

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



THIRD COMMITTEE, 472nd

MEETING

Thursday, 11 December 1952, at 10.30 a.m.

Headquarters, New York

C O N T E N T S

Page

Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (A/2126 and addendum, A/2126/Corr.1, A/2172, chapter IV, section VI, A/C.3/L.322, A/C.3/L.323) (<i>continued</i>)	327
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Chairman: Mr. S. Amjad ALI (Pakistan).

Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (A/2126 and addendum, A/2126/Corr.1, A/2172, chapter IV, section VI, A/C.3/L.322, A/C.3/L.323) (*continued*)

[Item 27]*

GENERAL DEBATE (*concluded*)

1. Mrs. EMMET (United Kingdom) submitted an amendment (A/C.3/L.324) to the joint draft resolution submitted by Colombia, Denmark, France and the Netherlands (A/C.3/L.322). The amendment reflected her Government's view that the governments directly concerned with the refugee problem should be closely associated with all practical schemes for its solution.

2. Mr. VAN GOETHEM (Belgium) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the results achieved by the High Commissioner for Refugees and the humanitarian spirit he had shown.

3. Belgium had taken an active part in the solution of the refugee problem. It had signed the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and had received and integrated into its own economy about 60,000 refugees. His Government would continue to co-operate with the High Commissioner in his work.

4. He pointed out that the definition of the term "refugee" in the Statute of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees (General Assembly resolution 428 (V), annex) was not the same as that in the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees. The difference might give rise to difficulties in countries which were parties to the convention; in his view a single definition should be uniformly applied.

5. He asked the High Commissioner to explain his understanding of the functions of his Advisory Committee on Refugees. The Belgian delegation felt that that Committee could be a strong support and afford

valuable aid to the High Commissioner, and that its powers ought perhaps to be strengthened. He wondered also what criteria were used by the High Commissioner in deciding which organizations should receive funds for direct assistance to refugees.

6. Mrs. NOVIKOVA (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) associated herself with the statements made by the USSR and Polish representatives. In order to save the Committee's time she would not comment further on the substance of the question under consideration.

7. Mr. LOOMES (Australia), replying to the Polish representative, said that the latter's remarks at the 468th meeting concerning conditions in the reception centres in Australia were absurd and wholly unfounded. The Polish newspaper cited as the authority for those comments was obviously not an impartial source. The standard of conditions in the centres, which were maintained by the Australian Department of Immigration and not by the police as alleged, were uniformly high. He knew of his own knowledge that the refugees were happy in a country to which they had come of their own volition, and where they were free from suspicion and fear. His Government's record of assistance to refugees was well known; it had contributed generously both to the International Refugee Organization and to the High Commissioner's Office, and had received a large number of refugees into its territory. The Polish Government, on the other hand, had not, so far as he knew, made any contribution. He was confident that the Third Committee would give the Polish representative's false allegations the weight they deserved.

8. Mrs. RÖSSEL (Sweden) expressed her Government's appreciation of the results thus far achieved by the High Commissioner and pledged its support for the continuation of his work.

9. Sweden had for many years maintained a generous attitude towards the reception of political or other

* Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.

refugees, who had been pouring into the country more or less continuously since 1933. Of the 200,000 foreigners then in Sweden, about 75,000 were political refugees, who had come of their own volition. Many of those received had applied for and been granted Swedish citizenship. All refugees residing in Sweden could obtain a labour permit if they so desired, the permits being issued with due regard both to their knowledge and skill and to conditions on the labour market. The authorities invariably consulted both management and labour in such cases, in order to avoid unnecessary conflicts, ensure that public opinion was not unfavourably affected, and facilitate the assimilation of the refugees into the Swedish population. Her Government regretted that owing to their unfamiliarity with the Swedish language and other factors, refugees could not in all cases be immediately given work corresponding to their qualifications and experience. Eventually, however, through training courses arranged by the employment authorities, they were enabled to exercise their original or similar professions. They were employed on the same conditions and received the same salary as Swedish citizens; social legislation had been amended to afford them unemployment subsidies, medical care and other forms of social welfare. Although the Government's policy towards refugees was dictated solely by humanitarian considerations, the refugees had helped considerably to increase the industrial output of Sweden during a period of labour shortage. It was generally agreed that during periods of possible unemployment they should receive the same treatment as Swedish citizens. The Government had no interest whatsoever in keeping refugees or any other foreigners in the country against their will; they might leave when they chose and were free to go where they chose.

