



## CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 13:	
Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees ( <i>concluded</i> ) . . . . .	159
Agenda item 10:	
Human rights . . . . .	164
Agenda item 11:	
Report of the Commission on the Status of Women . . . . .	167

*President:* Mr. M. MIR KHAN (Pakistan).

*Present:*

The representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Brazil, Canada, China, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Finland, France, Greece, Indonesia, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia.

Observers from the following countries: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Romania, Switzerland.

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

## AGENDA ITEM 13

**Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (E/3015 and Add.1 and 2, E/L.760, E/L.762) (*concluded*)**

1. Mr. BENSIS (Greece) congratulated the High Commissioner on behalf of his Government for the excellent work he had done in most difficult circumstances.

2. His delegation fully approved the draft resolution in document E/L.760, in particular part B in which the Council expressed the view that the Office of the High Commissioner should be continued for a period of five years from 1 January 1959, but submitted an amendment (E/L.762) for the addition to part C of a paragraph recommending "that the General Assembly authorize the High Commissioner to make an appeal to States Members of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies for the purpose of closing the refugee camps".

3. That proposal did not mean that the Greek delegation was not interested in the problem of refugees outside camps. As the High Commissioner had pointed out in paragraph 133 of his report (E/3015), "the condition of these refugees [in Greece] is often as precarious

as that of the camp population". The fact remained that the first step towards solving the refugee problem was to get the refugees out of the camps, in which some of them had now been living for years on end. The Greek delegation accordingly felt that the necessity of closing the refugee camps should be stressed and hoped that the Council would see its way to approve the proposal it had submitted.

4. Mr. PATRIOTA (Brazil) congratulated the High Commissioner for Refugees on the work carried out by his Office during the period covered by the annual report, particularly following the events of November 1956. Although the problem of the Hungarian refugees had largely been brought under control, the need for international action to protect refugees throughout the world remained. Both in the Council and in the Executive Committee of the United Nations Refugee Fund (UNREF), Brazil had taken an active part in discussions of the refugee problem and had been glad to join with other delegations in sponsoring the joint draft resolution before the Council. The terms of the draft were non-controversial and should, he believed, meet with the Council's unanimous approval.

5. His delegation considered that the Greek amendment was entirely acceptable.

6. Mr. de CURTON (France) wished to pay a tribute to the work done by the High Commissioner and his staff. During the year under consideration, in addition to faithfully carrying out its normal main activities — namely, international protection of refugees and the formulation and implementation of programmes of permanent solutions and emergency aid within the framework of the United Nations — the office had had to cope with a problem of unprecedented magnitude: the mass exodus of refugees from Hungary.

7. Chapter I of the High Commissioner's report (E/3015), which dealt with the Hungarian refugees, drew attention to the achievements of the countries of first asylum — Austria and Yugoslavia (paragraphs 14-25), the financial contributions made by 46 countries, and the outstandingly effective work done by the League of Red Cross Societies, the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and a number of voluntary agencies. Nevertheless, those efforts could not have been so effective without the work of co-ordination done by the Office of the High Commissioner.

8. Turning to chapter II, he observed that with part of the funds earmarked by the High Commissioner for solving special emergency problems a housing fund had been established through the medium of a voluntary agency to assist 2,300 stateless persons received in France early in 1957 following the events in the Middle East.

9. With reference to chapter III, paragraphs 50 and 51, he added that the French Office for the Protection of Refugees and Stateless Persons had registered 19,212 new refugees in 1956 and another 11,131 — mostly Poles and Spaniards — in the first few months of 1957. In connexion with paragraph 70 of the same chapter, he reported that 400 Hungarian students and 100 Hungarian secondary school pupils had already been awarded special scholarships by the French Government in 1957; in 1958, these numbers would increase to 500 and 440 respectively.

10. The French delegation was particularly interested in sections E (Camp adoption scheme) and G (Public information) of chapter VI. The camp adoption scheme, by encouraging private initiative in favour of the refugees in the camps, helped to make up for the inadequacy of government contributions. The French delegation felt that the High Commissioner should try to develop that type of activity, which could not fail to assist the United Nations in achieving its objective. Similarly, the High Commissioner might develop the information in such a way as to increase public interest in the refugee problem, and in that way obtain extra-budgetary funds.

11. The French delegation had observed two particularly important questions in the addenda to the report. The first related to the duration of the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (E/3015/Add.1, paragraph 79). In view of the excellence of the work already accomplished by that Office, and of the number of problems that still awaited solution, his delegation favoured the renewal of the mandate of the High Commissioner for a period of five years. The second question related to the arrangements to be made for the future of the UNREF programme (E/3015/Add.2, paragraph 8). The two alternatives suggested by the High Commissioner were that the programme could be intensified, or simply prolonged. Whatever choice was made, it was clear that a financial target higher than had been expected would have to be reached if permanent solutions were to be found and special efforts would have to be made to secure the necessary additional funds. His delegation did not in any way exclude the possibility of obtaining additional contributions from governments, and it approved the amendment proposed by the representative of Greece to the joint draft resolution in document E/L.760. It wished, however, to emphasize the fact that the Office of the High Commissioner, in collaboration with voluntary organizations in the Member States, could try to obtain further funds by appealing to the generosity of the public. Similarly, while the efforts of the Office of the High Commissioner should be directed first and foremost towards solving the problem of the refugees remaining in the camps, it was essential not to lose sight of the need to assist refugees living outside the camps, whose position was sometimes even more precarious.

12. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) expressed her delegation's sincere appreciation of the tireless and devoted efforts made by the High Commissioner and his staff between May 1956 and May 1957 to discharge their heavy responsibilities. The factual introductory statement by the High Commissioner at the 988th meeting and the annual report bore witness to the

magnitude of the task and the energy with which it was being undertaken.

13. Her country had been deeply concerned with the problem of refugees long before the High Commissioner's Office had been established, and had for many years been a haven for refugees from many countries. Indeed, one such refugee had now acquired Dominican nationality and was serving as a member of the Dominican parliament. Her country had always been among the first to offer its services to assist in solving the refugee problem, and earnestly hoped that the General Assembly would succeed in finding a permanent solution when it discussed the question at its twelfth session.

14. Her delegation warmly supported the joint draft resolution (E/L.760), and hoped it would receive a large majority. It was prepared to accept the Greek amendment (E/L.762).

15. Her delegation shared the concern voiced by the High Commissioner with regard to the refugees still in camps. Having seen refugee camps at first hand, she could testify that they were not conducive to maintaining the dignity of the individual and was confident that the High Commissioner would continue his efforts to eliminate them as far as possible.

16. Finally, she hoped that, before the twelfth session of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General would give effect to the decision in General Assembly resolution 1039 B (XI) that a plaque to the memory of Dr. G. J. van Heuven Goedhart should be placed in the Palais des Nations.

17. Mr. BECHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that, though the problem of displaced persons and refugees had been on the Council's agenda for eleven years, it was still far from a final solution.

18. As his delegation had repeatedly stated, one of the main reasons why the problem remained unsolved was that insufficient emphasis had been placed on the principle of voluntary repatriation. The General Assembly, in resolution 8 (I) adopted at its first session, had established that one of the main tasks of the International Refugee Organization was "to encourage and assist in every way possible their early return to their countries of origin" (paragraph (c) (iii)), and the principle of voluntary repatriation had been recognized by the Assembly in a number of subsequent resolutions as one of the possible methods of solving the refugee problem. It was essential therefore that the High Commissioner should not overlook the possibility of voluntary repatriation. Unfortunately, the UNREF Executive Committee had adopted an incorrect approach and had directed the High Commissioner's attention mainly to the possibility of settling refugees in countries in which they were at present living, and in overseas countries. The possibility of repatriation was not even mentioned in the Executive Committee's programme of practical measures and, in that respect, the Executive Committee had disregarded the instructions of the General Assembly and the wishes of a number of members of the Council who had insisted that the Assembly's resolutions be put into effect.

19. In recent years, a number of countries had enacted legislation facilitating the voluntary repatriation of those

of their nationals who were displaced persons and refugees, and the High Commissioner and the States concerned should offer every possible assistance in the repatriation of refugees who had expressed a wish to return to their fatherland. The legislative and other measures taken included the granting of amnesties and the provision of assistance to enable refugees to settle down in a normal life in which they would enjoy full civic rights.

20. Thousands of displaced persons were already returning to the Soviet Union and the people's democracies, where the local authorities and public organizations gave them every assistance in starting a new life. According to the information available in his country, the vast majority of displaced persons still abroad were anxious to return, but were being prevented from doing so by émigré organizations and other bodies hostile to the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. In consequence, tens of thousands of people were still languishing in camps, moving from country to country in search of work, or suffering unspeakable humiliations, as they were deprived of even the most elementary civic rights.

21. His delegation wished also to draw attention to the indisputable fact that agents for foreign intelligence services, and even foreign legions to fight against the refugees' countries of origin, were being recruited from among the refugees. In that connexion, he cited a statement in the United States periodical *U.S. News and World Report* of 19 April 1957 that refugees possessed two great assets which would be of inestimable value in the event of a third world war, a good knowledge of at least two languages spoken "behind the Iron Curtain" and a detailed acquaintance with "some important part of the Russian Empire". His delegation urged that the High Commissioner and the governments of countries in which refugees were living should take immediate steps, in the interests of the refugees themselves and of friendly relations among nations, to prevent the exploitation of human misfortune for such purposes.

22. With regard to the question of the Chinese refugees in Hong Kong, which had been raised by the UNREF Executive Committee at its fourth session (section X of the report of the session, E/3015, annex), his delegation would oppose the suggestion that the General Assembly should examine the question at its twelfth session (paragraph 107, resolution). The vast majority of the Chinese in Hong Kong were not political refugees, and consequently did not come within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner. Although there were among them a number of former officers in the Kuomintang Army, former officials of the Kuomintang administration, and former landowners, most of the Chinese in Hong Kong were ordinary persons who had moved there from the Chinese mainland, and were free to return. For many years before the victory of the Chinese revolution it had been customary for people to move from the interior of China to Hong Kong and back again. Any discussion by United Nations organs of the question of the so-called Chinese refugees in Hong Kong was an intentional interference in the private life of the persons concerned, and in the internal affairs of the Chinese People's Republic.

