



GENERAL

A/2084

26 January 1952

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: FRENCH

Sixth Session
Agenda items 30 and 31

Dual distribution

REFUGEES AND STATELESS PERSONS
PROBLEMS OF ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES
Draft report of the Third Committee
Rapporteur: Mr. K. AZKOUL (Lebanon)

I

1. At its 342nd plenary meeting the General Assembly decided to allocate to the Third Committee, among other items on the agenda of the sixth regular session, the items dealing with refugees and stateless persons and problems of assistance to refugees.

2. The Committee decided (A/C.3/SR.365) to take up these two items at its first meeting after the Christmas recess so that the Fifth Committee might be able to take action on the budget of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees not later than the middle of January. For this purpose, the Committee decided to interrupt its discussion of the draft international covenant on human rights.

3. The consideration of these two items dealing with refugees occupied eleven meetings. After the High Commissioner had made a statement (A/C.3/SR.373), several representatives put questions to him, to which the High Commissioner replied, and at the end of the general discussion he made another statement covering the whole of the matters discussed (A/C.3/SR.380). During the discussion, comments of importance were offered on the work and mandate of the High Commissioner's Office, dealing more especially with the establishment, number and size of its branch offices, the authorization requested by the High Commissioner to launch an appeal for voluntary contributions to an emergency fund to assist the most necessitous groups of refugees, the preparation of long-term programmes to enable the refugees to be merged into the economic and social life of the receiving countries the importance of migration as one of the solutions of the refugee problem, and the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees prepared at Geneva in July 1951.

4. In addition to these matters arising directly out of the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees,^{1/} some delegations raised other aspects of the refugee problem. Thus, one delegation drew the Committee's attention to the position of the Armenian refugees and to the distinction to be drawn between the legal responsibility of the United Nations for the Palestine refugees and its moral responsibility for other groups of refugees. Another delegation referred to the serious situation of the Chinese refugees. Several delegations stressed repatriation as the only solution of the refugee problem and suggested that the High Commissioner should approach the governments of the refugees' countries of origin in order to determine the conditions for their repatriation. Other delegations emphasized the part played by voluntary organizations, in respect of both material assistance to refugees and the execution of economic development programmes to promote their establishment and assimilation in the receiving countries.

5. Two conflicting trends emerged during the general debate. One school of thought was opposed in principle to the functions and activities vested in the High Commissioner's Office, which it was alleged, was averse to the execution of repatriation programmes and hence in conflict with the spirit of General Assembly resolution 8 (I) of 12 February 1946. Consequently, the delegations holding the point of view expressed their opposition to all measures likely to facilitate the High Commissioner's task or extend his powers. The majority of the Committee, however, felt very strongly that the High Commissioner had been given a very necessary and important mission in the performance of which he ought to be assisted.

6. The question of the establishment of field offices by the High Commissioner was also raised in connexion with the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.^{2/}

7. Several delegations observed that the principle of the establishment of such offices did not require the Third Committee's approval, inasmuch as it arose from the High Commissioner's Statute. They endorsed the High Commissioner's contention that the number and special difficulties of the refugees in some countries were such as to justify the establishment of field offices, subject, of course, to the consent of the countries concerned. The view was expressed that the very nature of the High Commissioner's functions did not allow him to delegate them to the United Nations Information Centres or the regional offices of the specialized agencies, whose staff members had quite other qualifications.

/8. Most of the

1/ A/2011, Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Supplement No. 19

2/ A/1853, Ibid., Supplement No. 7

8. Most of the Committee members who took part in the discussion took the view that field offices were necessary to enable the High Commissioner to maintain direct contact with the governments of the refugees' countries of residence, and that it should be left to the High Commissioner to determine the number and size of such offices within the limits of his budget. While recognizing that any discussion of that budget was solely a matter for the Fifth Committee, several delegations urged that the number and size of the field offices should be kept as low as possible. Other delegations, on the contrary, opposed the principle of the establishment of field offices for reasons arising out of their opposition to the High Commissioner's general programme of action, the existence of his Office and any extension whatever of his mandate.

