

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/AC.7/SR.173
25 August 1950

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH AND
FRENCH

Dual Distribution

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Eleventh Session

SOCIAL COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Saturday, 12 August 1950, at 2.30 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Refugees and Stateless Persons (item 32 of the agenda)
(concluded)

- (a) General Assembly resolution 319 (IV) A
(E/1668, E/1669, E/1767, E/1767/Add.1, E/1801,
E/1802, E/AC.7/L.60, E/AC.7/L.70, E/AC.7/L.72,
E/AC.7/L.73, E/AC.7/L.74, E/AC.7/L.75 and
E/AC.7/L.76) (continued)

Working paper submitted by the French delegation
(E/AC.7/L.60) (continued).

Present:

Chairman: Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada), Vice Chairman

Members:

Australia	Miss DOBSON
Belgium	Mr. DELHAYE
Brazil	Mr. SOUZA-BANDEIRA
Canada	Miss MEAGHER
Chile	Mr. BERNSTEIN
China	Mr. CHA
Denmark	Mr. FRIIS
France	Mr. ROCHEFORT
India	Mr. DESAI
Iran	Mr. KHALATBARY
Mexico	Mr. CALDERON PUIG Mr. GONZALEZ SOSA
Pakistan	Mr. AKHTAR
Peru	Mr. CABADA
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. FEARNLEY
United States of America	Mr. ROSEMAN Mr. HENKIN

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Mr. LEMOINE
International Refugee Organization	Mr. KULLMANN

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category B and Register

International Co-operative Women's Guild	Miss ROSSIER
Liaison Committee of Women's International Organizations	Miss ROSSIER

Secretariat:

Mr. Humphrey	Director, Division of Human Rights
Mr. Hogan	Department of Social Affairs
Mr. Alexander	Department of Social Affairs
Mr. Cook	Administrative and Financial Services
Mr. Dumontet	Secretary to the Committee

REFUGEES AND STATELESS PERSONS (item 32 of the agenda) (concluded)

- (a) General Assembly resolution 319 (IV)
(E/1668, E/1669, E/1767, E/1767/Add.1, E/1801, E/1802, E/AC.7/L.60
E/AC.7/L.70, E/AC.7/L.72, E/AC.7/L.73, E/AC.7/L.74, E/AC.7/L.75 and
E/AC.7/L.76) (continued)

Working paper submitted by the French delegation (E/AC.7/L.70) (continued)

Chapter III - Powers, Functions and Competence

Section C - Competence (continued)

The CHAIRMAN called on the Committee to resume consideration of the French working paper concerning the Statute of the High Commissioner's Office, as from Chapter III, Section C (Competence) (E/AC.7/L.60, page 6).

Mr. BERNSTEIN (Chile) recalled that, when the question of the definition of the term "refugee" had first been discussed, his delegation had taken the view that there were two separate problems to which different definitions could be applied. As the draft Convention was concerned with the rights of refugees, it was reasonable that a broad definition should be used, therein, to enable the greatest number of refugees to enjoy such rights. The definition of the term "refugee" in the Statute of the High Commissioner's Office might, however, be less broad, since the High Commissioner would be able to extend the benefits of the Convention as occasion arose to refugees throughout the world. After hearing the various views expressed at the previous (172nd) meeting of the Committee, he had come to the conclusion that a broad definition in the Statute would make the work of the High Commissioner more difficult, and that a less comprehensive definition would be sufficient, for under his mandate the High Commissioner would be able to extend protection to all refugees. Again, a broad definition in the Statute would encourage a very large number of people to claim refugee status individually, thereby making the High Commissioner's task even more difficult. He was not convinced by the arguments advanced in favour of the view that many refugees would be left without protection if a definition by categories similar to that in article 1 of the draft Convention were adopted. If other groups of refugees had to be

added to those categories, the General Assembly would take the necessary action in good time and, moreover, under the United States proposal the High Commissioner would have power to deal with urgent cases provisionally, pending the sanction of the General Assembly. His delegation would therefore support the French proposal as amended by the United States delegation.

Mr. HENKIN (United States of America) desired, without going into details, to clarify one point. One aspect of the difference between the United States and United Kingdom definitions had not been clearly brought out. The United States definition of the term "refugee" referred to those who were victims of persecution "as a result of events" in Europe prior to 1 January 1951. That phrase was derived from the Constitution of the International Refugee Organization (IRO), and had a recognized meaning which everyone understood. When speaking of individuals victims of persecution as a result of events in Europe the intention was to cover individuals victims of campaigns of persecution arising out of political upheavals. Unlike the United Kingdom definition, it would not cover an isolated individual claiming persecution not part of a campaign of persecution.

Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) enquired whether the United States definition would cover the case where, as the result of a revolutionary change of government before 1 January 1951, say for the sake of argument, in Great Britain, a large section of the population was victimized and found it necessary to flee the country.

Mr. HENKIN (United States of America) said that the definition would cover those who had to flee from one country to another as the result of a major political upheaval of the kind all had in mind. If the political changes were of a minor nature, the definition, he felt, would not cover them. The important factor to keep in mind was the choice of date, and the known meaning of the phrase.

Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) wished, in order to clarify still further the United States definition, to put a second question. Assuming that

certain people had to leave the country, not because of a political upheaval but because of certain laws passed by a government duly elected by the people and taking action against such people because of their political beliefs, would such individuals be covered by article 1 of the draft Convention?

Mr. HENKIN (United States of America) explained further that his difficulty in replying to that question was that the Convention was intended to deal with known situations, hence the date 1 January 1951. In the light of that fact, he considered that the United Kingdom's second hypothetical case was not intended to be covered by the definition in article 1 of the draft Convention. There might be a period between the close of the next (fifth) session of the General Assembly and 1 January 1951 during which new classes of refugee might emerge, but those would presumably be considered on their merits as future cases. The definition in the draft Convention was intended to cover victims of persecution as a result of currently known events in certain countries.

Mr. ROCHEFORT (France) pointed out that, without doubt, the value of the discussion lay in the fact that it enabled the same question to be considered in its different aspects. Both the general definition with its necessary exclusions, and the definition on the basis of categories with its possible inclusions, would produce in the end very much the same immediate results. In the final analysis, the definition contained in the draft Convention, together, on the one hand, with the clause authorizing the High Commissioner to intercede with Governments on behalf of other categories of refugees, and, on the other, with the future recommendations of the General Assembly, provided a solution which was mid-way between the two extremes. If everything was not being achieved at once, that was only because it could not be; the essential thing was to compromise nothing and to safeguard the future; that had been achieved, beyond doubt.

In present world conditions, conscience was not to be eased merely by adopting a general definition; action was required. And when it came to action, the attempt to achieve the best result often compromised the achievement of a good result, so that to give the High Commissioner too broad a mandate

might make him completely ineffective in practice. The French delegation had made every effort, both at and since the fourth session of the General Assembly, to extend the High Commissioner's terms of reference as far as was compatible with prevailing conditions. It felt that great progress had been made, and that the texts which had emerged from the Social Committee's discussions held out real hope to refugees. Any attempt to go further at the present time would have the effect of transferring the General Assembly's responsibility to the High Commissioner, and would be tantamount to a refusal to take existing facts and possibilities into account. Logic had played its part in the drafting of those texts, and his delegation felt that it too had contributed in some measure; there were times, however, when even French logic had to pay tribute to British empiricism.

To turn to the question of financing, since that had been raised during the discussion, it was not very convincing to argue that, in as much as all States Members of the United Nations would be responsible for the expenses of the High Commissioner's Office, the definition should be a general one. When the question of assuming international responsibility for European refugees and displaced persons had arisen, only eighteen governments had shouldered that burden, which should have been shared by all nations. Several of those governments had been so impoverished by the war that they had not been able to participate to any considerable extent in financing IRO, which had an annual budget of 150 million dollars. At the present time, however, the sum required to complete that task, which was the responsibility of all, was so small that no delegation would be able to object to that modest but concrete contribution to international collaboration.

The CHAIRMAN requested the meeting to take up the three amendments proposed by the United Kingdom delegation (E/AC.7/L.76) to the text suggested by the United States delegation (E/AC.7/L.73, page 3) to paragraph 2 of Section C of Chapter III of the draft Annex submitted in document E/AC.7/L.60.

Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) explained that his delegation's suggestion that the words "after consultation with the Advisory Committee on

Refugees" should be deleted had been made, not because there had been no decision as to whether or not an advisory committee on refugees should be set up, but rather because it was not convinced that such consultation should be mandatory on the High Commissioner. The deletion of that phrase would not, of course, prevent him from entering into such consultation if he saw fit to do so.

His second amendment that the words "other categories of refugees" should be substituted for "new categories of refugees which might arise" was submitted on the ground that the High Commissioner should be in a position to act, not only on behalf of new refugees, but also on behalf of existing refugees not at present covered by the United States definition. He hoped that the United States representative would be able to accept that amendment since, if the latter still considered, as he had stated earlier, that there were no existing refugees not covered, then the amendment would not alter matters.

The third amendment, (the deletion of the word "new" from the fourth line of the paragraph) was consequential to the second amendment.

His delegation was somewhat dismayed to find that a number of delegations that had supported a broad definition of the term "refugee" for inclusion in the draft Convention had not been able to accept a broad definition for inclusion in the Statute of the High Commissioner's Office. He was not referring to the Chilean delegation, which had made its position quite clear from the very beginning, but to other delegations, and he failed to see why they were unable to accept such a broad definition in the Statute when they had expressed a desire to ensure that the interests of all the refugees in the world should be covered by the Convention. His delegation hoped that when the matter came before the General Assembly the broad definition would be considered the best. He wished to make it clear that his delegation would sympathetically consider any amendments to the United Kingdom definition that might have the effect of excluding certain categories of refugees that should not at the moment be included. He hoped that when his proposal was put to the vote, delegations would consider that they were voting on a question of general principle and that the details were open to further consideration.

There was one essential difference between the United States and United Kingdom proposals. If the general principle enunciated by the United Kingdom amendment was adopted, it would be adopted on humanitarian grounds, for its intention was that all refugees, present and future, should have someone to turn to. The United States proposal, on the other hand, left it to the General Assembly to decide whether or which new categories of refugees should be included. That decision would be taken piecemeal, not on purely humanitarian grounds but on grounds which were bound to be affected by extraneous political considerations. Thus, if the United States amendment were adopted there was a danger that, at some future session of the General Assembly, one category of refugees might, owing to political considerations, be accepted, whereas another was refused, also for political reasons, although they both had equal humanitarian claims to the protection of the High Commissioner.

Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) observed that his delegation had originally favoured a broad definition of the term "refugee". Its support of a definition by categories for the draft Convention had been given reluctantly, and only because it felt that ratification of the Convention might be adversely affected by the adoption of a broad definition. The problem in the case of the Statute of the High Commissioner's Office, however, was different, and the question could be viewed from another angle. Besides, the General Assembly's position was not the same in the present situation as when it had decided to set up IRO, with the resulting heavy financial burden for Member States.

His delegation would vote for the United Kingdom definition for the reasons so admirably expressed by the representative of Canada. If it were adopted and the discussion were continued in the General Assembly, his delegation would look with an open mind on any reasonable proposals that might then be put forward, particularly as the United Kingdom representative had said that his text should not be considered as the final word in the matter. If the United Kingdom amendment were not adopted, he would abstain from voting on the United States text.

Mr. HENKIN (United States of America) thought that it was perhaps unfortunate that the debate on the definition of the term "refugee" in connection with the draft Convention had not been as full and as candid as the present debate. If, as he hoped, his proposal was adopted, his delegation would recognize that the question of the definition of the term "refugee", both in the draft Convention and in the Statute, would be re-opened in the General Assembly.

The difference between the United Kingdom proposal and that of his own delegation was essentially one of approach. The United States delegation desired to see a definition adopted that would make sure that every refugee who should be included was included, rather than a definition such as that proposed by the United Kingdom delegation, which required several exclusions to make it appropriate, and from which it was impossible to eliminate all undesirable aspects. As to future cases, his delegation believed in leaving the General Assembly a free hand and in giving the High Commissioner discretion in the matter of provisional action with regard to new situations.

His delegation accepted the three amendments proposed by the United Kingdom delegation (E/AC.7/L.76).