23. So far as he knew, the Government of the Chinese People's Republic had no objections to Chinese nationals at present in Hong Kong returning to the mainland. Many of them had already returned and had not been subjected to any persecution. An artificial situation had been created in Hong Kong, however, and many Chinese were now afraid to return. In addition, the local authorities were intentionally detaining Chinese nationals in Hong Kong and thus obstructing free communication between the mainland and Hong Kong, in contrast to the previous situation when travel had been entirely unrestricted. His delegation would oppose the UNREF Executive Committee's resolution, and hoped that other delegations would do the same, since its approval could only prejudice friendly relations between States.

24. With reference to the United States representative's statement at the 988th meeting, he regretted the inappropriate reference to Hungarian refugees. That reference had no connexion with the contents of the report and the observations of earlier speakers, and had impaired the business-like spirit of the discussion.

25. Mr. PATTEET (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions), speaking at the invitation of the PRESIDENT, commented on the tributes paid to the work of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees during the flight of the Hungarian refugees, and said that, while it was true that the governments of the free world, non-governmental organizations, and individuals had tackled the urgent problem quickly and with great efficiency, it should not be forgotten that, apart from the Hungarian refugees, there were still those others whom the High Commissioner had called the "old" refugees. Despite a justifiable pride in past achievements, no country and no organization had the right to be satisfied with its work so long as there were refugees in camps. For that reason, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions welcomed any proposals not only for extending the High Commissioner's mandate, but also for finding the staff and funds required to complete the task entrusted to him.

26. During the discussion, in addition to European refugees, mention had been made of the Hong Kong refugees and Arab refugees from Palestine. It was unthinkable that those human beings could not be given the aid received by other refugees in the world. Unfortunately, in their case, people were more concerned with the political than the humanitarian aspects of the problem.

27. He would finally invite the Council's attention to a problem that had not been mentioned during the discussion — namely, the question of the Algerian refugees in Tunisia and Morocco. The International Committee of the Red Cross was tackling the problem as far as its resources permitted, but the United Nations, too, could and must seek a satisfactory solution of the problem.

28. Mr. EGGERMANN (International Federation of Christian Trade Unions), speaking at the invitation of the PRESIDENT, said that the most urgent task was to close the refugee camps, in which several thousand men, women and children had already been living for many years. He wished to pay tribute to the work of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for

Refugees, which had done much towards solving the problem, at least in part. Most of the refugees still in the camps were difficult cases; nevertheless, he would urge the United Nations to take effective steps on their behalf.

29. He was glad to see that a large number of Hungarian refugees had found a home in various countries. A number still remained in Austria and Yugoslavia, however, and it was essential for their cases to be dealt with at once. If they had to remain in the camps too long they would eventually swell the ranks of the old refugees, thereby rendering their distribution among the various host countries even more difficult.

30. In November 1956, several countries had volunteered to accept Hungarian refugees without prior selection, thus enabling a considerable number to be evacuated within a few days. Almost all the old refugees, on the other hand, had been interviewed by selection missions and the fact that some still remained in the camps meant that they had not been accepted by them. If the refugee camps were to be closed, the governments of the host countries would have to agree to accept a number of old refugees without prior selection.

31. His Federation hoped that the Council would decide to renew the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and was fully prepared to co-operate with his Office as in the past.

32. Mr. SMITH (World Federation of United Nations Associations), speaking at the invitation of the PRESIDENT, said that the Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA) had always taken a great interest in the activities of the United Nations in regard to refugees, and supported the principle that the problem should be tackled from a humanitarian rather than from a political angle.

33. In a resolution adopted in December 1956 the Executive Committee of the Federation had appealed to member associations to participate in campaigns to aid Hungarian refugees. Its appeals had met with a heartening response. The Executive Committee had also agreed to lodge a small number of Hungarian refugee students in Geneva while they pursued their studies.

34. However, there was one group of refugees for whom little had been done and for whom the United Nations had taken no responsibility — namely, the Chinese refugees in Hong Kong. According to a report on that problem prepared for the High Commissioner's Office in 1954 by Dr. Hambro, there were almost 700,000 refugees in the British Crown Colony. The British authorities and private voluntary agencies had contributed to the relief of their distress, but nevertheless such assistance had been insufficient. Much more needed to be done.

35. It would be inappropriate to broach the complicated problem of their political status; it had already proved too baffling to be dealt with by the UNREF Executive Committee. WFUNA was, however, in full agreement with that Committee in considering that the plight of the Chinese refugees in Hong Kong was such as to be of concern to the international community. It also warmly welcomed the UNREF Executive Committee's suggestion that the General Assembly at its

twelfth session should examine the question of the Chinese refugees in Hong Kong (E/3015, annex, paragraphs 107 and 111).

36. WFUNA had already urged its member associations to appeal to their governments to increase their financial contributions to the Office of the High Commissioner in order to enable the latter to concern itself with the Chinese refugees in Hong Kong, and had also asked its member associations to approach their governments on the possibilities of accepting such refugees as immigrants.

