

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTEENTH SESSION

Official Records


 Thursday, 6 November 1958,
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 31: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (continued)	201

Chairman: Mrs. Lina P. TSALDARIS (Greece).

AGENDA ITEM 31

Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (A/3828/Rev.1, A/3828/Rev.1/Add.1, A/3848, chap. VI, sect. II, A/C.3/L.694/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.695/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.696) (continued)

1. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) regretted that, owing to the heavy financial burdens it had to bear, his country was unable to make a contribution to the settlement of the refugee problem, the great importance of which it appreciated. Despite the magnificent work already accomplished by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, a great deal remained to be done and his delegation had accordingly voted in favour of the prolongation of the Office at the twelfth session.

2. The interest of the whole world should be focused on the refugee problem; his delegation would therefore vote in favour of the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.695/Rev.1), on the understanding that in endorsing the text it was not assuming any financial or other obligation. It could not support the amendments submitted by the Soviet Union (A/C.3/L.697). It would, however, vote in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.696) and of that submitted by Morocco and Tunisia (A/C.3/L.694/Rev.1).

3. Mr. TELSON (Haiti) congratulated the Office of the High Commissioner on the efforts it had made and the results it had achieved. The refugee problem should be finally settled at the very earliest moment, but unfortunately its political and economic implications complicated the search for a solution. The receiving countries, which were not always the most favoured economically, had to take on heavy burdens. All delegations agreed that the refugees should be helped to regain their zest for life and, although they did not agree on the methods which should be used to that end, it would be wrong to abandon all hope that the goal would be reached.

4. He would vote in favour of the ten-Power draft resolution. He would also support the draft resolution submitted by Morocco and Tunisia, but felt that it would be desirable to insert the words "with satisfaction" after the words "Taking note" in the third paragraph of the preamble. He agreed with those delegations which had suggested the deletion of the words "on a substantial scale" in the operative part.

5. Mr. MAHMUD (Ceylon) explained that owing to his country's present economic position his Government could make no contribution to the High Commissioner's Office. Ceylon had to use all its available resources to assist the countless people who, in Ceylon as in many other under-developed countries of Asia and Africa, were struggling against poverty and unemployment. Nevertheless his country was deeply interested in the distressing problem of the refugees and paid a tribute to all those who were trying to settle it.

6. His delegation would be happy to support the draft resolution submitted by Morocco and Tunisia (A/C.3/L.694/Rev.1) and the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.696). It would study the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.695/Rev.1) and the USSR amendments (A/C.3/L.697) carefully and hoped that the discussion in the Committee would help it to reach a decision on those two texts.

7. Mr. HILL (Secretariat) announced that if the ten-Power draft resolution were adopted the Secretary-General would be happy to assist to the utmost in the promotion of a world refugee year. The resources currently available for that purpose would not, however, permit the appointment of the necessary staff, nor would they cover any special travel to participating countries. Supplementary appropriations would therefore be required for 1959 and 1960 if the Secretary-General was to be able to discharge the task entrusted to him. The Secretariat was not able just then to supply a detailed estimate of the sum that would be needed, for it did not yet know anything about the nature and extent of the services for which Governments would ask. He would initiate consultations on the subject and would try to determine the total amount of special appropriations which would have to be approved for the World Refugee Year, in order that the Fifth Committee might take a decision before the General Assembly considered the draft resolution in plenary session.

8. Mrs. SOLYMAN (Afghanistan) said that she fully supported the draft resolution submitted by Morocco and Tunisia (A/C.3/L.694/Rev.1). She found the revised text of the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.695/Rev.1) entirely satisfactory and she thought there was no longer any need to replace the last preambular paragraph by the text proposed in the Soviet amendment (A/C.3/L.697). It seemed to her, however, that operative paragraph 4 of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.696) would be improved if the word "Urges" was replaced by the word "Invites".

9. Mr. SUDJAHRI (Indonesia) associated himself with the delegations which had thanked the High Commissioner and his assistants for their work on behalf of refugees. Great progress had already been achieved but much remained to be done. The Indo-

nesian Government attached great importance to the refugee problem and regretted its inability to make any financial contribution to the settlement of that problem. He wished to pay a tribute to all the countries which had made great efforts to help the refugees, and in particular to the Governments of Austria and Yugoslavia for their prompt and energetic action on behalf of the Hungarian refugees.