Mr. ROCHEFORT (France) pointed out that the Annex to General Assembly resolution 319 (IV) A made it clear that the High Commissioner would consider individual cases only exceptionally, whereas the United States text apparently wished to make individual consideration a general rule. In order to reconcile the two texts, he proposed that in paragraph 1 of the United States amendment (E/AC.7/L.73, pages 2 and 3), the words "a person falls" in the fifth line should be replaced by the words "such persons fall" and the words "is therefore excluded" in the sixth and seventh lines by the words "are therefore excluded".

Mr. HENKIN (United States of America) appreciated the concern of the French representative. However, the fact that the High Commissioner was to determine, as occasion arose, who fell within the categories, did not

necessarily mean that he would have to screen every refugee. The amendment suggested by the French representative somewhat changed the sense of the sentence, for it seemed to legislate only for cases where entire categories became war criminals etc. He would suggest that a more general term be used and the word "cases" submitted for the words "a person".

Replying to Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom), he confirmed that the provision in question was for the purposes of the High Commissioner's mandate only.

The CHAIRMAN then put the United Kingdom amendment (E/AC.7/L.72) to Section C of Chapter III of the French working paper to the vote.

At the request of Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom), the vote was taken by roll-call. The result of the voting was as follows:

In favour: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Peru, United Kingdom.

Against: Brazil, Chile, France, India, Mexico, United States of America.

Abstentions: China, Pakistan, Australia.

The United Kingdom amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. DELHAYE (Belgium) stated that he had voted for the United Kingdom amendment, not because he regarded the definition contained in that amendment as perfect, but because it represented a substantial advance along the lines desired by his delegation.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States amendment (E/AC.7/L.73, pages 2 and 3) to Section C of Chapter III of the French working paper, which, as amended, read:

"1) Persons falling under the competence of the High Commissioner's Office for Refugees shall be those defined in Article 1 of the Convention relating to status of refugees, as approved by the General Assembly and such other persons as the General Assembly may from time to time determine. The High Commissioner shall determine which cases fall within the categories mentioned in paragraph (c) of Article 1 of the Convention and are therefore excluded from his mandate.

2) In his discretion the High Commissioner may intercede with governments on behalf of other categories of refugees, pending consideration by the General Assembly as to whether to bring such categories within the mandate of the High Commissioner's Office for Refugees".

The United States amendment was adopted by 8 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

Chapter IV - General Provisions.

The CHAIRMAN, requesting the Committee to proceed to consideration of Chapter IV (General Provisions) of the French working paper, drew attention to the two United States amendments (document E/AC.7/L.73, paragraphs 15 and 16) the first proposing the insertion of the word "the" before the words "financial rules" in line 3 of paragraph 2 [English text only] and the second the deletion of the words "subject to the provisions of Chapter III, Section A, article 1" from line 5 of the same paragraph. In view of a recent decision of the Committee, "Chapter III, Section A, article 1" would now have to read "Chapter II, Section A, Article 3".

The first United States amendment was unanimously adopted.

The second United States amendment was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN then put Chapter IV, as a whole, and as amended, to the vote.

Chapter IV of the Annex in the French working paper (E/AC.7/L.60) was adopted by 12 votes to none with 2 abstentions.

Chapter III - Section A - Powers (resumed)

Paragraph 1 (resumed)

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that discussion on the last sub-paragraph of paragraph 1 of Section A, Chapter III, had been deferred, as the Secretariat had been unable to provide the information asked for at the 171st meeting by the United States representative.

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) recalled that his delegation had suggested that the last sub-paragraph be deleted because it regarded the existing staff regulations as adequate to ensure that the High Commissioner would be able to enlist voluntary services.

Mr. COOK (Secretariat) said that, in the matter of uncompensated personnel, the Administrative Manual laid down that the United Nations regarded it as undesirable to employ personnel without paying the compensation properly attaching to the work done. He interpreted that provision as meaning that the Secretary-General could, in fact, employ uncompensated personnel; actually, there were two persons working in the Geneva Office without compensation.

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) thought that, as the Secretary-General had authority to employ uncompensated personnel, the issue only concerned administrative understandings between the Secretary-General and the High Commissioner. The last sub-paragraph therefore appeared to be unnecessary.

Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) felt that the attitude adopted in the Administrative Manual was too negative a one for the present purposes. He suggested that the French representative might agree to delete the sub-paragraph for the present, while reserving his right to reformulate it, if he wished, either in the Council or in the General Assembly in order to cover questions connected with voluntary help. He might, for example, add some provision to the previous sub-paragraph to ensure that the normal rules relating to uncompensated personnel should be interpreted a little more liberally. His delegation would certainly support the inclusion of some such form of words in the paragraph.

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America), to meet the views expressed, proposed that the following sentence be added at the end of the third sub-paragraph of paragraph 1:

"Provision may also be made to permit the employment of personnel without compensation".

Mr. ROCHEFORT (France) was prepared to support the United States proposal, but was not at all sure as to how it should be interpreted. Would the High Commissioner have to obtain the permission of the Secretary-General before employing voluntary staff, or would he be able to do so on his own initiative?

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) thought that the relative responsibilities of the Secretary-General and the High Commissioner had been adequately defined by the first and third sub-paragraphs. The United States suggestion would clearly enable the High Commissioner to enlist voluntary assistance.

Mr. COOK (Secretariat) considered that, if the United States representative's amendment were adopted, the High Commissioner could use uncompensated personnel without reference to the Secretary-General.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States representative's proposal that the fourth sub-paragraph of paragraph 1 be deleted, and that the sentence given above be added to the third sub-paragraph.

The United States representative's proposal was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 1 of Section A of Chapter III of the French working paper was adopted unanimously, as amended.

The Committee adopted the annex in the French working paper (E/AC.7/L.60), as amended, by 11 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) explained that he had abstained in view of the attitude of his delegation to the definition of the term "refugees" which was

being proposed by the Social Committee. The abstention should not be taken as indicating disapproval of the remainder of the proposed text.

Mr. DELHAYE (Belgium) said that his delegation had abstained on the text which had just been adopted, principally because of the definition it contained. That abstention did not, however, mean, as members of the Committee would have been able to appreciate in the course of the discussion, that his delegation disapproved of the whole text, a number of the provisions of which were excellent.

Miss DOBSON (Australia) asked that note be taken of the reservation made by her delegation at the 172nd meeting regarding Section C of Chapter III of the Annex.

Draft General Assembly Resolution.

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Belgian amendment (E/AC.7/L.75) to the draft resolution at the beginning of the French Working paper (E/AC.7/L.60).

Mr. DELHAYE (Belgium) confirmed what he had already had occasion to say during the discussion, namely, that his delegation was well aware that it would be difficult to allocate large sums to the High Commissioner's Office, but that it considered it would be out of place to prevent him from providing material assistance to refugees in certain cases. That was why the Belgian amendment used the words "material aid on an essentially temporary basis to refugees or displaced persons in dire need".

Mr. ROSEMAN (United States of America) thought that, in view of paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 319 (IV) A, the Belgian delegation's amendment would have the effect of re-opening an issue on which there had already been much discussion in the General Assembly. His Government's position on the question had been made clear on many previous occasions and he would oppose the amendment.

Mr. ROCHEFORT (France) recalled also paragraph 2 of resolution 319 (IV) B which read as follows: "The General Assembly .. Decides, in the absence of definite data, to postpone, until its fifth regular session, the examination of the problems of assistance raised by the above-mentioned memorandum, should these problems still be in existence at that date".

Mr. DELHAYE (Belgium) said that that provision had not escaped his attention. Nevertheless, while it was not always expedient to query a decision already taken, that must not be taken as an unbreakable rule. It was for the Council to decide what should be done in the matter.

Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) agreed with the United States and French representatives as to the relevance of the paragraphs of General Assembly resolutions 319 (IV) A and B which they had quoted. Paragraph 4 of resolution 319 (IV) A, which was the operative paragraph so far as the Council was concerned, limited itself to asking the Council to prepare detailed provisions for the functioning of the High Commissioner's Office and to make recommendations on the definition of the term "refugee". He, too, would therefore oppose the Belgian amendment.

Mr. FRIIS (Denmark), while appreciating the motives underlying the Belgian amendment, regretted that he would have to abstain from voting on it, as it was hardly in order for the Council to adopt such an amendment in view of the specific instructions of the General Assembly. The General Assembly itself might, however, consider a new proposal.

The Belgian amendment (E/AC.7/L.75) to the draft General Assembly resolution in the French working paper (E/AC.7/L.60) was rejected by 10 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN, opening the discussion on the draft resolution contained in the Secretary-General's memorandum (E/1669) pointed out that in its working paper, which the Committee had adopted as a basis for discussion the French delegation had proposed that the provisions relating to the

election of the High Commissioner and the invitation to be sent to governments should form the subject of two separate resolutions. He also pointed out that paragraph 2 had already been deleted, as it formed part of a separate resolution, so that paragraph 3 would become paragraph 2.

Mr. FERNLEY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had proposed an amendment (E/AC.7/L.70), substituting a new version for sub-paragraph 3 (f) of the draft resolution. The purpose of the amendment was to introduce a specific reference to the so-called London Agreement on Refugee Travel Documents which had been of great value in enabling refugees to travel from one country to another with the minimum of formalities and delay. By its inclusion, the paragraph would enable States to ascertain the status of the London Agreement pending the coming into force of any new agreement.

Mr. ROCHEFORT (France) recalled that, as the Chairman had pointed out, he had already had occasion to point out that the provisions contained in the draft resolution in paragraph 5 of document E/1669, relating to the election of the High Commissioner and the invitation to be issued to Governments, should form the subject of two separate draft resolutions.

Apart from that, he supported the United Kingdom amendment.

Mr. FERNLEY (United Kingdom) agreed with the French representative. He suggested that paragraph 3 of the draft resolution should be taken from its context and added as a fresh paragraph to the draft resolution in the French delegation's working paper (E/AC.7/L.60).

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that if the United Kingdom representative's suggestion was adopted, the introductory paragraph would appear to have little application to the single paragraph relating to the election of the High Commissioner.

Mr. ROCHEFORT (France) thought that it would be possible to avoid that difficulty by simplifying the draft resolution, to read: "The General Assembly, having considered article 9 of the annex to its resolution 319 (IV) A of 3 December 1949, and the Secretary-General having nominated"

The CHAIRMAN thought that the draft resolution, thus whittled down, was unnecessary, as the General Assembly had already decided on the election of a High Commissioner and could perfectly well draft its own resolution. As there was nothing substantive in such a draft resolution he proposed that it be left for the General Assembly to draft as it thought fit.

Mr. ROCHEFORT (France) supported the Chairman's proposal.

The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United Kingdom amendment (E/AC.7/L.70) to sub-paragraph 3 (f) of the draft General Assembly resolution in document E/1669.

The Committee adopted the United Kingdom amendment by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United Kingdom representative's proposal that paragraph 3 of the draft General Assembly resolution in document E/1669 be removed from its context and inserted at the end of the draft resolution in the French working paper (E/AC.7/L.60).

The Committee adopted the United Kingdom proposal by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the draft General Assembly resolution submitted by the Secretary-General (E/1669) had now been disposed of. He put to the vote the draft General Assembly resolution in the French working paper (E/AC.7/L.60), as amended.

The Committee adopted the draft General Assembly resolution in the French working paper (E/AC.7/L.60), as amended, by 9 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) said that he had abstained from voting because of the Committee's decision to adopt a limited definition of the term "refugee". He regretted the necessity for abstention, because the work of the Committee had been extremely useful.

He wondered if, in sending the draft resolution and the Statute to the General Assembly, steps could be taken to indicate, as had been done in the French working paper, the parts which were new additions to the general principles already adopted by the General Assembly. If that were done, the work of the General Assembly would be greatly simplified.

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Secretariat to the United Kingdom representative's suggestion.

Miss MEAGHER (Canada) said that her delegation had abstained from voting because it disapproved of the definition of refugees by categories; otherwise it found the Statute of the High Commissioner's Office entirely acceptable.

Mr. DESAI (India) said that he had abstained from voting because his country had disapproved in principle of the setting up of a High Commissioner's Office for Refugees.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the resolution drafted under item 32 (a) of the agenda had been drafted for the General Assembly. The Council would presumably wish the Committee to draft a resolution on its behalf for transmission to the General Assembly. He proposed that the Committee entrust the work of preparing such draft resolution to the Secretariat; it should be in a form similar to the one he had submitted the previous day in connection with other resolutions.

It was so agreed

Mr. FEARNLEY (United Kingdom) expressed to the Chairman the thanks of the Committee for the excellent manner in which he had directed its work, and its appreciation of the co-operation of the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN also thanked the Secretariat for its invaluable co-operation throughout the session.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.