37. The Federation now appealed directly to the United Nations, through the Council, to urge that the problem should receive international recognition and that the Chinese refugees in Hong Kong should be given international assistance. Whether such assistance was rendered through the Office of the High Commissioner or by a special agency established to deal with the problem, WFUNA's only concern was for the needs of the people involved. It urged the United Nations to assume responsibility for the refugees in question.

38. Mr. KATEL (World Veterans Federation), speaking at the invitation of the PRESIDENT, said that his organization had consistently supported the activities of the High Commissioner. The resettlement of refugees was an extremely urgent and important task which deserved the fullest assistance from governments and non-governmental organizations. The World Veterans Federation therefore welcomed the unanimous decision of the UNREF Executive Committee, embodied in the joint draft resolution now before the Council, to recommend that the High Commissioner's Office be continued beyond 31 December 1958.

39. The uprising of the freedom forces of Hungary and the subsequent repression by Soviet troops had created a new and serious refugee problem for the United Nations and placed a heavy burden upon the High Commissioner's Office. Immediately upon receipt of General Assembly resolution 1129 (XI), paragraph 4 of which requested non-governmental organizations to provide relief and assistance to Hungarian refugees, his federation had placed its resources at the disposal of the High Commissioner's Office. In lending its admittedly modest but wholehearted support to the United Nations efforts to help Hungarian refugees, the Federation had been motivated by considerations of solidarity as well as of humanity.

40. The United Nations and the non-governmental organizations co-operating with it were in duty bound to ensure a decent and productive life for the Hungarian refugees who chose not to return to their oppressed homeland. The member organizations of the Federation in thirty-five countries were urging their governments to make every effort to receive as rapidly as possible all the refugees from Yugoslavia and Austria so that they could settle in the country of their choice. In accordance with a unanimous resolution of the Federation's Council, they were also urging their governments to offer as much financial assistance as possible for the support of Hungarian refugees in Yugoslavia and Austria.

41. Action to relieve refugees from oppression and assist their resettlement in countries of their choice was more than

a humane act. It showed that those who resisted oppression were not alone.

42. Mr. KAHANY (Observer for the Government of Israel), speaking at the invitation of the PRESIDENT, reminded the Council of Israel's membership of the UNREF Executive Committee, and of its contribution to the solution of the refugee problem. During the last few years, Israel had received and definitely integrated a tremendous number of Jewish refugees — about 400,000 of whom had come from Arab and other Middle East countries — who would otherwise have greatly increased the number of those under the mandate of the High Commissioner.

43. Despite Israel's particular interest in the debate, he had had, however, no intention of asking for the floor, but had been obliged to do so after hearing the statement of the representative of Egypt at the 988th meeting concerning Jewish refugees from Egypt.

44. At the end of 1956 and the beginning of 1957, world public opinion had been almost exclusively pre-occupied with the terrible drama of the refugees from Hungary, and a no less terrible tragedy which was taking place at the same time in Egypt had gone almost unnoticed. He was referring to the almost complete destruction and uprooting of one of the oldest Jewish communities in the world.

45. The Egyptian representative had said that he was surprised to hear of "refugees from Egypt", because he considered that there were none; and he had gone on to say that none of the 35,000 Jews who were Egyptian nationals had been expelled, and that only 280 of the 7,000 stateless Jews had been asked to leave the country.

46. That statement was unfortunately not in accordance with the facts, and he wished to bring the following details to the Council's attention. Immediately before the events of November 1956 there had still been some 45,000 to 50,000 Jews in Egypt. At the most 5,000 to 7,000 of them possessed Egyptian nationality; 15,000 to 17,000 were of foreign nationality and about 25,000 were stateless. Those stateless persons were not, however, people who had lost their nationality fairly recently. They had never taken out nationalization papers, but had been living and working in Egypt for many generations and held residence permits giving them a status almost equal to that of Egyptian nationals. At the beginning of November 1956 the position of all Jews in Egypt, even those possessing Egyptian nationality, had been rendered highly critical by the administrative measures taken by the Egyptian authorities, accompanied by a violent anti-Jewish campaign.

47. Mr. SINBEL (Egypt), speaking on a point of order, said that the observer for Israel was merely indulging in political propaganda and should be prevented from continuing his statement.

48. The PRESIDENT reminded the observer for the Government of Israel that, when invited to speak by the Council under rule 75 of its rules of procedure, observers should limit their remarks to the item under discussion and to matters of particular concern to them, and not make general statements that were not of immediate

relevance. He invited the observer to continue his statement.

49. Mr. KAHANY (Observer for the Government of Israel) said that his statement had not been inspired by any political motives but by respect for the facts, and that it was strictly limited to the subject — refugees from Egypt — under discussion.

50. Continuing his statement, he pointed out that the circumstances of the mass eviction of Jews from Egypt were fairly well known, and that there was therefore no need for him to go into further details. He only wanted to mention some of the facts which had so far resulted from that eviction. Since November 1956 Israel had received nearly 15,000 Jewish refugees from Egypt, the great majority of them stateless persons. Five thousand other stateless refugees from Egypt were at the present time scattered through France, Italy, Greece and other countries of first asylum. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner would only have to deal with those 5,000, and others to come, because those now in Israel had ceased to be refugees and the Government and people of Israel were glad to have been able to receive them as fellow citizens.

