Such assistance did not, however, qualify for the matching system, which, unfortunately, was gaining ground. Sweden had admitted sixty difficult tuberculosis cases and their dependants with no contribution from UNREF. That was most commendable, but it was not a contribution that could be matched, since it could not be evaluated in exact figures. When a country voluntarily accepted difficult cases free of charge, it did so for a certain number of years. If the cost was broken down for each of those years, the matching contribution would add up to a considerable figure. Unfortunately, the matching system always ignored the past. Some countries had contributed to UNREF; others had not; and when countries made their initial contribution under the matching system they failed to take into account the previous years in which they had contributed nothing while others had borne all the burden. Still, contributions under the matching system were far better than no contributions at all. The United Kingdom representative's announcement that Parliament had approved a contribution of which 20 per cent would be under the

matching system and 80 per cent not under it was most welcome.

22. The Australian representative had drawn attention to the difficulties that would arise if the target figure was not reached. A striking instance of such difficulties was provided by the case in which funds were immediately available in the country of asylum so that the project could be put into operation if they were matched immediately. If that was not possible, there was no certainty that the money would still be available the following year. That kind of difficulty was perhaps greatest in federal States, where the constituent members had pressing budgetary problems and could not hold funds over until the following year. Thus there was every reason for concern about the 1955 target, and unless some country started the flow it would not be reached. He must be forgiven some pessimism, because there was no conceivable way in which he could be certain that the programme approved by the General Assembly at its ninth session could be put into effect.

23. His Office must, however, see the matter through and was endeavouring to do so. The UNREF Executive Committee had met for the first time only two months previously, but as a result of the effective procedures adopted it had been able to approve many projects under the new programme, many of which were already being carried out. Ten housing projects totalling 247 small apartments for 1,000 refugees had already been completed, and within six weeks 159 more apartments would be made available for a further 600 refugees. Counselling, emergency assistance, medical insurance and emergency feeding were being vigorously pursued, and the solution of 253 of the most difficult cases was nearing completion.

24. The refugees, however, could not wait. Over the past four and a half years, some headway had been made; there were still three and a half years more in which to complete his Office's programme. He earnestly hoped that the countries which had approved that programme would see that the money was forthcoming. The refugees knew about the programme, and hoped and trusted that the United Nations would not disappoint them. It was now for Governments to see that their hopes were not frustrated.

25. The PRESIDENT drew attention to two amendments, which had been accepted by the authors, to the draft resolution (E/L.684). In the third paragraph of the preamble, the words "by Governments" should be inserted after the words "made so far". In the first operative paragraph, the words "a reasonable number of" should be inserted between the words "continue to include" and "such refugees".

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 9 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions.

26. Mr. PLEIĆ (Yugoslavia), explaining his delegation's attitude, said that the reason why it had not taken part in the debate on the High Commissioner's report was that it preferred not to start a discussion on those activities of the High Commissioner's Office which were not mentioned in the report but of which his delegation could not help being aware. Today, there were brighter prospects on the international horizon for the solution of

contentious problems which for years had been envenoming relations between nations. The turn towards compromise and agreement had already produced tangible results in the examination of questions which had previously been bones of contention. Thus the refugee problem should have profited by the new climate and the potentialities of the changed international scene. There were many humanitarian, social, economic and political reasons militating in favour of a final settlement of the fate of some hundreds of thousands of refugees. Yet the High Commissioner's activities continued to be a source of perpetual conflict. The High Commissioner's Office was one of the very few international bodies which had not succeeded in enlisting the co-operation of all States or of all interested parties. That was a source of constant anxiety for all those who were anxious to see international understanding develop. His delegation urged the members of the Council and the High Commissioner alike to ponder that fact. It had not voted for the draft resolution because it was not prepared to give its support to a policy which tended to become an anachronism in international life today.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Report of the Commission on Human Rights

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/2781)

27. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the report of the Social Committee (E/2781) on the report of the eleventh session of the Commission on Human Rights (E/2731 and Corr.1).

28. Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom), referring to paragraph 3 of the Social Committee's report, recalled that he had suggested in the Committee that, in view of general United Nations policy on publications and bibliographies, it would be inappropriate to proceed with the bibliographical index of works and studies relating to human rights that the Commission on Human Rights wished to have included in the *Yearbook on Human Rights*. The proposed new section containing statements furnished by Governments on specific rights or categories of rights might be included in the 1955 *Yearbook* on a provisional basis. The situation could be reviewed at the end of the year in the light of any additional costs or staff, or increase in the bulk of the *Yearbook*.

29. Mr. VIRA (India) said that the Social Committee had been divided on the question. While some members had shared the views expressed by the United Kingdom representative, others had felt that the Commission's recommendations should be accepted *in toto*. The bibliographical index would be a very helpful feature, and the additional expenditure was relatively small. He would therefore oppose the suggestion that the bibliography be omitted. He would have no objection to the new section in the *Yearbook* being included on a provisional basis.