9. Several delegations, while paying tribute to the work done by the International Refugee Organization, also remarked that upon the termination of that agency a large number of unrepatriated and unresettled refugees survived in need of assistance and protection. They would have to be provided with material assistance by voluntary organizations, and it was to obtain the necessary funds for such organizations that the High Commissioner was requesting authorization to launch an appeal for voluntary contributions. Some delegations felt, however, that the refugee problem, which is not confined to the so-called "residual" groups, but covers large numbers of fresh refugees, could not be solved solely by affording material assistance to the indigent. It is, they contended, also necessary to draw up long-term programmes for the merging of refugees in the economic life of the countries where they reside and to collaborate with States in assuring refugees of a place in overseas migration and resettlement plans. Some delegations explained that where the admission of refugees to the receiving countries was concerned, due regard must be paid both to the domestic legislation of such countries and to their economic development. Others, again, drew attention to the contribution which voluntary organizations might bring to the solution of various aspects of the refugee problem.

10. Many delegations expressed support for the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees as representing a decisive step towards the legal protection of refugees. Some pointed out that their governments had already signed the Convention and instituted the necessary procedure for its ratification.

11. At the end of the general discussion, the Third Committee had before it three draft resolutions (A/C.3/L.199, A/C.3/L.200 and A/C.3/L.201), and amendments to the last two (A/C.3/L.207/Rev.3^{3/} and A/C.3/L.202, respectively).

12. A draft resolution submitted by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (A/C.3/L.201) (a) noted the failure of the Governments of the United States of America, France, the United Kingdom and certain other States Members to implement General Assembly resolution 8 (I) of 12 February 1946; (b) condemned the policy of the International Refugee Organization and the High Commissioner, which was designed to substitute for repatriation the forced resettlement of displaced persons in other countries; (c) condemned the alleged attempts by certain Member States designated by name to recruit displaced persons for subversive and diversionary activities; (d) recommended the Governments of those countries and the Governments of the refugees' countries of residence to take steps to implement General Assembly resolution 8 (I), so as to complete the repatriation of the refugees during 1952; and (e) proposed to the Governments of the countries of residence of refugees and displaced persons to submit to the Secretariat of the United Nations full information regarding the refugees and displaced persons.

13. An amendment to the above draft resolution, introduced by Syria (A/C.3/L.202), proposed (a) to delete the references to particular governments; (b) to add a paragraph noting that the governments of some of the refugees' countries of origin opposed their repatriation or failed to provide them with all the desirable guarantees for their safety; (c) to delete the reference to attempts to recruit refugees for subversive activities; (d) to replace the reference to 1952 as the time-limit for repatriation by the words "within a short time"; and (e) to insert an additional paragraph before the final paragraph of the resolution, calling upon the governments of the refugees' countries of origin to facilitate the repatriation of persons who express the desire therefor.

/14. A proposal.

^{3/} (A/C.3/L.207/Rev.4 in the French text).

14. A proposal by the Soviet Union representative that the Byelorussian draft resolution should be discussed and voted on first was adopted by 14 votes to 10, with 17 abstentions.

15. The Byelorussian draft resolution was discussed at the Committee's 381st meeting. Introducing it, the Byelorussian representative stated that his purpose was to place on record the failure of the countries he had designated to implement the General Assembly resolution of 1946 and to censure the International Refugee Organization and the High Commissioner for what he described as their policy of substituting for repatriation the enforced transfer of displaced persons to other countries and attempting to recruit refugees for the armed forces and secret services of certain States.

16. He explained that the recommendation to the Governments of those countries to comply with the General Assembly resolution and to submit to the United Nations full information regarding the refugees within their territories was in keeping with the spirit of the Charter and with that of the decisions taken by Members of the United Nations to make a distinction between, on the one hand, refugees desiring to return to their countries of origin, quislings and war criminals who ought to be extradited, and on the other hand, refugees who could not be repatriated for sound reasons.

17. The Byelorussian representative stated that the Syrian amendments to the draft resolution were unacceptable because they weakened the text and represented an attempt to conceal the names of the delinquent States.

18. In the course of the discussion the Syrian representative withdrew his amendment. Several delegates expressed objections to the spirit and letter of the Byelorussian draft resolution which, they felt, contained expressions of unwarranted censure both of international organizations and of the States Members of the United Nations referred to by name therein and was not likely to contribute to a solution of the refugee problem but would only be used for propaganda purposes. All the accusations contained in the draft resolution were strenuously contested. The delegations of the States alluded to affirm that their Governments had strictly conformed to General Assembly resolution 8 (I) of 1946: if they were still harbouring a large number of refugees in

their territories, the reason was that they could not force them to return to their countries of origin against their will. Some added that for the Governments of countries of residence to supply full information regarding refugees would involve real danger for the latter. On the same occasion several delegations expressed their appreciation of the work done by the International Refugee Organization and their entire confidence in the High Commissioner for Refugees.