51. Mr. SINBEL (Egypt) regretted that, whereas the Council was trying to discuss the problem of refugees in a humanitarian spirit, the observer for the Government of Israel had merely sought to engage in political propaganda. His delegation had not objected when the observer for the Government of Israel had requested the floor, because it had no reason to fear criticism from any quarter. Egypt was convinced of the legality of its actions with regard to the Jews in Egypt and, indeed, the members of any other religion. The observer for the Government of Israel had introduced a number of irrelevant statistics which did nothing to disprove the legitimacy of the actions taken by the Egyptian Government. Finally, the observer for the Government of Israel was not qualified to speak for Jews throughout the world. Jews in Egypt possessed all the rights of Egyptian citizens, and only Egypt was qualified to speak about their situation.

52. Mr. BUXTON (United Kingdom) wished to comment on two points which had arisen in the course of discussion.

53. With reference to the Soviet Union representative's statement, he pointed out that voluntary repatriation was one of the three methods open to the High Commissioner in finding a permanent solution for individual refugee problems. The question of voluntary repatriation had been discussed in detail by the General Assembly at its tenth and eleventh sessions, and his delegation had full confidence in the way in which the High Commissioner was fulfilling his task.

54. Secondly, his delegation could not accept the Soviet Union representative's definition of the types of refugee found in Hong Kong or his statement that the situation there was artificial. It was a distressing situation, but not an artificial one.

55. Mr. POPPER (United States of America) said that his delegation could accept the Greek delegation's

amendment (E/L.762), because it was focused on what to his delegation was the most important single problem confronting the High Commissioner — the closure of refugee camps. It was for the General Assembly to make specific decisions as to changes in existing financial arrangements; his delegation wished to study the results of the High Commissioner's survey of the non-settled refugee population before approaching financial problems.

56. With regard to the Chinese refugees in Hong Kong, he said that his delegation's previous silence on that matter did not imply that his Government was not fully and sympathetically aware of the humanitarian, social and economic problems involved, and of the scope of the unilateral efforts made by the United Kingdom to deal with those problems.

57. Finally, he would express his surprise that the Soviet Union representative in his statement had engaged in nothing more than a stubborn repetition of a thesis long exploded by the facts.

58. Mr. BECHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that his delegation had been speaking of the extremely serious matter of voluntary repatriation. He would suggest that a stubborn repetition of the facts was a much more valuable contribution to a solution of the refugee problem than tendentious references to the cold war, such as had been made in the statement of the representative of the World Veterans Federation.

59. Mr. POPPER (United States of America) wished it to be placed on record that he had described the Soviet Union representative's statement, not as a stubborn repetition of the facts, but as "a stubborn repetition of a thesis long exploded by the facts".

60. Miss LUNSINGH MEIJER (Netherlands) said that her delegation supported the Greek amendment in principle, but considered that the wording was unsatisfactory. As the existing draft contained no reference to the need for finding the financial resources necessary for closing the refugee camps, she would propose that the phrase "for the purpose of closing the refugee camps" be replaced by the phrase "for the purpose of raising funds for closing the refugee camps".

61. Mr. BENSIS (Greece) accepted that proposal.

62. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Greek amendment (E/L.762), as amended by the Netherlands representative, to the draft resolution submitted by Brazil, Canada, France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (E/L.760).

*The amendment, as amended, was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

63. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Brazil, Canada, France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, as thus amended.

64. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland), supported by Mr. BECHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), requested that separate votes be taken on parts A, B and C of the draft resolution.

*Part A of the draft resolution was adopted unanimously*

*Part B of the draft resolution was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

*Part C of the draft resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.*

65. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) said that he must make it clear that his delegation's abstention in the vote on part B of the draft resolution did not mean that it did not appreciate the merits of the High Commissioner.

*The draft resolution, as a whole, as amended, was adopted.*

66. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had concluded its consideration of item 13 of the agenda.

#### AGENDA ITEM 10

#### Human rights (E/2970 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1, E/3002, E/3006).

#### REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/3027 and Corr. 2 and Add.1, E/L.761)

67. The PRESIDENT invited the Soviet Union representative to introduce his delegation's amendment (E/L.761) to draft resolution B in the report of the Social Committee (E/3027 and Corr.2) on the report of the Commission on Human Rights (thirteenth session) (E/2970 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1).

68. Mr. LOMAKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the amendment was self-explanatory. Its intention was that the tenth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should be celebrated by all the peoples of the world and not by States Members of the United Nations only. A resolution confining the celebration to States Members would be at variance with the principles of the United Nations Charter and with the terms of General Assembly resolution 423 (V), which stated in its preamble that the anniversary "should be appropriately celebrated in all countries", and in paragraph 1 invited "all States and interested organizations to adopt 10 December of each year as Human Rights Day". It was surely not for the Council to overlook that clear directive by the General Assembly.

69. Mr. POPPER (United States of America) observed that the issue raised by the Soviet Union representative had already been considered exhaustively by the Social Committee, where his delegation had drawn attention to the difficulties which the Secretariat would encounter in communicating with States not members of the United Nations.