30. Mr. HARRY (Australia) believed that the Social Committee had not intended the Council to take any action on paragraph 3 of its report, but had merely wished to inform the Council that there had been a divergence of view about the *Yearbook*. There had been general agreement, however, that the new section should

be reviewed after a trial period, perhaps at the thirteenth session of the Commission on Human Rights as the Commission itself had suggested, or alternatively rather earlier.

31. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) endorsed the Secretary-General's suggestion that the bibliographical index should be omitted from the *Yearbook*. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) had a great deal of material on human rights and much experience in bibliographical matters, and might be able to take over some of the work. That possibility could be discussed by the Co-ordination Committee.

32. Mr. CHENG Paonan (China) said that his delegation had supported the Commission's recommendations in the Social Committee. He saw no reason why the matter should be referred to the Co-ordination Committee; the Council need only take note of paragraph 3 of the report. It would be quite reasonable to review the new section in the *Yearbook*, provided that were done at the Commission's thirteenth session. In the meantime, the Secretariat was bound to respect the Commission's decisions and to carry out its directives until such time as the Commission itself amended them.

33. Mr. DONS (Norway) said that a matter of principle was at stake. The Secretary-General had said very clearly that he was opposed to the Commission's recommendations. He (Mr. Dons) formally proposed that the matter referred to in paragraph 3 of the Social Committee's report be referred to the Co-ordination Committee. There were precedents for such a course.

34. Mr. FOMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) opposed the Norwegian representative's suggestion. The matter had been discussed at length in the Social Committee, whose members were well aware of the contents of the *Yearbook* and competent to discuss it. There seemed no reason why the question should be reopened in another committee. The proper course would be to judge the new procedure in the light of experience with the 1955 edition of the *Yearbook*.

35. Mr. GHORBAL (Egypt) pointed out that the whole situation would in any case be reviewed by the Commission at its thirteenth session. In the meantime, the Secretary-General, acting on his own initiative, could ascertain whether the bibliography could be prepared by UNESCO either on its own account or in co-operation with the United Nations. There was no need for the Council to make a formal decision to that effect or to refer the issue to the Co-ordination Committee. That would merely delay work on the *Yearbook* and the bibliographical index.

36. Mr. JUVIGNY (France) observed that the resolution submitted by the Commission on the *Yearbook* involved two quite distinct issues; it would simplify the discussion if they were considered separately. On the one hand, there was the question of the statements furnished by Governments—which involved no problem of co-ordination. On the other, there was the question of the bibliographical index, and there the United States representative had suggested that the Secretary-General should consult UNESCO. In view of UNESCO's

experience of that kind of work, the United States suggestion might well be adopted.

The Council decided by 9 votes to 7, with 2 abstentions, to refer the question of the bibliographical index to the Co-ordination Committee.

37. The PRESIDENT then invited the Council to vote on the draft resolutions recommended for adoption in the report of the Social Committee:

DRAFT RESOLUTION A—REPORT OF THE COMMISSION

Draft resolution A was adopted unanimously.

DRAFT RESOLUTION B—STUDY OF DISCRIMINATION IN THE MATTER OF EMIGRATION AND TRAVEL

Draft resolution B was adopted by 10 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

DRAFT RESOLUTION C—STUDIES IN THE FIELD OF DISCRIMINATION TO BE UNDERTAKEN BY THE SUB-COMMISSION ON PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND PROTECTION OF MINORITIES.

38. Mr. HOARE (United Kingdom) proposed that the beginning of operative paragraph 3 should be amended to read "*Authorizes* the Sub-Commission to undertake . . .".

It was so agreed.

39. Mr. VIRA (India) requested that a separate vote be taken on the last part of operative paragraph 2, beginning with the words "subject to the revision . . .".

The last part of paragraph 2 was adopted by 9 votes to 6, with 3 abstentions.

40. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 4.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution C, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

DRAFT RESOLUTION D—RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING INTERNATIONAL RESPECT FOR THE RIGHT OF PEOPLES AND NATIONS TO SELF-DETERMINATION.

41. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation's position on the recommendations of the Commission on Human Rights, which now constituted parts I and II of draft resolution D, had been fully explained in the Social Committee. Those recommendations had been prepared by the Commission in pursuance of the terms of General Assembly resolution 837 (IX) and the Social Committee had quite properly decided that they should be transmitted to the General Assembly. His delegation had voted against the last part of the draft resolution from the words "*Transmits, furthermore, . . .*" for the reasons stated in the Committee. He asked that a separate vote be taken on that last part of the draft resolution. He would vote against it and, if it were adopted, would abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

42. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) said that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution, but that would not

imply his delegation's agreement with all or any of the draft recommendations embodied in it. He was merely voting in favour of transmitting them to the General Assembly. On the substance of the matter, he repeated the reservations already made by his delegation in 1954, and again at recent meetings of the Social Committee.

43. Mr. VIRA (India) asked that a separate vote be taken on the first part of the draft resolution—viz. on the introductory section and parts I and II. He would vote in favour of them, because the Council was required to transmit the Commission's recommendations to the General Assembly. He would vote against the last part of the draft resolution, beginning with the words "Transmits, furthermore, . . ." principally because it had been expressly stated that it was to be regarded as an alternative to the first part and because he did not feel that the recommendations embodied in it would improve international relations or be of ultimate benefit to the peoples suffering under foreign domination. If the last part were adopted, he would abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole because he did not wish, even indirectly, to express approval of its final section.