19. At the request of the representative of Afghanistan the Committee agreed to vote on the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.201) paragraph by paragraph. The draft resolution was rejected by the following votes:

<u>Paragraph 1</u>	by 35 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions
<u>Paragraph 2</u>	by 38 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions
<u>Paragraph 3</u>	by 37 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions
<u>Paragraph 4</u>	by 31 votes to 7, with 9 abstentions
<u>Paragraph 5</u>	by 25 votes to 8, with 11 abstentions.

20. A joint draft resolution submitted to the Third Committee by Colombia, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Uruguay and Yugoslavia (A/C.3/L.199) (a) took note of the High Commissioner's report; (b) expressed its satisfaction at the conclusion of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees; (c) invited States to become parties to that Convention as soon as possible; and (d) called upon Governments to co-operate with the High Commissioner.

21. This draft resolution was discussed at the 381st and 382nd meetings. It was presented to the Committee by one of its co-sponsors, the United Kingdom representative, who stated that the object of paragraphs 1 and 4 was to facilitate the High Commissioner's task by assuring him of the co-operation of United Nations Member States in the performance of his task, while the purpose of paragraphs 2 and 3 was to endow with life the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees which had on an earlier occasion been described as a decisive step towards the provision of legal protection for refugees.

22. During the subsequent discussion, a great many delegations supported the draft resolution and expressed their confidence in the High Commissioner personally and their intention to co-operate with him in carrying out his work. Several delegations stated that their Governments had signed or were about to sign the

(a) by authorizing him to issue an appeal for contributions to an emergency fund in favour of the neediest groups of refugees, on the understanding that the States giving such authorization would not thereby be placed under any obligation, moral or otherwise, to contribute to the fund; (b) by directing the attention of the States and agencies concerned with the refugee problem to the importance of long-term programmes and by encouraging the High Commissioner to promote such programmes, while avoiding duplication of effort; and (c) by recommending that States should admit refugees to the benefit of their migration programmes. The Danish representative accepted the Syrian amendment on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, although he felt that subject to their consent freely given the repatriation of refugees was clearly within the High Commissioner's mandate as defined by his Statute.

27. During the subsequent debate, the French representative submitted an oral amendment to the original Syrian amendment (A/C.3/L.207/Rev.3) proposing that it was the repatriation of refugees and not the solution of the refugee problem in general that should be described as urgent. The representative of the USSR having questioned whether the amendment was in order, the Chairman ruled that it was receivable under rule 119 of the rules of procedure.

28. With regard to the substance of the draft resolution, several delegations supported the second paragraph of the preamble, which notes the serious unsolved problems facing refugees not yet repatriated or resettled and the original Syrian amendments but were opposed to the other paragraphs on the ground that they endorsed the policy followed by the International Refugee Organization and the High Commissioner which laid insufficient stress on the repatriation of refugees and placed the emphasis on long-term programmes and migration with the object, they claimed, of avoiding repatriation; the assistance fund would have been useful, they said, had an assurance been forthcoming that the High Commissioner would not use it for purposes other than the provision of emergency aid for the neediest groups.

Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and were taking the necessary steps to secure its ratification. Other delegations stated that they could not invite other States to become parties to the Convention since their own Governments had not signed it or had not as yet taken any decision in the matter.

23. Certain delegations expressed their general opposition to the draft resolution since it endorsed the policy followed by the High Commissioner, which they were not prepared to do.

24. The Chairman having put the draft resolution to the vote by paragraphs, it was adopted by the following votes:

<u>Paragraph 1</u>	35 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.
<u>Paragraph 2</u>	18 votes to 5, with 22 abstentions.
<u>Paragraph 3</u>	19 votes to 5, with 22 abstentions.
<u>Paragraph 4</u>	35 votes to 5, with 6 abstentions.
<u>The draft resolution as a whole</u>	25 votes to 5, with 15 abstentions.

25. A joint draft resolution was also submitted by Colombia, Denmark, Lebanon, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and Uruguay (A/C.3/L.200) with three aims in view: (a) to authorize the High Commissioner to issue an appeal for voluntary contributions to provide emergency aid for the most needy groups of refugees; (b) to recommend that the States, specialized agencies and inter-governmental agencies concerned should pay special attention to the refugee problem when executing their programmes of economic reconstruction and development, and to request the High Commissioner to promote such activities; and (c) to appeal to States to give to refugees every possible opportunity to participate in projects to promote migration. Amendments to this draft resolution were submitted by Syria (A/C.3/L.207/Rev.3)^{4/} which proposed the insertion in the preamble of a new paragraph drawing attention to the urgency of the voluntary repatriation of refugees and the addition at the end of paragraph 2 of the operative part of a phrase expressing the same idea.

26. The draft resolution was discussed at the 382nd and 383rd meetings. The resolution was introduced by the representative of Denmark, one of the co-sponsors. He explained that it was intended to convey the General Assembly's endorsement of the three conclusions at which the High Commissioner had arrived,

/(a) by authorizing

^{4/}(A/C.3/L.207/Rev.4 in the French text).

29. A large majority, however, concurred in favour of the draft as a whole, stressing the tragic situation of the refugees not yet repatriated or resettled and their need of assistance. Many speakers stated their complete agreement with the High Commissioner's wish for authority to issue an appeal for voluntary contributions; others uttered a warning against any undue optimism as to the results of such an appeal and suggested that it would be useful to have more detailed information on the ultimate use of any funds collected. Almost all the delegations supporting the appeal said that they were doing so on the express understanding that they were in no way committing their Governments to contribute to the fund.

30. The principle that the refugees should be fitted into the economic development programmes of their countries of residence was endorsed by most delegations, some of which however pointed out that the special economic position and needs of the individual countries would have to be taken into consideration. The same comment was made on the proposal relating to migration projects, in implementing which regard would have to be had to the provisions of the various national legislations. Finally, several delegations stressed the part which the specialized agencies and the non-governmental organizations would have to play in the execution of such projects.

31. At the request of the Canadian representative, the draft resolution was put to the vote paragraph by paragraph, beginning with the French oral amendment, which was rejected by 21 votes to 17, with 12 abstentions.

32. The draft resolution was adopted by the following votes:

1. Preamble

<u>First paragraph</u>	41 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions
<u>Second paragraph</u>	46 votes to none, with 3 abstentions
<u>Third paragraph</u>	43 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions

/2. Operative part

2. Operative part

Paragraph 1

34 votes to none, with 16 abstentions

Paragraph 2

39 votes to 5, with 7 abstentions

Paragraph 2 of the
Syrian amendments

46 votes to none, with 4 abstentions

(A/C.3/L.207/Rev.3)

as modified and accepted
by the sponsors of the
draft resolution

Paragraph 3

37 votes to 35, with 8 abstentions

3. The draft resolution

39 votes to 5, with 6 abstentions

as a whole, as amended

33. The Third Committee accordingly recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the two draft resolutions contained in Part III of this report.

II

Exchange of views of Members of the Committee on the book "The Refugee in the Post War World" (A/AC.36/6).

34. At the 378th, 379th and 380th meetings of the Committee the delegations of Greece and Egypt expressed the opinion that the book "The Refugee in the Post War World" contained errors and presented in a biased, not to say hostile, way the facts narrated in the passages concerned with their countries. The Egyptian representative expressed doubts as to the objectivity of the book and asked how a work compiled by independent "research students" could have been published with a United Nations symbol. The Secretary of the Committee replied that a United Nations symbol on a publication did not necessarily imply that the United Nations was responsible for the contents; the purpose of the symbol was merely to ensure distribution through official channels. The present volume had been issued to members of the Committee for information only. On the proposal of the representative of Belgium, the Committee decided to return to the matter after ending debate and voting on the draft resolutions before it on assistance to and protection of refugees.

35. The Committee resumed its examination of the book during its 383rd meeting, and continued the discussion throughout its 384th, 385th and 386th meetings. Some delegations alleged that the book was not written in good faith; that it contained allusions incompatible with the spirit of the Charter and that a high-ranking officer of the United Nations, such as the High Commissioner, could not properly order it to be published and write a laudatory preface; and that this was a dangerous political activity beyond the powers of the High Commissioner as defined by the Statute of his Office and obviously directed against certain countries. The same

delegations also took exception to the publication of the work on the responsibility of the High Commissioner or the United Nations without the express permission of the General Assembly, which, with the Economic and Social Council, alone had power to give instructions to the High Commissioner.

36. Some members of the Committee expressed their regret that the investigation had not been entrusted to the international officials of the Office of the High Commissioner, who were bound by their oath, nor submitted to the governments for their comments.

37. Some delegations, while deploring the inaccuracies and mistakes in the work, regretted that it contained insufficient information and was lacking in objectivity; some of these delegations, however, took the view that the principle of entrusting the enquiry to independent research students gave no ground for criticism; that there was no doubt of the intellectual honesty and fairness of its authors; and that the matter would therefore be adequately dealt with by a disclaimer of United Nations responsibility issued by the Secretary-General to the Press. Other delegations expressed the fear that such a disclaimer would attract undue attention to the book, besides inflicting a public rebuff on the High Commissioner.

38. Some delegations made it clear that the opposition against the work should not be taken to reflect on the accuracy of its contents but to concern only its apparent connexion with the United Nations resulting from the form in which it was published and the circumstance of its circulation by the United Nations.

39. The Commission had before it the three draft resolutions and an amendment (A/C.3/L.210, L.211, L.212 and L.213). These were the subject of a general debate in which many members of the Committee took part and the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General's representative also spoke.

40. The Egyptian draft resolution (A/C.3/L.210) proposed that the Third Committee should (a) note the Secretariat's statement that the work did not constitute a United Nations document; (b) invite the Secretariat to embody its statement in a press release to which it should give the widest possible dissemination, and to cease all circulation of the work through the United Nations; and (c) consider the incident closed so far as the Third Committee was concerned.

41. An amendment to the Egyptian draft resolution submitted by Pakistan (A/C.3/L.211) proposed to add a paragraph requesting the Secretariat to insert prominently in publications for which the United Nations accepted no responsibility a notice to that effect. During the debate that amendment was withdrawn by its sponsor, but was taken up again by the Afghan delegation.

42. The draft resolution of Saudi Arabia (A/C.3/L.212) proposed that the Third Committee, considering that the book entitled "The Refugee in the Post War World" and bearing the imprint and a symbol of the United Nations was published without the authorization of the General Assembly or any Member State of the United Nations, and contained serious inaccuracies and misrepresentations to which many Member States of the United Nations had strongly objected, should decide (a) that the book should be withdrawn from circulation at once by the Secretariat and the Office of the High Commissioner; (b) that the cover, the flyleaf, the introduction by the High Commissioner and the preface by Mr. Jacques Vernant should be removed from any copies still in the possession of the Secretariat or the High Commissioner for Refugees; (c) that the number of the remaining copies of the book should be accurately counted and disclosed to the Third Committee and that such copies should be impounded after the provisions of sub-paragraph (b) had been carried out; and (d) that a full enquiry should be held and the report thereof be given to the Third Committee as to how the Secretariat came to authorize the publication of the book under the imprint and symbol of the United Nations without the authorization of the General Assembly or of a Member State of the United Nations.

43. The draft resolution of Czechoslovakia (A/C.3/L.213) proposed that whereas, in accordance with Article 2 of the Statute of the Office of the High Commissioner, the work of the High Commissioner was to be of an exclusively humanitarian and social character and the High Commissioner was to follow

recommendations and instructions given him by the General Assembly or the Economic and Social Council, the Third Committee, having noted the report entitled "The Refugee in the Post War World", prepared at the request of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and published in book form at Geneva in December 1951 on behalf of the United Nations under the symbol A/AC.36/6, should (a) note that many delegations had criticized the contents of the book and the statements contained therein, which did not reflect the views of the General Assembly or the Economic and Social Council; (b) draw the attention of the President of the General Assembly to the book and to the activities of the High Commissioner; and (c) request the President of the General Assembly to take the necessary steps for the immediate withdrawal of the book from circulation.

44. The three draft resolutions have been the subject of a general exchange of views.

During the discussion the High Commissioner made a statement to the effect that the book was the work of an independent survey group formed at his request by Mr. Jacques Vernant, Secretary-General of the Centre d'études de politique étrangère in Paris; that it was merely a preliminary report; and that it was clear both from his own introduction to the book and from Mr. Vernant's preface, that Mr. Vernant and his colleagues accepted sole responsibility for the book's contents. The High Commissioner added that he was prepared to issue a press release stating that the book did not constitute a United Nations document and that neither he nor the Secretary-General was responsible for its contents; that a notice to that effect would be inserted in the copies of the book still available to the Secretariat and the High Commissioner; that, moreover, he would see to it that the final version of the report would be published and distributed independently of the United Nations; and, lastly, that, when preparing the final version, the survey group would be happy to receive and take into consideration any comments or corrections submitted by governments.