10. The refugees should be able to decide freely on their future. His delegation considered voluntary repatriation to be one of the principle means for providing permanent solutions for refugees and it hoped that the Office of the High Commissioner would continue to facilitate voluntary repatriation as well as other permanent solutions for the remaining Hungarian refugees and other refugees within its mandate.

11. He would willingly vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Morocco and Tunisia (A/C.3/L.694/Rev.1). Its purpose was purely humanitarian and it deserved universal support. The High Commissioner had already provided the refugees in Tunisia with the sum of \$116,000 but it should not be forgotten that there were refugees in Morocco, too, and that the Government of that country was faced with the same problems as was the Tunisian Government. His delegation was prepared to support the promotion of a world refugee year, on condition that the project retained a purely humanitarian character, and subject to the reservation that approval of the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.695/Rev.1) did not commit Governments to putting the project into execution and to contributing financially towards it. Subject also to the reservation that his Government was not thereby assuming any financial obligations, his delegation would vote in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.696).

12. Mrs. HAYDEN (Canada) said that she would gladly support the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.695/Rev.1). She recalled that in Geneva a similar text had been unanimously adopted by the members of the United Nations Refugee Fund (UNREF) Executive Committee (A/3828/Rev.1/Add.1, annex II) and she urged all Governments to co-operate in the promotion of a world refugee year. The attention of the entire world should be drawn to the tragic fate of refugees; that could be expected to produce an increase in financial assistance. The institution of a world refugee year would also provide new opportunities for permanent solutions.

13. Commenting briefly on the Soviet amendments (A/C.3/L.697), she pointed out that the most desirable solution to the refugee problem would be for the refugees to return to their countries of origin without fear of persecution. Yet many people had become refugees because they could not accept the form of government in power in their country. Her delegation could not therefore support the amendments submitted by the Soviet Union and regretted that they introduced political considerations into the discussion of a question which should be considered from a strictly humanitarian point of view.

14. It was from that point of view that her delegation had considered the draft resolution submitted by Morocco and Tunisia (A/C.3/L.694/Rev.1). When the time came to vote on that text, she would take into account the fact that the High Commissioner had

already provided, and would most certainly continue to provide, assistance to the refugees from Algeria.

15. She would vote very willingly for the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.696) and hoped that it would secure a large number of votes. If the High Commissioner's programme, which had been endorsed by many delegations, was to be successfully carried out, it would be necessary for every country to co-operate in its execution, either by contributing financially or by offering to receive refugees.

16. Mr. BEAUFORT (Netherlands) agreed, on behalf of the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.696), to the insertion of the word "international" between the words "substantial" and "effort" in the second paragraph of the preamble, in accordance with a suggestion made by the representative of Austria at the preceding meeting.

17. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) associated himself with the comments made by the representative of Indonesia, who had praised the generous assistance given by Austria and Yugoslavia to the Hungarian refugees. The extent of the assistance Austria had given was well known; moreover, it had been given even before the United Nations had taken up the question. Yugoslavia, for its part, had shown that with good will it was always possible to find a full and satisfactory solution to the refugee problem.

18. The United States representative had said at the preceding meeting that the majority of "displaced persons" wanted to be resettled in a new country. Although it was true that after the Second World War most of the "displaced persons"—who had lost their homes and their families, and could not for various reasons return to their own countries—had indeed wanted to settle abroad, the case of the present-day refugees was different. Some of them might indeed be afraid to return to their own countries, but amnesties and other encouragements might facilitate their return, which was still the most desirable solution.

19. The representative of the United States had also said that the host countries should decide the fate of orphans. The fact was, however, that in all juridical systems that responsibility appeared to rest with the next of kin or, in their absence, with the competent authorities of the country of origin. Repatriation was accordingly the only conceivable solution in the case of minor refugees. He had hoped that the Committee would adopt a draft resolution to that effect rather than the somewhat feeble text proposed by the Soviet Union as an amendment. As things were, his delegation would support the Soviet amendment (A/C.3/L.697) to the last paragraph of the preamble to the ten-Power draft resolution. It would have liked to make certain formal changes in the Soviet amendment to paragraph 1 of the operative part, but, owing to lack of time, would doubtless be obliged to abstain from voting on it.