10. Swedish policy was designed not only to integrate the refugees into the life of the country, but to rouse the positive interest of the Swedish public in the refugee problem and enable them to participate in its solution.

11. Her Government had followed with intense interest and sympathy the relief work done among the refugees first by IRO and subsequently by the High Commissioner. It particularly appreciated two aspects of the latter's efforts. First, he was endeavouring to co-ordinate the work of the various agencies and organizations concerned and to utilize the services of the voluntary agencies, thus avoiding the duplication and competition which often occurred when various bodies were active in the same field. Secondly, he had stressed the importance of assistance to young people. In its relief work aboard after the Second World War, her country had placed special emphasis upon social welfare activities among young people between the ages of thirteen and eighteen. It had done so because of its belief that in the deplorable situation in which all refugees were placed, young people suffered particularly from the frustration of enforced idleness and lack of plans for the future. It was therefore essential that young people should receive thorough training and assistance to enable them to adjust themselves to their new surroundings.

12. More attention should also be paid to the professional and so-called "white collar" workers among the refugees. Failure to give them an opportunity of

exercising their professions meant a loss to the refugees themselves and to the country in which they were living.

13. The work for refugees had to be continued, and the Swedish Government considered it essential that the High Commissioner's mandate should be extended after its expiration in 1953, in order that he might continue the efforts which had already proved so valuable.

14. Her delegation regretted that contributions to the Refugee Emergency Fund had not reached the total proposed by the High Commissioner, and in that connexion she would support the joint draft resolution on integration of refugees (A/C.3/L.322).

15. She would also vote in favour of the second joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.323) if the sponsors accepted her delegation's amendment (A/C.3/L.325).

16. She added that the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees would probably be submitted to the Swedish Parliament for ratification at its next session in 1953.

17. Mr. VAN HEUVEN GOEDHART (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees) wished to reply briefly to the delegations which had, at the preceding meeting, made wholly untrue and fantastic charges against his office. He could only conclude that those accusations were based on a theory that while any citizen of a communist State could return to his country, no citizen was free to leave it, and that while all other countries were obliged to return such citizens to their country, no such obligation was binding upon communist States. That theory contradicted the principle upheld by the United Nations, that each human being was free to leave his country of origin if he found its régime and way of life no longer bearable.

18. He regarded his work among the refugees as purely humanitarian and non-political in character and was glad that that fact was noted in the Statute of his office. The USSR delegation and others had made charges which could not be supported by the slightest proof. He had never recruited any refugee for any job whatever, nor had he ever received any directives of any sort from the United States, United Kingdom, French or any other Government. If such a directive had ever been proffered, he would have flatly refused to comply with it, since in his capacity as High Commissioner he was responsible to the General Assembly alone. He had steadfastly refused to enter into any connexion with any institution or establishment which had any political affiliations.

19. The High Commissioner recalled that the USSR representative had referred to a school for the training of subversive elements. He had probably been referring to the Free University of Europe, which the High Commissioner believed had some political character although of a completely different kind from that described by the USSR representative. Nevertheless, the fact that he felt that it was an institution with some political character made him refuse to have any connexion with it since his work was purely humanitarian.

20. As regards the charge that he had misused the refugees in the camps, he pointed out that those camps were run by the governments of the various countries; his only connexion with them was in persuading the

governments to improve the living conditions of the refugees. Far from hampering the activities of the repatriation missions of the various countries, he had done everything in his power to assist them. Nor had he ever indulged in war propaganda of any sort.

21. All those accusations could only spring from habits of thinking which had no connexion with reality; the accusers merely assumed that anyone in the High Commissioner's position would act in that way, and saw no necessity of furnishing proof of their accusations. He appealed to the delegations in question, if they had any feeling of sympathy for the plight of human beings in need, to cease from using the refugee problem as a political weapon and deal with it as the purely humanitarian problem that it was.

22. He was grateful for the constructive suggestions made by many members of the Third Committee. So long as real and lasting peace did not exist throughout the world, the refugee question would continue to present a grave problem; and he was glad that the representative of Yugoslavia (471st meeting) and the Netherlands (470th meeting) had stressed the direct responsibility assumed by the United Nations in the matter. He himself was grateful for the opportunity of playing a part in the United Nations effort to solve the problem.

23. It had been suggested that the Economic and Social Council and his own Advisory Committee should consider whether the mandate of his Office should be extended beyond 1953. He was uncertain whether he could submit the question to his Advisory Committee at its next session without a directive from the General Assembly.

24. The representatives of Turkey (471st meeting) and China (470th meeting) had mentioned the possibility of his bringing about certain changes in the Statute of his office. He pointed out that he could do nothing in that direction, since he had to make budgetary provision either for the elimination of his Office at the end of 1953 or for its extension after that date.

25. As regards the eligibility of refugees, the representatives of China and Turkey had raised questions concerning the definition of the term "refugee". He had discussed with his Advisory Committee the position of 150,000 Bulgarian refugees of Turkish origin who had been received by Turkey after their expulsion from Bulgaria. He stood by the Committee's decision that since the Turkish Government had generously granted them Turkish citizenship, they could no longer be regarded as refugees. He recognized, however, that the Turkish Government might have a difficult problem in the event of another similar influx of refugees in the future. The problem was not within his competence, but it certainly merited attention at the international level. Under the terms of his grant from the Ford Foundation, he could, in collaboration with a voluntary agency, devote time and funds to a suitable project, if one were proposed.

26. He commended the Chinese representative for his presentation (470th meeting) of the complex and distressing problem of Chinese refugees outside China. He intended to submit the problem of the refugees in the Hong Kong area to his Advisory Committee at its next session. In the single camp in that area there were

about 12,000 refugees, of whom 4,400 received daily care and maintenance from the United Kingdom authorities. The problem was a difficult one, however, in view of the critical housing shortage resulting from the rapid growth of population in this area. The question of the eligibility of the refugees was a delicate legal matter which he would have to discuss in detail with his Advisory Committee.

27. The "alternate visa" system for refugees going from Shanghai to Hong Kong was working relatively well. Under that system, a refugee could enter Hong Kong to find out whether he could travel to a country of immigration. If so, he did not use the "alternate visa" of that country; it was transferred to another refugee in Shanghai who wished to go to Hong Kong. Some ninety refugees monthly entered Hong Kong with such visas and from seventy-five to eighty left. The Migration Committee, which had a joint office in Hong Kong with the High Commissioner's representative, had co-operated very efficiently.

28. As the Belgian representative had observed, the definitions of the term "refugee" differed in the Statute of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees and the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, but both definitions could be operative at the same time or even in the same area. Under the convention, governments had to decide whether they wished to protect refugees from Europe only or also those from other continents. Obviously, a United Nations definition could not be restricted to refugees coming only from one area. Whereas the convention established obligations between States, the Statute was a moral obligation on all Members of the United Nations. The High Commissioner would always be entitled to intervene on behalf of a refugee in a country signatory to the convention, even if he were not a conventional refugee.

29. A number of agencies and organizations were currently co-operating with the office of the High Commissioner. The Geneva headquarters of the Migration Committee and the Office held short joint meetings every fortnight to discuss matters of common concern. He was well acquainted with the Director-General of the International Labour Office and had induced him to act as an honorary adviser on the spending of the grant from the Ford Foundation. Since ILO had had much experience with regard to migration and vocational training, it was collaborating closely with his Office both at headquarters and in the field. He had held discussions with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization since under the Ford Foundation grant he was entitled to spend \$US 200,000 on cultural activities on behalf of refugees. It had been agreed that technical advice might be more useful than scholarships. Undoubtedly the UNESCO Conference had already passed upon the proposal favourably. Collaboration with the World Health Organization was most efficient and the action of WHO had been remarkably prompt, particularly in sending an expert to report on tubercular refugees in Trieste. The situation in Trieste was fortunately improving. The new hospital was already open. The Swedish Government had accepted a number of tubercular children and their families. The Swiss Government had given 175,000 Swiss francs for the treatment of tuberculosis in Trieste. The Allied Military Govern-

ment had built a better camp and it would soon be possible to dispense with the former prison currently in use. He had not had much contact with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, except in connexion with the integration programme for Austria, which involved agricultural assimilation. That agency had sent a mission to Vienna, and had reported on similar lines to those of the High Commissioner's report to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

30. He had established excellent relations both at headquarters and in the field with the administration of President Truman's programme for refugees and was confident that there was no duplication of effort.

31. He had some doubts about accepting the course suggested by the Council of Europe with respect to refugees; but that could not be discussed by the Third Committee. At his request, his Office had been included in the working relation for the exchange of documentation and information reached between the United Nations Secretariat and the Council of Europe.

32. He deeply appreciated the attitude of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. He was well aware of the constitutional limitations of the Bank, but had felt that the Office was faced with a problem which required an acceptable solution. The Bank had gone out of its way to seek such a solution, and only when it had found that there was not a great deal it could do, had the desirability of asking the General Assembly to issue a special invitation to find other ways and means been discussed.

33. As the Yugoslav representative had said (471st meeting), the governments concerned would have to do their share of the work. He had been convinced of that from the outset and the governments had accepted that view. It had been somewhat hard to persuade governments which accepted integration in principle actually to give it effect, since they tended to fear that they might be compelled for lack of funds to leave the project half-finished. The Austrian and Western German Governments had started assimilation projects.

34. The French and Swedish representatives seemed to have misunderstood his previous statement (470th meeting) that assimilation was not the best way of solving the problem. Certainly hundreds of thousands of refugees were perfectly content to live in their country of first asylum and had no wish to go elsewhere. In such countries as Germany and Austria, however, conditions were so unfavourable that most refugees there would prefer resettlement elsewhere.

35. He agreed with the French representative that integration should be carried out by loans rather than grants. Experience had shown that refugees made it their business to repay loans. He wholeheartedly concurred in the Danish representative's expression of gratitude for the Ford Foundation's grant to help integration on a revolving basis.

36. He apologized for the error in the addendum to his report (A/2126 addendum, para. 42) with regard to the figure of 2,000 refugees in Iran under the High Commissioner's mandate. The Iranian Government had been most generous and he could appreciate its feeling that when a government regarded a refugee as an unsuitable immigrant, he should be resettled elsewhere.

That was the responsibility of the voluntary agencies. There was a representative of the World Council of Churches in Iran in charge of preparations for resettlement. The matter would require time; he was sure that the Iranian Government would be patient.

37. The Yugoslav representative's complaint that there was no mention in the report of the problem's existence in Yugoslavia would be met shortly when the High Commissioner visited that country and had an opportunity of discussing all its implications. The omission of a reference to it in the report had been due to the lack of first-hand information.

38. He entirely concurred in the regret expressed by the United Kingdom and Danish representatives that the assistance fund had not yet received even one-third of the contributions required. He still felt uncertain about the future of some groups of refugees if no further funds were forthcoming. To discontinue programmes for refugees completely dependent upon the United Nations for their living would be a disaster. The problem was a humanitarian, not a political, one. His Holiness the Pope had sent him a message describing the abiding interest he took in the problem, pledging the continued support of the Holy See and warmly commending the High Commissioner for his initiative in setting up the fund to meet the essential needs of refugees unable to maintain themselves while awaiting resettlement.

39. He was grateful for the joint draft resolutions (A/C.3/322 and A/C.3/323) that had been submitted. They might well have been somewhat more strongly worded, but there was wisdom in compromise.

40. The phrase "expresses the hope" in document A/C.3/L.323 might be regarded as weak, but the draft resolution should be read in the light of the discussion. For many refugees the measures proposed might be the last and only hope.

41. The United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.324) was not really necessary and might even be construed as excluding organizations other than governments; but he had no strong objection to it.

42. The General Assembly should do all in its power to act. The problem was still urgent, vast and unsolved.

43. Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey), referring to the statement just made by the High Commissioner concerning the refugees who had fled from Bulgaria to Turkey, said that his Government had reserved its position with regard to the High Commissioner's conclusions. He reiterated that reservation and expressed the wish that his statement should be inserted in the summary record of the meeting.

44. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America), replying to the statement made by the representative of the USSR, said that the argument about repatriation had been going on since 1946. When the original resolutions regarding the relief of refugees had been adopted, it had been clearly stated that repatriation was the first objective, but it had also been laid down that those refugees who did not wish to return to their country of origin should not be forcibly repatriated. During the sixth session of the General Assembly the United States Government had gone to considerable trouble and expense to obtain telegraphic information from Bonn and Vienna regarding the specific cases cited by

the USSR and other representatives; all the allegations had been found to be untrue. Her Government would not take that trouble again at the current session.

45. With regard to the children allegedly detained outside their own country, it should be remembered that large numbers of such children had left the camps at an age when they could make their own decisions. The judge was always guided by the paramount consideration of the children's own wishes and own good. Most countries naturally wanted their children back; but enough harm had been done by removing them in the first place and every effort was made not to cause more harm. The United States of America would never force any refugee to return to his country of origin against his will.

46. The charges that the United States was fomenting subversive activities were properly a matter for the First Committee rather than the Third, and would be answered by the United States delegation in that Committee. It seemed useless to furnish accurate information about such charges because no attention was ever paid to it.

47. Mr. SIE (Indonesia) observed that the Chinese representative had said that Chinese refugees from the mainland were not receiving the same assistance in Shanghai and Hong Kong as non-Chinese refugees. He was sure that the Chinese Government was doing everything it could for them; but he wondered whether the possibility of resettling them on Formosa had been considered.

48. Mr. VAN HEUVEN GOEDHART (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees) said that his Advisory Committee had not yet decided whether those refugees came under his mandate. He himself had not closely investigated the possibility of resettling them on Formosa, but he believed that the committee headed by Walter H. Judd, Member of Congress, had prepared such a project. There might be some difficulties, because the economy of Formosa was weak and there was some doubt whether it could support such a large influx.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.3/L.322 and A/C.3/L.323) AND AMENDMENTS THERETO

49. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) said that her delegation would vote for the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.322) on the integration of refugees because it whole-heartedly supported the humanitarian activities of the High Commissioner's Office.

50. In 1937, her country had opened its doors to thousands of European refugees, who were treated on a basis of absolute equality with the nationals of the country, had rapidly become integrated and made a valuable contribution to the well-being of the Dominican Republic.

51. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) stressed the humanitarian nature of the High Commissioner's work and pointed out that, although immediate aid in particularly needy cases could not replace long-term programmes, the first step was to keep the refugees alive. She therefore greatly regretted that the High Commissioner had been unable to obtain the minimum funds required for such emergency assistance.

52. The Netherlands representative had asked why sixty Member States were unable to make the necessary contributions, when eighteen States had found it possible to raise the funds required by IRO; the reason for that seemed to be that those eighteen nations had been particularly interested in the specific categories of refugees dealt with by IRO, whereas the refugees who fell under the High Commissioner's mandate did not arouse the same interest.

53. The Iraqi delegation was fully conscious of its responsibility towards all refugees, and regretted that it was unable to contribute to the Emergency Fund. Nevertheless, it would vote for the joint draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.323, in the hope that the High Commissioner would succeed in obtaining the necessary funds.

54. Although her delegation agreed in principle with the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.322) on the integration of refugees, it considered that the operative paragraph was obscure and prejudged the decision of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Moreover, it had been said that the Bank was concerned with large-scale projects and could not extend assistance to refugees who had become citizens of their countries of refuge; it was difficult to understand, however, how a country could institute a large-scale programme for its own refugees. Owing to that obscurity, the Iraqi delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution unless the operative paragraph was clarified.

55. Mr. SHTOKALO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation did not consider that the illegally constituted High Commissioner's Office had made any contribution to the solution of the refugee problem, since it had failed to comply with the provisions of the General Assembly resolutions on the matter. The Ukrainian delegation believed that the only correct and effective solution was that of repatriation. The United States of America and other Western Powers were pursuing a policy of preventing repatriation, were recruiting refugees and displaced persons for military service and espionage against the peoples' democracies and were using the refugees as slave labour. Ample proof of those facts had been given by the USSR, Polish and Czechoslovak representatives in their statements, which no other delegation had been able to refute.

56. Since the High Commissioner was a tool of that Western policy, the Ukrainian delegation could not approve of his activities and would vote against both of the joint draft resolutions which had been submitted.

57. Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) thought that the High Commissioner's statement clearly showed that there were three possible methods of action with regard to refugees and that only one of them provided a solution of the problem. Experience had shown that repatriation did not represent a solution, since so many recent refugees had left their countries voluntarily. Although immigration had helped to solve the problems of many displaced persons, the possibilities of that method were no longer as wide as they had been in the past, because some receiving countries had taken their full quotas of refugees and because economic conditions had changed in consequence. The Argentine

delegation thought that assimilation in the country of first asylum was the only method likely to provide a permanent solution, in spite of the difficulties of overpopulation and of the preference of some refugees for emigration.

58. Integration required adequate financing, which was provided for in the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.322) on that subject. The Argentine delegation would vote for that text, in the hope that the consultations between the High Commissioner and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development would make assimilation projects possible.

59. It would also vote for the joint draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.323, but pointed out, with reference to paragraph 5 of the operative part, that Argentina already had an immigration plan and that the position of refugees in that connexion would be subject to the general provisions of that plan.

60. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) paid a tribute to the High Commissioner's intelligence, skill and devotion in carrying out his difficult task.

61. Her delegation would vote for the joint draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.322 and for the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.324) to that text.

62. It would also vote for the joint draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.323 (although that vote would not imply any commitment on the part of the United States of America to contribute to the assistance fund) and for the Swedish amendment (A/C.3/L.325) to that text.

63. Mr. CORDOVA (El Salvador) said that he would vote for the joint draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.322.

64. He approved of the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.324) to that draft resolution, but suggested that the text would be less ambiguous if the proposed phrase were inserted after the words "Reconstruction and Development" in the operative paragraph.

65. Mrs. EMMET (United Kingdom) accepted that suggestion.

66. Mrs. BERGER (Canada) expressed her delegation's satisfaction with the activities of the High Commissioner's Office and its continued interest in all action for a permanent solution of the refugee problem.

67. She would vote for both the joint draft resolutions, but would ask for a separate vote on paragraph 3 of the operative part of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.323 and would abstain from voting on it, because her delegation was reluctant to support an appeal for funds before the Canadian

Government had taken a decision on its possible contribution.

68. Mr. TASWELL (Union of South Africa) pointed out that many requests for contributions to various causes had been made recently and had been complied with by Member States. His country had met many such requests, but was unable to commit itself to a further contribution, in view of the many calls on its exchequer. For example, national expenditure on assistance to needy native children must come first.

69. Although his delegation sympathized with the appeal for funds, it would be obliged to abstain from voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.323.

70. He shared the doubts expressed by the Iraqi representative concerning the full implications of the operative part of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.322 and would abstain from voting on that text.

71. Mr. HESSEL (France) said that the doubts expressed by certain representatives concerning the operative paragraph of the joint draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.322 showed their anxiety lest the High Commissioner should undertake large-scale projects without consulting governments. Although the French delegation did not share that anxiety, it would be willing to accept the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.324) providing for such consultation.

72. It was essential, however, not to confuse the two stages at which the High Commissioner would hold consultations. The High Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Refugees had approved the consultations with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which had already been initiated; it would be in connexion with specific and detailed projects that the High Commissioner would consult with the governments concerned. The original position of the phrase proposed by the United Kingdom was therefore preferable, and the amendment would be acceptable to the co-sponsors of the draft resolution if the phrase were inserted in the place originally proposed.

73. On behalf of the co-sponsors he also accepted the Swedish amendment (A/C.3/L.325) to the joint draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.323.

74. He suggested that the words "the solution of" should be inserted after the words "refugee problem" in the English text of the preamble to that resolution.

75. Mrs. EMMET (United Kingdom) agreed that her delegation's amendment should be incorporated in its original position in the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.322) on the integration of refugees.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.