

relations among nations. Under Article 14 of the Charter the General Assembly is empowered to deal with such matters "regardless of their origin." The present dispute fell within that definition and therefore the Soviet Union could not claim the protection of Article 2 (7) of the Charter¹.

The Soviet Government in the past had justified their conduct as necessary, firstly on grounds of national security, and secondly to protect the Soviet wives of foreign nationals from the unhappiness, humiliation, and police supervision which they would experience abroad. Surely, he said, the security of the Soviet State was not so unstable that it would be threatened if a few women left the country in order to live with their husbands. The second explanation was equally false. "Is it believable," he asked, "that people who feel unhappy anywhere in the world on account of police supervision would go to live in Russia?"

Mr. Cruz Acampo then referred to the case of his daughter-in-law. Miss Lida Liessina had contracted marriage in December, 1946, with his son, Alvaro Cruz. Having thus become a member of the Chilean Ambassador's family, she was normally entitled to diplomatic immunities in conformity with international practice. When, however, she applied to leave with Mr. Cruz Acampo and his family her request was refused.

He could not accept the Soviet argument that their practice was to grant immunities only to officials, their wives, and their children under age, and to extend them only to subjects of the country represented. Immunities were not granted on the basis of age, sex, and nationality. They were, moreover, not created by an act of Soviet sovereignty, so that the decisions of the Council of People's Commissars could not have binding force on all the nations of the world nor could it oblige them to renounce their rights.

The representatives of the *United Kingdom* and the *United States* supported the view that the Soviet Government had committed a flagrant violation of basic human rights in preventing the Soviet wives of foreigners from rejoining their husbands. Mr Fitzmaurice (*United Kingdom*) said that on the question of diplomatic privilege, he would not discuss whether strictly the Soviet attitude could, or could not, be justified. The Soviet attitude was, however, the most restrictive that could possibly be adopted, and the hostile treatment of foreign officials in Russia could not be reconciled with normal diplomatic practice.

¹ "Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII."