



**C O N T E N T S**

Agenda item 27 :

Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for  
Refugees (A/C.3/L.463, A/C.3/L.464), (*continued*).. 15

**Chairman: Mr. Omar LOUTFI (Egypt).**

**AGENDA ITEM 27**

**Report of the United Nations High Commissioner  
for Refugees (A/2902 and Add. 1, A/2943, chap-  
ter V, section IV, A/C.3/L.463, A/C.3/L.464.)  
(*continued*)**

**GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)**

1. Mrs. HOUCK (Canada) congratulated the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on his clear exposition of the full scope of the humanitarian problem which the United Nations was endeavouring to solve and of the progress which had been achieved despite serious difficulties. She was pleased to see all that had been done for the legal and political protection of refugees, which was the primary task of the High Commissioner.

2. At that stage, however, the Canadian delegation would like to lay more stress on another almost equally important function, namely, the finding of a permanent solution to the refugee problem. Since the end of the Second World War her country had been working unceasingly to settle that problem. It had made regular contributions to the International Refugee Organization, and later to the United Nations Refugee Emergency Fund. In the past two years, it had paid a total of \$150,000 into that Fund, to provide assistance for refugees of European origin in China, and a total of \$100,000 to the Inter-Governmental Committee for European Migration, for the purpose of resettling some of those refugees in other countries. Faithful to that policy, from which it had never swerved, Canada had at the previous session supported the resolution under which the Assembly had authorized the High Commissioner to undertake a programme designed to achieve permanent solutions (General Assembly resolution 832 [IX]). The Canadian delegation had not been in a position at that time to pledge a contribution to the new Fund that had been established, but the Canadian Government had since decided to allocate to the Fund the sum of \$125,000, which had been paid in full.

3. That contribution had not been subject to any conditions, for when it had taken its decision the Canadian Government had thought that many other countries would respond generously to the appeal of

the Negotiating Committee. The fact was, however, that of the 44 Governments which had voted in favour of the resolution on the programme for permanent solutions, only 12 had made or pledged contributions. Despite the financial efforts of three other Governments—Switzerland, the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Korea—which were not Members of the United Nations, the guaranteed contributions amounted so far to only 50 per cent of the total fixed for 1955.

4. The Canadian delegation did not think that an undertaking as important as the programme for permanent solutions could be successfully implemented unless there was a general determination to carry it out in full. Consequently, the 32 Governments which had voted in favour of the General Assembly resolution and had not yet made any contribution should do their utmost to ensure that the funds available to the High Commissioner by the end of 1955 approximated as closely as possible to the target fixed for that year. If not, Canada and the other countries which had made or pledged contributions would not, with all their goodwill, be able to continue their efforts on the same scale. Failure to implement the programme fully would cause bitter disappointment to all those whose hopes had been raised by the General Assembly resolution and would be harmful to the prestige of the United Nations.

5. It was important to remember that the final purpose of the activities of the United Nations, whether in the protection of collective rights, assistance to under-developed countries or large-scale activities in other fields, was to serve the individual. Accordingly, it was by their effects upon persons rather than by their intrinsic worth that the plans drawn up by the United Nations would be judged.

6. The Canadian delegation hoped, therefore, that Member States would be able to prove that the United Nations could do more than just prepare plans and that it could take measures to relieve human suffering, illustrating by concrete action the full nobility of its purposes and principles.

7. Mrs. VARGAS (Costa Rica) was glad to note the good results Mr. van Heuven Goedhart had so far achieved. While it was of course encouraging to see that the number of those who came within the mandate of the High Commissioner's Office was gradually decreasing, the problem as a whole was still far from a solution. All mankind should redouble its efforts to put an end to the insecurity in which all too many refugees were still living. International solidarity should take as practical a form as possible in that field, but the work should not be done by Governments alone; the peoples themselves should take part in it. In that connexion, she would like to refer to the practical and moral value of the gesture made by

the Government and people of the Netherlands. If that example were to be followed, the interest of the peoples of the world must be aroused; they must be informed of the problems raised by the existence of a large number of refugees and of the possible solutions to those problems.

8. As comparatively few of the refugees wished to return to their own countries, repatriation was not a suitable form of rehabilitation in all cases. As it could not be imposed by force, recourse must be had to another method, such as economic integration in the country of residence. To that end, the Governments and the non-governmental organizations could perhaps allow the refugees wider access to the vocational training and housing programmes which they put into operation.

9. She pointed out that, at the request of the representative of Uruguay, the General Assembly had made special reference in resolution 832 (IX) to family groups, thereby recognizing the importance of the family unit in the rehabilitation of the refugees. Aware of the psychological and moral value of the family, particularly with regard to the upbringing of children, the Government of Costa Rica was prepared, after negotiation with the High Commissioner's Office, to admit more family groups into its territory.

10. In conclusion, she announced that her Government was trying by all the means in its power to improve the lot of the refugees. It recognized, for example, the travel documents issued by the States signatories to the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (A/Conf.2/108) and it had recently proposed that the Organization of Central American States should at its next session consider ways of contributing effectively to the solution of the refugee problem.

11. Mrs. LIONAES (Norway) was pleased to note the admirable results the High Commissioner had achieved but she shared his concern regarding the consequences which the current financial position might have on the implementation of the programme. In view of the fundamental importance of the humanitarian work for which the United Nations had assumed responsibility in that field, it would be extremely regrettable if the inadequacy of the funds available to the Office of the High Commissioner forced it to restrict its activities. All States should do their utmost to respond to the High Commissioner's appeal and to give him the funds he needed to carry out his plans of operations for 1955 and 1956. Many of the States which were not participating in the financing of the four-year programme were admittedly making considerable sacrifices on behalf of the refugees in their territories, but they should recognize the co-ordinating role of the Office of the High Commissioner and give it the means to carry out its task. All States should therefore make a contribution, no matter how small, to the financing of the United Nations Refugee Fund. Norway had made a great effort in the current financial year and the Norwegian Government would shortly be requesting Parliament to make appropriations in the next budget which would enable it to contribute in 1956. Irrespective of the other obligations which Norway had assumed towards the refugees, the High Commissioner could count on Norway's unfailing support.

12. She recognized, as had Mr. van Heuven Goedhart in his general statement (625th meeting), that several

agencies, in Europe in particular, were to a certain extent duplicating the work of the Office of the High Commissioner and tending to complicate his task. That was difficult to avoid, and the disadvantage was more easily accepted when it was remembered that the aim of all those agencies was to promote the rehabilitation, so long awaited, of the many refugees living in Europe.

13. She drew the Committee's attention to the essential role of the High Commissioner in connexion with the protection of refugees. She noted with satisfaction that the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees was entering into force in an increasing number of countries and that the travel documents were recognized even in States which had not yet deposited their instruments of ratification. She also expressed her satisfaction with the efforts that were being made to improve the position of refugee seamen.

14. Lastly, she expressed the hope that States would do more and more on behalf of the refugees and would be able to keep the tragic problem out of the political arena.

15. Mr. HSIA (China) paid a tribute to all those who, with untiring patience and zeal, were endeavouring to rehabilitate the many refugees scattered throughout the world. He wished in particular to thank the High Commissioner and the Executive Committee—especially Mr. Ralph Harry, who had presided over its first session—for their constant efforts in that field.

16. He was very glad to note that, according to the High Commissioner's report (A/2902 and Add.1), results were increasingly satisfactory; co-ordination between the Office of the High Commissioner and the various agencies doing similar work had improved consistently during the past few years. With regard to permanent solutions, he had voted in favour of carrying out the plan of operations for 1955 and regretted that the shortage of funds was tending to compromise the implementation of the plan.

17. He referred to Mr. Edward Hambro's report<sup>1</sup> and praised its soundness and its high quality. He recalled that, following a recommendation made by the Advisory Committee in the spring of 1953, Mr. Hambro had been appointed by the High Commissioner to survey the situation of Chinese refugees in Hong Kong and had led a special mission, which had worked in the field from April to August 1954. The mission had been made possible by the generosity of the Ford Foundation.

18. As the report showed, the number of refugees currently living in Hong Kong was 385,000; if dependants were included, the number was 670,000. Of that number, 285,000 were refugees who had fled from the Chinese mainland for fear of being persecuted on account of their race, religion or political opinions, while 100,000 were refugees who had left China for various reasons and did not wish to return for fear of persecution. More than 99 per cent refused to return to the Chinese mainland.