70. Several delegations, including his own, had approved the existing text of draft resolution B in the Social Committee, and on logical and practical grounds he would appeal to all members of the Council to vote for the draft resolution as it stood, and to oppose the amendment.

71. Mr. JAFRI (Pakistan) said that his delegation was gratified that draft resolution B had been approved by



the Social Committee almost unanimously. The Declaration of Human Rights was an epoch-making event in the annals of the United Nations, and it was fitting that the anniversary should be celebrated as a means of bringing home to the peoples of the world the importance of human rights.

72. As the Declaration had been adopted in Paris on 10 December 1948, the Commission on Human Rights had expressed the wish that its fourteenth session in 1958 should be held in that city. The Pakistan delegation to the Social Committee had co-sponsored a draft resolution recommending that its wish should be granted. Since the Social Committee discussed the matter, however, the Secretary-General had circulated a revised statement of the financial implications involved (E/3027/Add.1 and Corr.1). In the light of that statement, his delegation would now propose that the question should not be put to a vote in the Council, but should be discussed by the Interim Committee on Programme of Conferences, or any other appropriate committee, and a suitable recommendation made to the General Assembly.

73. It was disappointing that so little progress had been made in completing the draft Declaration of the Rights of the Child. His delegation was anxious that everything possible should be done to complete the draft Covenants on human rights and the declarations pertaining thereto, and hoped that work on them would be expedited.

74. His delegation endorsed the recommendations made by the Secretary-General in his reports on advisory services in the field of human rights (E/3006) and on the United Nations news personnel seminar and news personnel fellowships (E/3002). The ultimate success of the United Nations would depend on the support and understanding it was able to evoke in the minds of the people throughout the world, and the promotion of freedom of information was essential for the achievement of that objective. It was to be hoped that the seminar scheme for news personnel could be developed into a continuous programme of collaboration in many other fields of human rights. His delegation was also prepared to support the Secretary-General's recommendations with regard to the *Yearbook on Human Rights* (E/2970, paragraph 220). The *Yearbook* should be published in an increasing number of languages, including Arabic.

75. His delegation had expressed its opposition to the Co-ordination Committee's recommendation that the Commission on Human Rights and the Commission on the Status of Women should in future meet biennially. While agreeing that the activities of the former Commission should be streamlined, his delegation opposed any attempt to make streamlining an excuse for curtailing the Commission's activities. Any such curtailment should be avoided at the present stage. The Commission had many important tasks before it on which only a start had been made, and it would be doing it a grave injustice if a decision were taken at the present session that it should hold its meetings biennially. Such a course might prove possible at a later stage, but the new arrangement should be discussed by the Commission itself at its fourteenth session before any firm decision was reached in the Council. The Commission should be given an opportunity to define its conception of its future duties and submit an outline of its work pro-

gramme. In that respect, it should bear in mind the part which the specialized agencies could play in helping it to discharge certain of its heavy responsibilities. The good results which had emerged from the close collaboration between the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) provided an example of what could be done in that direction.

76. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) remarked that all the members of the Council had taken part in the discussion in the Social Committee, and it was pointless to repeat in a plenary meeting statements already made on the subject. He moved the closure of the discussion.

77. The PRESIDENT said that delegations could not be denied the right of expressing their views on the matter in a plenary meeting. Statements should, however, be as brief as possible.

78. Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) observed that he had nothing to add to what had already been said by the United States representative concerning the proposed amendment to draft resolution B.

79. With reference to paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, he regretted that the report of the Social Committee contained no reference to the procedure decided on for the appointment of members of the special committee to make the necessary arrangements to give effect to the recommendations of the Commission on Human Rights. His delegation had proposed, and the Social Committee had agreed, that the members of the committee should be appointed by the President of the Council.

80. Turning to draft resolution H, he explained that his delegation had abstained from voting on that draft resolution in the Social Committee, because the financial implications of holding the fourteenth session of the Commission on Human Rights in Paris had not been altogether clear. The Secretary-General had provided some fuller information on the financial problems involved (E/3027/Add.1 and Corr.1) and his delegation would be compelled to vote against the draft resolution, if it were put to the vote. He would wish, however, to support the Pakistan representative's proposal that no vote be taken on the draft resolution, and that it be referred for consideration to the Interim Committee on Programme of Conferences.

81. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) explained that certain delegations had supported the proposal to hold the fourteenth session of the Commission on Human Rights in Paris, because France had played an exceptional role in the history of mankind's struggle for freedom. Indeed, it was true to say that since 1789 all popular movements to win freedom had been inspired by the French Revolution. As the Council would have to take the final decision, there would be no point in referring the matter to the Interim Committee on Programme of Conferences.

82. Mr. MACKAY (Canada) agreed with the Pakistan representative that the most business-like way of dealing with draft resolution H would be to refer it to the Interim Committee on Programme of Conferences.

83. His country would be the first to recognize the outstanding role played by France, and by the city of Paris in particular, in the realization of modern concepts of human rights, but he urged that, before voting on the draft resolution, the Council should be in possession of more detailed information on the serious financial problems involved.

