

eventually adopted declared that the measures complained of were not in conformity with the Charter and recommended that the Government of the Soviet Union should withdraw such measures. There was not time, however, in Paris for the plenary session to consider the resolution adopted by the Committee, and it was accordingly postponed until the second part of the session.

When the report of the Sixth Committee on this question came before the General Assembly on 25 April, 1949, the *Chilean* delegate reiterated the views expressed by his delegation in Paris. In confutation of the Soviet argument that the Assembly was incompetent to deal with the question because of the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter (the domestic jurisdiction clause), the *Chilean* delegate referred to the Soviet attempt in the Economic and Social Council to have adopted a resolution which would declare that certain legislative and administrative measures taken by some countries in connection with trade-union rights were contrary to the Charter and that they should be withdrawn. The Soviet objection to the present draft resolution, which implied exactly the same sort of action by the United Nations, was therefore in contradiction to their attitude in the Economic and Social Council and was a clear example of political opportunism. The action of the Soviet Government in this instance was, in the view of Chile, a systematic violation of the basic principles upon which the United Nations was constructed.

The *Soviet* representative, however, said that refusal to grant exit *visas* to Soviet citizens was an ordinary administrative question and could not under any circumstances be subject to discussion by the United Nations, since it related exclusively to the internal jurisdiction of the State. The present resolution was merely one of a series of attempts to use the General Assembly for the purposes of hostile propaganda and libels against the Soviet Union. It was unthinkable that the General Assembly would give serious consideration to such an inconsistent and ludicrous proposal.

Mrs Roosevelt (*United States*) and Mr McNeil (*United Kingdom*) stated that their Governments were deeply concerned at the policy of the Soviet Government in refusing to allow the Russian wives of their citizens to leave the Soviet Union; restrictions on the departure of these wives were contrary to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the principles of the Charter itself.

The draft resolution submitted by the Committee was adopted by a vote of 39 (N.Z.) to 6 (the Eastern European states) with 11 abstentions.

A *Chilean* amendment replacing references to articles of the draft Declaration of Human Rights by references to articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as finally adopted had previously been incorporated in the resolution* by the same vote.

* Op. cit. page 142 (text of operative part of resolution).