20. With regard to the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.696), he would like the word "Urges" in paragraph 4 of the operative part to be replaced by "Appeals to".

21. The revised ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.695/Rev.1) was undoubtedly an improvement on the original version. He was still afraid, however, that in some countries the observance of a world refugee

year might give rise to demonstrations of a political rather than a humanitarian nature, in particular by the voluntary organizations. Moreover, in Islamic societies the *zakah* system obliged every Moslem to devote 2.5 per cent of his goods to charitable purposes every year. The ten-Power draft resolution might well oblige the Moslem countries to change that traditional system. His delegation would accordingly be unable to vote in its favour.

22. The draft resolution submitted by Morocco and Tunisia, in its revised form (A/C.3/L.694/Rev.1), which had been shortened still further at the preceding meeting, represented, so to speak, merely the bare bones of the original text. The sole purpose of that proposal was to draw attention to the destitute condition of certain refugees; it cast no reflections on the admirable work and the devotion of the High Commissioner and his assistants. The various reservations made to it were consequently rather surprising. It was hard to see why the Committee should fear to mention Algerian refugees by name, when it had felt no such scruples in the case of the Hungarian refugees, who had undoubtedly been the responsibility of the High Commissioner and would in any case have received assistance. It was not a matter of raising political questions but of demonstrating more sympathy and offering more generous moral support to a group of destitute persons who stood in the greatest need of it.

23. Mrs. LEFLEROVA (Czechoslovakia) found the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.695/Rev.1) unsatisfactory from the humanitarian point of view: it relegated the idea of voluntary repatriation to second place when it should be strongly emphasized, and it made no reference to the unconditional repatriation of refugee minors. As the sponsors had not accepted the USSR amendments (A/C.3/L.697), her delegation would be obliged to vote against it. She feared that the World Refugee Year would provide fresh opportunities for exploiting the sufferings of the refugees for political ends. Her delegation would support the Soviet amendments.

24. Her delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Morocco and Tunisia (A/C.3/L.694/Rev.1), which was purely humanitarian in character, but it maintained the reservations it had made on the subject of UNREF (872nd meeting).

25. It could not support the whole of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.696) and would ask for a separate vote on the first paragraph of the preamble.

26. The problem of the Hong Kong refugees was a mere fabrication, invented to slander the People's Republic of China. She wanted to make it clear that the persons in question were not genuine refugees but people who had simply changed their place of residence; neither the General Assembly nor any other United Nations organ was entitled to engage in action which would constitute intervention in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of China.

27. Mr. BONDEVIK (Norway) pointed out that his delegation was among the sponsors of two draft resolutions (A/C.3/L.695/Rev.1 and A/C.3/L.696), both of which were designed to promote an increase in financial and other resources in order to bring about a speedy settlement of the refugee problem. The best way of demonstrating the confidence which the High

Commissioner deserved was to give him the widest possible freedom of action to deal with situations which might arise. A certain priority should nevertheless be given to camp clearance, assistance to families, and so-called difficult cases.

28. His delegation felt the deepest sympathy with the intentions that had prompted the draft resolution submitted by Morocco and Tunisia (A/C.3/L.694/Rev.1). He recalled that Norwegian voluntary organizations had provided assistance to the refugees from Algeria. Nevertheless he had questioned the value of the draft resolution, in view of the fact that the High Commissioner's Office was already providing assistance to the refugees from Algeria and would without doubt continue to do so. Moreover, the words "on a substantial scale" had seemed to him rather vague. In view, however, of the interpretation placed on them by the United States representative at the preceding meeting, his delegation would be able to support the draft resolution as it stood.

29. Mrs. ERSHOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to reply to the comments some delegations had made on the Soviet amendments (A/C.3/L.697). At its previous sessions the General Assembly had stressed the principle of voluntary repatriation; in practice, however, that principle had been more or less disregarded. It was not the High Commissioner himself but the programme and general policy of certain United Nations organs and of the UNREF Executive Committee that were to blame. That being so, the Soviet delegation had wished to do something to ensure that in connexion with the World Refugee Year that abnormal situation should be brought to an end. It had based its actions on the knowledge of conditions prevailing in the camps and on the activities of certain groups which were systematically trying to prevent the return of the refugees. There was no question of making repatriation absolutely compulsory. There was, however, reason to believe that the Hungarian refugee problem would have been solved long since if artificial obstacles had not been placed in the way of repatriation and if the situation had not been shamelessly exploited by some people for strictly political ends. The main purpose of the Soviet amendments was to give the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.695/Rev.1) a more concrete and thus truly humanitarian character. She was consequently surprised that such efforts had been made to detect political motives in them.

30. The ten-Power draft resolution, even in its revised form, endorsed the current practice, which in most cases consisted of resettling refugees in a country other than their own. Mention was certainly made of voluntary repatriation but there was not a single practical provision calculated to facilitate such repatriation and to eliminate the obstacles which were persistently being placed in its way. Lastly, the proposed text did not establish the principle of the unconditional repatriation of refugee minors. Her delegation was therefore maintaining its amendments; if they were not accepted, it would vote against the ten-Power draft resolution.

31. The seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.696) sought to obtain General Assembly approval of the working methods of the UNREF Executive Committee—methods which left much to be desired. Moreover, there was no mention of voluntary repatriation

in it. Her delegation would not therefore support the draft resolution as a whole unless considerable improvements were made in it. It would nevertheless vote in favour of the first two paragraphs of the preamble.

32. Mr. BENGTON (Sweden) stated that he would vote in favour of the Moroccan and Tunisian draft resolution (A/C.3/L.694/Rev.1) on the understanding that it was to be interpreted in the light of the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1166 (XII). The High Commissioner should report to the Executive Committee on the programme of assistance to refugees in Morocco and Tunisia. He regretted, however, that the text seemed to deviate from the usual practice by mentioning the origin of the refugees.

33. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said that he would vote in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.696) for the same reasons that led his Government to support in various ways international efforts in favour of refugees.

34. He would also vote in favour of the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.695/Rev.1). The USSR amendments (A/C.3/L.697) were unnecessary inasmuch as the ten-Power text sufficiently emphasized the essentially humanitarian character of assistance to refugees. In addition, they placed too much stress on voluntary repatriation, which was only one solution among others.

35. He had at first had some misgivings about the Moroccan and Tunisian draft resolution (A/C.3/L.694/Rev.1), for various reasons. He was glad to see, however, that his misgivings no longer seemed to be justified in view of the moderation shown by the countries directly concerned; he would therefore vote in favour of the revised draft resolution.

36. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that he would like the High Commissioner to state how many orphans or other minors came within his competence and who should take charge of the children who had neither father nor mother. The Office of Legal Affairs of the Secretariat might perhaps be able to supply information on that last point and say whether there were any international instruments covering the question.

37. With regard to the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.696), he expressed the view that in order to provide a more balanced text voluntary repatriation should be mentioned in operative paragraph 4.

38. Mrs. SOLYMAN (Afghanistan) formally proposed that the word "Urges", in operative paragraph 4 of the English text of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.696) should be replaced by "Invites".

39. Mr. LINDT (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees) said that he had no figures of the number of orphans living in camps to hand.

40. The policy of the Office of the High Commissioner with regard to unaccompanied children was based on two principles: the principle of family unity, in accordance with the freely expressed wish of the parents, and the principle whereby the best interests of the child should be the determining factor in any decision taken regarding the movement of a refugee child.

41. A minor came within the mandate of the High Commissioner only to the extent that he could be considered a refugee. It was not a question of applying a fixed age limit but of dealing with each case separately. If a minor was considered to be a refugee, his case was governed by the principles of the Convention of 28 July 1951 relating to the Status of Refugees;^{1/} in particular, the personal status of the individual concerned was governed by the laws of the country of residence. The tutelary authorities of the country of residence were therefore competent to authorize the movement of a minor. It was the duty of the High Commissioner, in carrying out his functions of international protection, to recommend respect for the above-mentioned principles. That meant that, if it were possible to find his parents, the child should normally join them. If the minor was an orphan, or if his parents could not be found, any decision concerning the child should be based on his best interests.