44. Mr. FOMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, under the terms of General Assembly resolution 837 (IX), the Council should have referred the Commission's recommendations to the General Assembly without more ado. Nevertheless, a number of delegations had thought fit to subscribe to the alternative recommendations submitted by the United States delegation, regardless of the fact that by suggesting a theoretical study of the concepts of self-determination and equal rights, they cast serious doubts on the Commission's recommendations and on previous General Assembly resolutions on the subject. Furthermore, the Social Committee had not been instructed to consider anything but the report of the Commission on Human Rights. Neither had it had sufficient time or documentation to consider any other recommendations. He would therefore vote against the additional recommendation in the last part of the draft resolution.

45. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that he would vote in favour of transmitting all the recommendations in the draft resolution to the General Assembly. With regard to the two texts submitted by the Commission on Human Rights, the General Assembly had requested the Council to forward the Commission's recommendations, and while his delegation regretted this decision of the General Assembly it would abide by it. Moreover, the United States delegation wished to act in the spirit of harmony which had characterized the Council's work and he knew that many members of the Council attached great importance to the Commission's recommendations. At the same time, he fully reserved his delegation's position on those recommendations which his Government could not support.

46. Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) pointed out that in resolution 837 (IX) the General Assembly had not requested the Council to act as intermediary between itself and the Commission on Human Rights. The Turkish delegation therefore preferred not to give an opinion on the subject of transmitting the Commission's recommendations to the General Assembly. The Council had, how-

ever, explicit authority to consider the right of peoples and nations to self-determination, under the Charter and by virtue of General Assembly resolution 637 (VII). Accordingly, his delegation was in favour of the final part of draft resolution D. It considered that the Council should in fact concern itself with that part only.

47. Mr. PICO (Argentina) said that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution. The question of self-determination was exclusively within the competence of the General Assembly, and it would facilitate that body's task to have the maximum amount of information before it. With regard to the substance of the recommendations, his delegation made the same reservations as the Venezuelan delegation.

48. Mr. GHORBAL (Egypt) said that he would vote in favour of parts I and II of the draft resolution, which contained the recommendations drawn up by the Commission on Human Rights in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 837 (IX). He could not support the last part of the draft resolution, as he would have preferred it to be referred to the General Assembly in its original form—namely, as a United States proposal—without the Council taking any formal position on its substance. His Government believed strongly in the right of peoples and nations to self-determination, and felt that a speedy solution to the problem should be found. He would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, in the hope that, with all the facts before it, the General Assembly would be able to reach a decision on a difficult but vital issue.

49. Mr. HARRY (Australia) said that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution; under General Assembly resolution 837 (IX) the Council was bound to forward the Commission's recommendations to the General Assembly. Although he appreciated the sincerity of purpose of those who supported the Commission's recommendations, his delegation took a different view of the competence of the Commission, and indeed of the United Nations as a whole, on the question of self-determination, and on the principle itself. He therefore reserved his delegation's right to oppose the Commission's recommendations in the General Assembly. He supported the last part of the draft resolution, because its recommendations fell within the competence of the United Nations and represented a more constructive approach to the question.

50. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) said that she would vote for the draft resolution, but wished to make it clear that she was not voting on the substance of the recommendations set out therein, but only in favour of transmitting them to the General Assembly.

51. Mrs. de VINK (Netherlands) said that she would vote in favour of the draft resolution, not because she agreed with the substance of the Commission's recommendations, but because the Council was bound to forward them to the General Assembly.

52. The PRESIDENT suggested that in order to meet the convenience of the delegations, the Council should proceed to an immediate vote on draft resolutions D and E, leaving explanations of votes to be deferred until the next meeting.

It was so agreed.

53. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the last part of draft resolution D from the words "*Transmits, furthermore . . .*," as requested by the Czechoslovak representative.

The last part of draft resolution D was adopted by 12 votes to 6.

54. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the first part of the draft resolution, up to, but not including, the words "*Transmits, furthermore . . .*," as requested by the Indian representative.

The first part of draft resolution D was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution D, as a whole, was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

DRAFT RESOLUTION E—ADVISORY SERVICES IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

55. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) proposed that the first paragraph of draft resolution E should be amended to read "*Recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the following draft resolution*".

56. He further proposed that operative paragraph 1 should be re-drafted to read:

"Decides to consolidate the technical assistance programmes already approved by the General Assembly (relating to the promotion and safeguarding of the rights of women, the eradication of discrimination and protection of minorities, and the promotion of freedom of information) with the broad programme of assistance in the field of human rights proposed in this resolution, the entire programme to be known as 'Advisory services in the field of human rights'".

His proposals affected the form, but not the substance.

57. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should vote on draft resolution E as amended, on the understanding that any delegation would reopen the matter if it objected to the amendments when it saw them in writing.

It was so agreed.

Draft resolution E, as amended, was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.