19. The question had arisen whether those refugees came under the authority of the High Commissioner. Mr. Hsia quoted a number of passages from the report in connexion with that point: Mr. Hambro explained that from a strictly legal point of view those refugees

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Tenth Session, Supplement No. 11*, annex, paras. 25 to 30.

did not come under the High Commissioner's mandate; nevertheless, from the humanitarian point of view they were in the same situation as numbers of others whom towards the United Nations had assumed certain responsibilities. It therefore seemed natural that the Hong Kong refugees, too, should receive international protection.

20. He turned next to the solutions proposed by Mr. Hambro. He remarked that, as far as the Hong Kong refugees were concerned, the term "repatriation" referred not so much to a return to the Chinese mainland—which most of them did not want—as to settlement in Taiwan or in the islands off the coast. The Chinese Government had tried to rehabilitate as many refugees as possible: from 1949 to 1954, 150,000 refugees had been received by Taiwan; 7,200 had been transferred from Hong Kong to Taiwan since the beginning of 1954. It was planned to transfer another 30,000 refugees to Taiwan or the neighbouring islands.

21. According to the report, resettlement overseas offered very limited possibilities. Integration seemed therefore to be the obvious solution. It should be noted, moreover, that about 50 per cent of the refugees wished to stay in Hong Kong. A number of them could find work in agriculture and others in handicrafts, but tools for farming or handicrafts entailed funds which they did not possess. That was why he agreed with Mr. Hambro on the advisability of setting up a fund to be kept up out of local or foreign capital, of public or private origin.

22. After studying Mr. Hambro's report, the Executive Committee had adopted a resolution to which he drew the Committee's attention (A/2902 and Add.1, p. 37, resolution No. 1). The resolution made it clear—and that, he thought, was the essential point—that the international community did not intend to ignore the fate of the Chinese refugees in Hong Kong, and that the Office of the High Commissioner would make every possible effort to put an end to a most tragic situation.

23. Mr. MAKIJEDO (Yugoslavia) was confident that the improvement in the international atmosphere would make it possible for the refugee problem to be solved more easily. Circumstances had never been so favourable to a realistic solution of the problem, provided that it was regarded as a purely humanitarian question and that all other considerations were set aside.

24. The Yugoslav delegation had already had occasion to express its opinion on the refugee problem more than once and to say what it thought were the best ways of solving it. He would, therefore, speak only of the programme for permanent solutions, on the basis of the information in the High Commissioner's report (A/2902 and Add.1). According to that report, the High Commissioner had made great efforts to give refugees adequate legal protection, to safeguard their interests and to devote himself generally to their welfare until they were finally resettled. Although the efforts of the High Commissioner in that direction had been satisfactory, the same could not be said of the programme for permanent solutions, and most of the objections the Yugoslav delegation had made to the programme at the ninth session of the General Assembly had proved to be well founded. Tens of thousands of refugees were still awaiting a permanent solution

to their problems; many of them were still living in camps.

25. At the ninth session of the General Assembly, the Yugoslav delegation had drawn attention to the defects of a method which was inclined to envisage only one solution to the problem. His delegation had declared that intergration could not fail to be difficult and costly and that, moreover, it was liable to encourage the formation of new refugee groups. The High Commissioner's report proved that his delegation had been right on all those points. The economic integration of refugees in their countries of residence would in fact appear to be very difficult. In most of those countries work was scarce and the housing shortage severe. Integration was difficult, even in countries like Germany, despite the prosperity of that country's economy since 1948. With regard to Italy, the High Commissioner himself had stated that opportunities for integration no longer existed and that the only course left to refugees living in that country was to emigrate overseas.

26. Integration was costly. While the budget estimates contained no allocation for repatriation, the figure for resettlement operations was \$2,300,000 and that for integration \$2,800,000. For reasons it had already explained several times, the Yugoslav delegation still doubted whether the whole programme of permanent solutions described in the High Commissioner's report would meet with success. In its opinion, the High Commissioner should concern himself not only with integration but also with resettlement and, above all, with repatriation—voluntary repatriation being the most natural and the most economical solution of the problem.

27. In that connexion the Yugoslav delegation supported in principle the idea in the USSR draft resolution (A/C.3/L.463) that repatriation was the best solution. It felt, however, that, ten years after the end of the war, repatriation could no longer be regarded as the only solution. However that might be, he noted the High Commissioner's statement that he would continue his efforts to facilitate the repatriation of any refugees who wished to return to their countries.

28. Miss ZEELLENBERG (Netherlands) also felt that it was tragic that ten years after the war had ended, 350,000 refugees had not yet been permanently settled in their country of origin or elsewhere, and that more than 70,000 of them were still living in camps in a state of mind akin to despair. However, as the United States representative had pointed out, a good number of those refugees were still healthy and able-bodied and could make themselves useful in whatever country they were.

29. Refugees based all their hopes on the High Commissioner and the latter, as shown by his report (A/2902 and Add.1), was doing his best to help them. That enlightening and unambiguous report was so striking that the reader almost felt he could hear the appeals of 350,000 suffering people begging for relief from their suffering. In order to answer that appeal, the High Commissioner needed the financial support of all Governments interested in the refugee problem. The situation was really serious. Despite his appeal at the Economic and Social Council's twentieth session<sup>2</sup>, the High Commissioner still had at his disposal little more

<sup>2</sup> *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Twentieth Session*, 888th and 889th meetings.

that \$2 million, whereas his needs for 1955 had been fixed at \$4,200,000. Countries which had neither made nor pledged a contribution should now make an effort, particularly since the large contributions of the United States and United Kingdom Governments depended on counterpart funds and it would probably be necessary to fix a higher target in 1956.

30. The High Commissioner pointed out in his report that the United Nations Children's Fund and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East had been much more favoured than his Office, in that they had managed to collect periodically all the money they had asked for. She was fully aware of the value of the great humanitarian task those two bodies were performing, but could not believe that less importance could be attached to the question of European refugees, and hoped that Governments would now come forward in large numbers and display the same interest in those refugees as they had shown in the welfare of children or in the unfortunate Palestine Arab refugees.

31. Turning from the financial to the technical aspects of assistance to refugees, she paid a tribute to the countries which had admitted them in large numbers and helped in their resettlement. She felt, however, that the countries in question could do still better, for example by reducing the waiting period, as refugees must know as soon as possible when they would be permitted to emigrate. The experience acquired by the missions dispatched in 1955 by the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Sweden, respectively, to examine on the spot the situation of refugees who wished to emigrate to those countries, had been conclusive, and many other countries might profit from their example. The Netherlands Government would do so, and she could now state that her country was willing to admit 250 refugee families.

32. What was more, the countries concerned should admit not only skilled and semi-skilled workers, but also their families, even if they included sick or aged persons. With regard to the thousands of refugees who, for one reason or another, wished to remain in their present country of residence, integration was certainly the only possible solution. The integration of refugees was an overwhelming task which involved allowing them to earn their living, educate their children and lead the life of free men. That task fell for the most part on the present countries of residence, that was to say, Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and Greece. The High Commissioner had not spared any effort to assist those countries in that task and had put in hand a great variety of projects for that purpose.

33. The Netherlands delegation knew that the ideal solution for refugees was repatriation, and she noted from the High Commissioner's report (A/2902 and Add.1) that he intended to continue to facilitate that solution on the understanding that repatriation must be voluntary, in accordance with article 8 (c) of the Statute of the High Commissioner's Office (General Assembly resolution 428 [V], annex). Once a refugee had adopted for such a solution his country of origin must respond to the High Commissioner's appeal.

34. She was happy to report that the Second Chamber of the Parliament of the Netherlands had just approved a bill for the accession of the Netherlands to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (A/Conf.

2/108) and hoped that her country's ratification of that Convention would soon be announced. The Conference on the Legal Status of Refugee Seamen, convened at the invitation of the Netherlands Government, had been held at The Hague from 27 to 30 September 1955, and there were grounds for hoping that its recommendations would be given effect at the end of the current year.

35. Lastly, she announced that a fresh collection in aid of refugees would be made in November 1955 in the Netherlands, and hoped it would be entirely successful.

36. Mr. FERREIRA DE SOUZA (Brazil) paid a tribute to the efforts of the High Commissioner and of Mr. González Fernández, his representative in Latin America, in connexion with the resettlement of refugees in the Latin American countries. He was especially grateful to the High Commissioner for having stressed the part played by Brazil in solving the serious refugee problem.

37. However, with regard to the refugees of European origin from China, the Brazilian delegation wished to make the position quite clear so that there should no longer be any doubt regarding the difficulties his Government had encountered. The Brazilian immigration laws were most generous and contained no discriminatory provisions. They did, however, take account of the country's needs at its current stage of development and gave preference to immigrants who by their work could usefully contribute to the development of agriculture, industry or other productive branches of economic activity. Unfortunately, most of the refugees of European origin from China were either members of the liberal professions or tradesmen. In other words, they could not contribute directly to the country's economic progress at a time when the economy of Brazil was encountering the most serious difficulties as a result of inflation and the disorders caused by the industrial revolution. A large section of the Brazilian Press and of public opinion would not understand if the Government accepted thousands of immigrants who could not undertake productive work.

38. Its Government's attitude towards refugees of European origin from China was not a wholly negative one. The Brazilian Government merely proposed to wait a while, and to take up the question again after five years' experience, so as to be more certain when making its choice in the future. The results so far achieved had sometimes been disappointing both for the Brazilian Government and for the persons concerned. For example, the Brazilian consular authorities at Hong Kong had never been allowed to interview prospective immigrants before granting them the visas on which the United Kingdom authorities insisted before allowing them to enter Hong Kong. That was a major difficulty, which should perhaps be removed in the interest of all concerned.

39. Brazil was in great need of immigrants, but it needed people who could work in factories, laboratories or farms and contribute to the general development of the country. As a nation largely composed of immigrants of all races, nationalities and religions, Brazil had always opened its doors, and still kept them open, to all those willing and able to start a new and useful life in its territory. In that way it had always given proof of the sincerity of its intentions in regard to



the humanitarian problem raised by the existence of refugees in various countries of the world. It did so because it believed not only in the right of asylum but also in the moral duty to grant asylum. Nevertheless, anxious that its laws should always be complied with, it continued to uphold its right to choose, from among the refugees, those who best fulfilled its requirements.

40. With regard to the situation of refugees in the countries of resettlement, he protested against the Soviet Union representative's statement that the countries of the New World regarded refugees as cheap labour. The refugees admitted to Brazil, far from being an underprivileged class, enjoyed a standard of living which was above the average.

41. He supported the various speakers who had favoured the principle of allowing refugees freedom to choose between repatriation and resettlement. In that connexion, he expressed his approval of that part of the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union (A/C.3/L.463) which concerned voluntary repatriation. He could not, however, accept the operative clauses of the draft resolution, in particular as regards measures to persuade refugees to return to their own countries, for such measures would directly conflict with the principle enunciated in the preamble.

42. Mr. NAJAR (Israel) noted that while, as in previous years, the Third Committee must deplore the unfortunate fate of a still considerable number of refugees, it could feel gratified at what had been achieved in putting an end to the trials of many others. The problems outlined by the High Commissioner, both in his report (A/2902 and Add.1) and in his statement (625th meeting), were at once vast and singularly limited in scope. They were vast because the High Commissioner's task required a thorough understanding of the psychology of refugees, negotiations—frequently difficult—with the Governments of countries which might accept refugees, the maintenance of close contact with many international bodies and ceaseless co-operation with the countries of reception. But those problems were limited to the extent that, as a man of action, the High Commissioner was interested in arriving at a definite result, namely the collection of the necessary funds to transform his plans into practical achievements.

43. The State of Israel, which was the centre of an almost unprecedented population movement, well understood the High Commissioner's task. Israel, which had followed closely the work of the International Refugee Organization, was just as interested in the efforts of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, which, under the enlightened leadership of Mr. van Heuven Goedhart, had developed into a remarkable organization. A proper valuation should also be placed on the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (A/Conf.2/108), which guaranteed refugees the right to work and to freedom of movement. There was all the more reason for congratulation, in that in 1951 the six ratifications required for its entry into force had seemed to many people impossible to obtain.

44. The Israel delegation was convinced that the Office could count on the co-operation of a great many Governments, and in particular on that of the 20 States represented on the Executive Committee. He paid a tribute to the generous gestures by the United States and the Netherlands, and announced that despite its

heavy commitments the Government of Israel had considered it its duty to make a token contribution of \$5,000.

45. Mrs. US (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) emphasized that the lessening of international tension was an important fact in the life of the peoples and that the Third Committee should take advantage of that favourable situation to find a constructive solution for the problems upon its agenda, including that of displaced persons and refugees. The problem had arisen out of the Second World War, when thousands of Soviet citizens and nationals of other countries had been deported by the Hitlerite authorities; more than ten years after the end of the war, a complete solution had still not been found. The Byelorussian delegation had already stressed that the fairest solution would be the return of the displaced persons and refugees to their countries of origin and that the main task of the High Commissioner was to help and encourage those refugees by all the means in his power, relying on the principle of voluntary repatriation.

46. During the five years which had elapsed since its establishment, the High Commissioner's Office had principally busied itself with resettling refugees in overseas countries or with integrating them in the populations of their countries of residence; but events had shown that that method was not satisfactory. It was once again evident that the High Commissioner was consistently pursuing the wrong policy, thus prolonging the suffering of thousands of human beings. She quoted several passages from the High Commissioner's report showing the set-back to efforts to integrate the refugees into economic life, particularly in Austria and Germany, recalled the tragic effects of camp life on children, and mentioned the ravages of unemployment, despair and sickness among refugees generally. She had quoted those facts, not for polemical reasons, but to demonstrate the urgent necessity of solving the problem in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the decisions of the General Assembly. The United Nations could not agree to the continuance of such a situation; in the interests of justice it must take drastic measures. The General Assembly had clearly indicated the right way in its resolution 8 (1) of 12 February 1946: to encourage and assist the early return of displaced persons to their countries of origin. Considered from the point of view of substance but not from the formalistic point of view, that resolution fully related to the activity of the High Commissioner.

47. Like all of the Soviet people, the people of the Byelorussian SSR fully supported the principle of voluntary repatriation of displaced persons and refugees to their countries of origin. The Soviet Government had taken and was continuing to take steps to facilitate the return to the Soviet Union of Soviet citizens and their families who were displaced persons and refugees. It helped them to find employment and to return to normal life. It had also decided to pardon all persons who had acted against their country. Those measures had caused, and undoubtedly would cause, many Soviet citizens to decide to return home. She mentioned the cases of former refugees who had publicly expressed their happiness at having returned to their country and resumed an active life. On their initiative, a committee had been set up to encourage a repatriation movement among displaced persons and refugees and to

expose the lies of anti-Soviet propaganda, which attempted to dissuade refugees from returning to their country.

48. The USSR draft resolution (A/C.3/L.463) contained proposals for certain concrete measures for providing the speedy return of displaced persons and refugees while respecting the principle of voluntary repatriation. Her delegation warmly supported the draft resolution.

49. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) noted with satisfaction that at the current session of the General Assembly the principles set forth in resolution 832 (IX) and the experience gained in preparing the programme of action laid down in that resolution were available for the guidance of the Third Committee in its consideration of the refugee problem. The Committee also had at its disposal the valuable information contained in the report of the High Commissioner (A/2902 and Add.1) and the equally valuable information which the High Commissioner himself had given the Committee in his recent statement (625th meeting).

50. The Committee had once again been told of the difficulties presented by a problem which was of concern to all mankind. It had also had an opportunity once again to note the zeal and devotion with which the High Commissioner and his colleagues were attempting to rescue thousands of human beings from misery and despair. The United Nations should do everything in its power to assist those unfortunate victims of the horrors of war or of political, religious or racial persecution. It should remember that the issue was not an abstract social problem, but one of

human beings to whom it should restore that sense of dignity and worth of the human person proclaimed in the Charter adopted by the United Nations ten years previously at San Francisco. There was one principle to be observed in that connexion, and it had been introduced in General Assembly resolution 832 (IX) at the request of his delegation, namely, the principle of the family unit, of the protection of family groups. He would be glad if the High Commissioner could tell the Committee to what extent he had been able to apply that principle in carrying out his programme.

51. In July 1954 his Government had passed a bill to enable refugees to join the head of the family if he was already settled in Uruguay and had decided to admit refugees for whom residents of Uruguay would act as surety or who had offered employment contracts in professions or activities of national interest. The High Commissioner could be assured that he would always find the Uruguayan Government highly sympathetic and most anxious to collaborate with him.

52. His delegation would speak at a later stage on the draft resolutions before the Committee.

53. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) thought that in order to expedite the Committee's work, it would be helpful if the sponsors of the two draft resolutions (A/C.3/L.463 and A/C.3/L.464) would consult together in an attempt to work out a joint text.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.