42. In keeping with the general lines of that policy, the High Commissioner had issued instructions to all regional delegations that unaccompanied children should not be moved without the approval of the competent authorities.

43. It was the responsibility of the authorities of the country where the children were to put that policy into effect. The Office of the High Commissioner was not in a position to decide, in any particular case, whether or not the child should be moved or to state to what country he should be sent. The authorities of the country where the child was were responsible for taking that decision. The High Commissioner could only advise the authorities concerned.

44. The Office of the High Commissioner was following the question of minors very closely, particularly in the countries where there were many refugees.

45. Sir Humphrey TREVELYAN (Under-Secretary for Special Political Affairs) said that the Secretariat was unable at the moment to give the Saudi Arabian representative any other information than that already supplied by the High Commissioner. Detailed studies would be undertaken in due course.

46. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Moroccan and Tunisian draft resolution (A/C.3/L.694/Rev.1), as amended by the deletion of the words "until the return of the refugees to their homes" at the end of the operative paragraph.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Guatemala, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union

^{1/} United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Status of Refugees and Stateless Persons held at Geneva, Switzerland, from 2 to 25 July 1951, Final Act and Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (United Nations publication, Sales No.:1951.IV.4).

of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Greece.

Against: Union of South Africa, France.

Abstaining: Guatemala, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Peru, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 57 votes to 2, with 15 abstentions.

47. Miss HORNSBY-SMITH (United Kingdom) considered that all refugees were equally entitled to sympathy and assistance. Her delegation paid a tribute to Morocco and Tunisia for their efforts on behalf of the refugees within their borders, expressed satisfaction at the assistance already given by the High Commissioner and voiced the hope that if a world refugee year were instituted those refugees would benefit by the additional assistance which it might produce.

48. The resolution would not, however, achieve anything that would not be as well or better done without a resolution; in that respect it differed from resolutions adopted in the past about particular groups of refugees. In the case in point, as he had indicated both in his report and in his statement, the High Commissioner was already dealing with the problem; he would undoubtedly do everything within his means to continue and even extend his efforts on behalf of those refugees, even in the absence of a resolution, and he should be trusted to do so. It was for that reason that the United Kingdom had felt it appropriate to abstain.

49. Mr. BARRATT (Union of South Africa) said that although he found the aims of the draft resolution very praiseworthy, he had been unable to support it because he considered it unnecessary. The High Commissioner would undoubtedly continue to do everything in his power for all groups of refugees, and the South African delegation was not in a position to decide which of those groups deserved particular attention. The seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.696), which concerned all refugees, would give the same results as those sought by Morocco and Tunisia.

50. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) recalled that the General Assembly had already appealed to the High Commissioner to give the maximum assistance to all refugees coming within his mandate, including those in Morocco and Tunisia. The Dominican Republic had therefore abstained, not out of indifference but because the resolution was not necessary.

51. Mr. SAVINA (Italy) said that the Committee had already expressed the unanimous feeling that the refugee problem could and should be completely settled. There was every reason to believe that the High Commissioner's activities would be continued, with government assistance. In the particular case now before the Committee, all the necessary encouragement had been given to the Office of the High Commissioner and there was no doubt that the aim of

the sponsors of the draft resolution would be achieved. Nothing would be gained by the adoption of the draft resolution and the Italian delegation had therefore abstained from voting.

52. Mr. BOUQUIN (France) said that he had already made a clear statement of his position and would not repeat it. His delegation's vote did not mean that France had no interest in the fate of those people who had been torn from their homes and were eking out a miserable existence in Tunisia and Morocco. On the contrary, it felt their distress keenly and was doing its best to provide them with material assistance and to encourage their repatriation. The French consulates in Morocco and Tunisia had at their disposal all the means of assistance for which provision had been made for French nationals.

53. Miss HAMPTON (New Zealand) said that she had voted in favour of the draft resolution, although it was not absolutely necessary in view of the fact that the High Commissioner had already taken action on behalf of the refugees in Tunisia and would certainly have done the same for those in Morocco if he had been asked for assistance; nevertheless, she had voted in favour of the resolution in order to enable the High Commissioner to give that group of refugees assistance on an even more substantial scale, within the terms of his mandate and in accordance with the recommendations of the Executive Committee.

54. Mr. BOULOS (Lebanon) said that although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, despite the deletion of the phrase at the end of the operative part, that action should not be interpreted as a change of position. Lebanon still regarded repatriation, both for reasons of principle and for practical reasons, as the best means of settling refugee problems. He cited the case of the Palestine refugees, who had been waiting for ten years to return to their country. Lebanon, which had taken in a number of refugees equivalent to one-twelfth of its entire population, had in so doing shown its interest in the refugee problem. Despite what had been accomplished already, there was still a great deal to be done. He concluded with a tribute to the High Commissioner, in whose admirable humanitarian work he placed his hopes.

55. Mr. RIMALT (Israel) said that, although he shared the humanitarian concern which had prompted the draft resolution, he had thought it his duty to abstain from voting, in view of the fact that the High Commissioner already had full power to assist all refugees, wherever they were, and had shown in his report that he was aware of the needs of the refugees in North Africa. General Assembly resolution 1166 (XII) and the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.696) would give still greater stimulus to his efforts on behalf of all refugees.

56. Mr. COX (Peru) said that he had abstained from voting, having in mind the information in the High Commissioner's report (A/3828/Rev.1) on the refugees in question and the fact that, since the Office of the High Commissioner was responsible for assisting all refugees, it was not appropriate to give special mention to particular cases. The High Commissioner had said that he would continue to concern himself with those refugees and the adoption of a new resolution might be interpreted as a lack of confidence in him.

57. Mrs. DE ARENAS (Guatemala) said that she had abstained because her delegation was entirely confident that with or without a resolution the High Commissioner would fulfil his obligations towards all refugees.

58. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that his vote in favour of the draft resolution did not in any way imply a lack of confidence in the High Commissioner. In his opinion, the purpose of the draft resolution was to bring out the tragic fate of the Algerian refugees in Morocco and Tunisia. Their number, between 180,000 and 200,000 he thought, was sufficient grounds for the Third Committee to draw attention to their situation. Moreover, there was no reason to differentiate between the Algerian refugees and the Hungarian refugees or the refugees in Hong Kong, on whose behalf special resolutions had been adopted in the past without being interpreted as a criticism of the High Commissioner's work.

59. The CHAIRMAN said that he would put the Soviet amendments (A/C.3/L.697) to the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.695/Rev.1) to the vote.

60. Mr. RIFAI (Jordan) suggested that, in view of the lateness of the hour, explanations of vote on the various texts before the Committee should be postponed to the next meeting.

It was so decided.

61. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the Soviet amendment (A/C.3/L.697) to the last paragraph of the preamble.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Union of South Africa, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Against: Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

Abstaining: Uruguay, Burma, Cambodia, Finland, Ghana, Greece, India, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Thailand, Tunisia.

The amendment was rejected by 42 votes to 19, with 12 abstentions.

62. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the Soviet amendment (A/C.3/L.697) to paragraph 1 of the operative part.

The amendment was rejected by 47 votes to 9, with 18 abstentions.

63. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.695/Rev.1).

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Belgium, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania.

Abstaining: Burma, Cambodia, Hungary, India, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Uruguay, Yemen.

The draft resolution was adopted by 56 votes to 8, with 9 abstentions.

64. At the request of Mrs. LEFLEROVA (Czechoslovakia), the CHAIRMAN called for a separate vote on the first preambular paragraph of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.696).

The paragraph was adopted by 70 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

65. The CHAIRMAN proposed that a vote should be taken on the Afghan amendment replacing the word "Urges" in the English text of operative paragraph 4 by the word "Invites".

66. After an exchange of views in which Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic), Mrs. SOLYMAN (Afghanistan), Mr. ELMANDJRA (Morocco), Mr. BOUQUIN (France), Miss HORNSBY-SMITH (United Kingdom), Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), Mr. CALDERON PUIG (Mexico) and Mr. COX (Peru) took part, the CHAIRMAN suggested that the word "Urges" in the English text should be replaced by the words "Appeals to" and that the Secretariat should be asked to find appropriate translations in the other languages.

It was so decided.

67. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the seven-Power draft resolution as a whole (A/C.3/L.696).

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 57 votes to 8, with 5 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.