84. Mr. POPPER (United States of America) associated himself with the views expressed by the representatives of Pakistan, the United Kingdom and Canada.

85. Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) wished to correct the impression held by the Polish representative that the proposal to refer draft resolution H to the Interim Committee on Programme of Conferences was an alternative to its being considered by the Council. Any conclusions that might be reached by the Committee would undoubtedly be referred back to the Council, with which the final decision would rest.

86. Mr. LOMAKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the proposal to hold the fourteenth session of the Commission on Human Rights in Paris arose from a desire to pay tribute to the particular contribution made by Paris to the development of human rights, and that it was inappropriate to treat the matter as a problem of bookkeeping.

87. He had the impression that, in principle at least, most delegations were in favour of holding the fourteenth session in Paris, and suggested that the matter be finally decided at the present meeting of the Council.

88. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution A in the report of the Social Committee.

**A — REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS  
(THIRTEENTH SESSION)**

*Draft resolution A was adopted unanimously.*

89. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the amendment to draft resolution B submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (E/L.761).

*The amendment was rejected by 11 votes to 5, with one abstention.*

90. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolution B in the report of the Social Committee.

**B — CELEBRATION OF THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE  
ADOPTION OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF  
HUMAN RIGHTS**

*Draft resolution B was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

91. Mr. LOMAKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote, said that he recognized that the resolution was a progressive step, but felt that the Council's rejection of the amendment submitted by his delegation was illogical and in conflict with the United Nations Charter and the recommendations of the General Assembly.

92. Whatever the wishes of the Council might be, it was quite impossible for it to prevent the peoples of States not members of the United Nations from celebrating the tenth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights if they so desired.

93. Mr. SINBEL (Egypt), explaining his vote, said that he had abstained from voting because his delegation took the view that human rights were a privilege to be enjoyed by all mankind and not only by States Members of the United Nations. His delegation was of course fully in favour of celebrating the tenth anniversary of the Declaration, but objected to the Council's rejection of the Soviet Union amendment.

94. Mr. BENSIS (Greece) said that while it was perhaps fitting to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, recent events had unfortunately shown that human rights were not respected in many parts of the world and his delegation was therefore unable to associate itself with the celebration of the anniversary.

95. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) explained that his delegation had voted for the resolution because it invited all States to exert increasing efforts in that field of human progress. It was to be regretted, however, that the operative part of the resolution was addressed only to a limited number of countries — namely, the States Members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. In view of the Chinese people's long struggle for freedom, he could not accept the exclusion of the People's Republic of China from the anniversary celebrations.

96. Mr. CHEN (China) explained that his delegation had voted in favour of resolution B on the understanding that it embodied the second corrigendum to document E/3027. He would not reply to the Polish representative's remarks, as he did not wish to engage in political debate at a meeting of the Council.

97. The PRESIDENT stated that, if the Council wished the procedure outlined by the United Kingdom to be followed, he would announce later in the session the members of the special committee of representatives, as envisaged in paragraph 6 of resolution B.

98. He put to the vote *seriatim* draft resolutions C, D and E in the report of the Social Committee.

**C — ADVISORY SERVICES IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN RIGHTS:  
APPLICATION TO THE PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION  
AND THE PROTECTION OF MINORITIES**

*Draft resolution C was adopted unanimously.*

**D — PROPOSED SECOND CONFERENCE OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL  
ORGANIZATIONS INTERESTED IN THE ERADICATION  
OF PREJUDICE AND DISCRIMINATION**

*Draft resolution D was adopted unanimously.*

**E — DRAFT DECLARATION ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD**

*Draft resolution E was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

99. Mr. VUKMANOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) recalled that his delegation had repeatedly advocated the preparation of a draft Declaration on the Rights of the Child. It believed that the declaration should be drafted as soon as possible, and was surprised that the Commission on Human Rights had not yet succeeded in submitting a final text. For that reason, it had not voted for resolution E.



100. The PRESIDENT put to the vote *seriatim* draft resolutions F and G in the report of the Social Committee.

**F — RIGHT OF ASYLUM**

*Draft resolution F was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

**G — STUDY OF DISCRIMINATION IN EDUCATION**

*Draft resolution G was adopted unanimously.*

101. The PRESIDENT announced, with reference to draft resolution H, that he had received a proposal from the delegations of Pakistan, the United Kingdom and Canada that, having considered draft resolution H submitted by the Social Committee, the Council decide, before taking a final decision, to refer the draft resolution to the Interim Committee on Programme of Conferences for consideration. He invited the Council to vote on that proposal.

*The proposal was adopted by 11 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.*

102. Mr. CHEN (China) explained that he had abstained from voting on the proposal because the Interim Committee on Programme of Conferences, which consisted of only five members, was unlikely to take a favourable view of the recommendation in draft resolution H. He was certain that, when the matter was referred back to the Council, there would be further discussion, and took the view that it would have been better to reach a decision forthwith.

103. Mr. JAFRI (Pakistan) explained that, in submitting the proposal jointly with the delegations of the United Kingdom and Canada, he had had no intention of implying that the possibility of holding the fourteenth session of the Commission in Paris should be ruled out. He had merely wished to emphasize that the financial and practical problems should be considered first. He hoped that the Interim Committee would provide the Council with all the information it required.

104. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had concluded its consideration of item 10 of the agenda, with the exception of draft resolution H, submitted by the Social Committee, which had been referred to the Interim Committee on Programme of Conferences for consideration.

**AGENDA ITEM 11**

**Report of the Commission on the Status of Women  
(E 2968)**

**REPORT OF THE SOCIAL COMMITTEE (E/3030)**

105. Mr. POPPER (United States of America) said that, with reference to draft resolution J submitted in the report of the Social Committee (E/3030), in his delegation's view the Social Committee should have adopted the Co-ordination Committee's recommendation that the Commission on the Status of Women should meet biennially after 1959.

106. If draft resolution J were adopted by the Council in its present form, he hoped that the periodicity of the

sessions of the Commission on the Status of Women would be reviewed again by that Commission, since it was obviously desirable that there should be uniformity in that respect between the Commission on the Status of Women and the other functional commissions.

107. The PRESIDENT put to the vote *seriatim* draft resolutions A to E in the report of the Social Committee.

**A — REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN (ELEVENTH SESSION)**

*Draft resolution A was adopted unanimously.*

**B — POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN**

*Draft resolution B was adopted by 15 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

**C — ACCESS OF WOMEN TO EDUCATION**

*Draft resolution C was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

**D — EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK**

*Draft resolution D was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

**E — ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN**

*Draft resolution E was adopted by 11 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.*

108. Mr. JAFRI (Pakistan), explaining his vote, said that he had voted in favour of resolution E, since it would undoubtedly serve a useful purpose. His delegation regretted, however, that the list of professions in the questionnaire had been limited to the legal, architectural and engineering professions, since those professions played a relatively small role in the under-developed countries and participation in them by women was insignificant. As it stood, the questionnaire was confined to professions about which useful information was available only in the case of highly-developed countries, and there was no provision for supplying information about professions to which women might have access in the under-developed countries.

109. Mrs. MURAVIEVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that her delegation had voted against resolution E because the questionnaire contained no reference to the medical and teaching professions, in which a large number of women in her country were engaged. Though she found the resolution acceptable in principle, she felt that the omission of the medical and legal professions was particularly regrettable, as the access of women to those professions was not studied by any other organization.

110. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) explained that, though she had voted in favour of resolution E, she believed that the whole matter should be referred back to the Commission on the Status of Women for further consideration of items to be included in the questionnaire.

111. The PRESIDENT put to the vote *seriatim* draft resolutions F to I in the report of the Social Committee.

F — CONVENTION ON THE NATIONALITY OF MARRIED WOMEN

*Draft resolution F was adopted by 12 votes to one, with 5 abstentions.*

G — STATUS OF WOMEN IN PRIVATE LAW

*Draft resolution G was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

H — TAX LEGISLATION APPLICABLE TO WOMEN

*Draft resolution H was adopted unanimously.*

I — INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR ON CIVIC RESPONSIBILITIES AND INCREASED PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN PUBLIC LIFE

*Draft resolution I was adopted by 11 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.*

112. Mr. JAFRI (Pakistan) said that, after discussion with other delegations and the Secretariat, he would propose that the second paragraph of the preamble to draft resolution J and the word "also" in the third paragraph of the preamble be deleted.

113. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) supported those amendments.

*The amendments were adopted.*

114. Mr. POPPER (United States of America) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

115. Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

116. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) requested that the vote on operative paragraphs 2 and 3 be taken by roll-call.

117. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the preamble and operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution J.

J — THE PERIODICITY OF THE SESSIONS OF THE COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

*The preamble and operative paragraph 1 were adopted unanimously.*

*The vote on operative paragraph 2 was taken by roll-call.*

*The representative of Poland, having been chosen by ballot, voted first.*

*In favour:* Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Finland, France, Greece, Indonesia, Pakistan.

*Against:* United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Canada, Netherlands.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Brazil, China.

*Paragraph 2 was adopted by 10 votes to 4 with 3 abstentions.*

*The vote on operative paragraph 3 was taken by roll-call.*

*The representative of Finland, having been chosen by ballot, voted first.*

*In favour:* Finland, France, Greece, Pakistan, Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Dominican Republic, Egypt.

*Against:* Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Canada.

*Abstaining:* Indonesia, Yugoslavia, Brazil, China.

*Paragraph 3 was adopted by 8 votes to 5 with 4 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution J, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 9 votes to 5 with 3 abstentions.*

118. Mr. DRAGO (Argentina) explained that he had voted against operative paragraph 3 of the resolution, not because his delegation underestimated the value of the Commission on the Status of Women, but because the text of the paragraph was unacceptable.

119. Sir Samuel HOARE (United Kingdom) explained that he had two objections to operative paragraph 2 of the resolution. In the first place, it was somewhat of an innovation for the Council to invite a Commission to express its views on its own future; and in the second place, he took the view that any recommendation by the Council about the periodicity of sessions should be general. The same treatment should be accorded to the Commission on the Status of Women and to the Commission on Human Rights.

120. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had concluded its consideration of item 11 of the agenda.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.