

the resolution and especially to eliminate reference to the specific case cited. The delegate of *Australia* said that, since doubt concerning the scope of diplomatic privileges existed, the question should be referred to the International Court of Justice. He accordingly submitted a resolution to that effect.

In support of the Soviet position, members of the Eastern bloc spoke at great length. Mr Katz-Suchy of *Poland* said that Chile's case was based on the claim that certain rights had been infringed, but there were no such rights. Many international tribunals had decided that nationality and the movement of nationals fell within domestic jurisdiction. Any country could decide whether it banned or allowed emigration of its citizens, and the United Nations therefore had no right to consider the case of the Soviet wives.

The amended version of the Chilean resolution submitted by *France* and *Uruguay*, after referring to the human rights provisions of the Charter (Articles 1 (3) and 55 (c)), to a resolution adopted by the Economic and Social Council on 23 August, 1948, deploring "the legislative or administrative provisions which deny to a woman the right to leave her country of origin and reside with her husband in any other," and to Articles 11 and 14 of the draft Declaration of Human Rights¹, continued :—

" The General Assembly

" Declares that the measures which prevent or coerce the wives of citizens of other nationalities from leaving their country of origin with their husbands or in order to join them abroad, are not in conformity with the Charter ; and when those measures refer to the wives of persons belonging to foreign diplomatic missions, or of members of their families or retinue, they are contrary to courtesy, to diplomatic practices and to the principle of reciprocity, and are likely to impair friendly relations among nations ;

" Recommends the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to withdraw the measures of such a nature which have been adopted."

This text was approved by 26 votes (N.Z.) to 6 (the Eastern bloc) with 6 abstentions.

Discussion continued on the proposal of *Australia* to submit to the International Court of Justice the following questions :—

I. To what degree do the privileges and immunities granted to the head of a foreign mission in accordance with diplomatic practices traditionally established by international law extend to his family and to his establishment ?

¹ Articles 13 and 16 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as finally adopted (Appendix II).