

On the broader question, he considered the Soviet attitude inhuman and contrary to civilized usage. The Soviet authorities had now set themselves to destroy the marriages and were using police pressure and false arrest for that purpose. Mr Gross, for the *United States*, said that there were now 350 Soviet wives and 65 Soviet husbands of American citizens who had been refused permission to leave the Soviet Union. "It is difficult," he said, "to conceive of a violation of the fundamental human rights of the family and marriage more flagrant than the action of a Government in preventing the unity of the family by prohibiting the wife from departing from its territory, and advising divorce as the only alternative."

The *Soviet* representative (Mr Pavlov) stated that the true instigators of the resolution were the United Kingdom and the United States. The United Nations was clearly prevented from dealing with this, a purely internal concern of the Soviet Union, by Article 2 (7) of the Charter. The decree of March, 1947, was not imposed on the Russian people, but was issued to satisfy a public demand created by the hostility to the Soviet Union which had become evident elsewhere. The decree was necessary, moreover, to protect Soviet citizens from the indignities they would suffer in foreign countries.

He charged the United States representative with criticizing conditions elsewhere while resisting judgment upon such shortcomings as the prohibition by law of mixed marriages in so many parts of his own country. He contended that the granting of visas had nothing to do with the Declaration of Human Rights, citing cases in which the United States and other Governments had refused them. But if it *was* in place to refer to the Declaration of Human Rights in this connection, it was not out of place to do so in connection with, say, the United States immigration quota system.

Mr Pavlov termed the statement of the representative of Chile "empty and full of hatred against the Soviet Union." The Chilean charges appeared especially absurd when one considered that Chile had no tradition of diplomatic privileges and had allowed members of the Soviet Embassy to be machine-gunned and to be kept in Chile against their will. No diplomatic immunity could be claimed for a Soviet citizen, nor, for that matter, did it extend to the ex-Ambassador's son, who was an adult. It was not possible to define the concept of the household and to stretch the application of diplomatic immunity as Chile had sought to do.

In subsequent discussions it became clear that, while many delegations approved the Chilean resolution in principle, they considered that it could not be accepted in its present form. The delegates of *Uruguay* and *France* submitted amendments designed to alter the emphasis of