45. Referring to the High Commissioner's statement, the Executive Assistant to the Secretary-General confirmed that the book, for the contents of which neither the High Commissioner nor the Secretariat assumed any responsibility whatever, was not an official document; it had been published as the result of a survey carried out at the High Commissioner's request by independent experts who were alone responsible for it and it was designed to assist governments by clarifying a vast and very complex problem. He added that a press release to that effect

/would be

would be issued. He regretted that the work contained passages which had been criticized by certain governments as lacking in objectivity, and said that circulation of the work through the Secretariat would cease immediately.

46. After these explanatory statements, several delegations expressed the view that it would not be expedient to put the draft resolution before the Committee to the vote and that it would be better to settle the incident amicably by accepting the assurances given to the Committee that there would be no further connexion between the work and the United Nations.

47. After the ensuing exchange of views, Haiti and Lebanon submitted a procedural motion (A/C.3/L.214) inviting the Rapporteur: (a) to include in the Third Committee's report dealing with the refugee question, the undertaking assumed by the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General to take the following action: (i) issue of a press release stating categorically that the book "The Refugee in the Post War World" did not constitute a United Nations document and that neither the Secretariat nor the High Commissioner was in any way responsible for its contents; (ii) removal of the United Nations seal and symbol from all copies still in the hands of the United Nations; (iii) immediate cessation of all circulation of the work through the Secretariat or the High Commissioner; (iv) insertion of a notice in the copies of the work still available to the effect that the authors thereof were alone responsible for the ideas and opinions expressed therein; and (b) to indicate that the Committee expressed itself satisfied with the assurances given by the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General and considered the incident closed so far as the Committee was concerned.

48. In submitting this proposal, the Lebanese representative pointed out that the undertaking assumed by the representative of the Secretary-General to cease circulation of the book through the United Nations implied the removal of the United Nations seal (the words "Published by the United Nations") and symbol from the remaining copies. He also made it clear that the press release was to be issued by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, while the High Commissioner would see to the insertion of the notice in the book.

49. The Chairman proposed that the Committee should vote on the procedural motion submitted by the delegations of Haiti and Lebanon before voting on the three draft resolutions. The Committee adopted this proposal by 22 votes to 10, with 12 abstentions.

50. The proposal submitted by the delegations of Haiti and Lebanon was voted by division, at the request of the delegations of Afghanistan and Haiti, with the following results:

Sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 1 was adopted by 31 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 1 was adopted by 34 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph 1 was adopted by 32 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph 1 was adopted by 34 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 30 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

The proposal as a whole was adopted by 31 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

51. The Chairman stated that a Syrian amendment to the proposal of Haiti and Lebanon had reached him too late to be taken into account. The purpose of the amendment was to add a paragraph requesting the High Commissioner: (a) to stop, if possible, the publication of the final edition of the report "The Refugee in the Post War World", or to refuse it his sponsorship; (b) to consider, in collaboration with the Secretariat and Members of the United Nations and with the assistance of experts approved by that Organization, the preparation of an official report on refugees to be submitted to the seventh session of the General Assembly.

52. The Chairman ruled that adoption of the Haitian and Lebanese procedural motion would preclude voting on the draft resolutions previously submitted to the Committee. After a number of members of the Committee had raised objections to this ruling the Chairman called for a roll-call vote to ascertain whether the Committee wished to vote on the draft resolutions submitted by Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Czechoslovakia. The Committee decided by 20 votes to 13, with 22 abstentions, not to put to the vote the three draft resolutions (A/C.3/L.210, A/C.3/L.212 and A/C.3/L.213). The result of the vote was as follows:

/In favour:

In favour:

Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Afghanistan, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Egypt.

Against:

Haiti, Israel, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, France.

Abstaining:

Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Lebanon, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Burma, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala.

53. The Syrian representative argued that his amendment to the procedural motion contained in the joint Haitian and Lebanese proposal had been submitted before the vote was taken, and should therefore be discussed. He urged that the Committee should decide whether it wished to vote on his amendment. The Chairman ruled that, in order to be able to discuss the matter, the Committee would first have to decide to reconsider its decision on the procedural motion; in accordance with rule 122 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, it could only do so if a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting were in favour. She called upon the Secretary of the Committee to read the text of the Syrian oral amendment, and also gave its sponsor permission to explain the amendment. The question of reconsidering the Committee's decision on the procedural motion which it had adopted was then put to the vote. By 26 votes to 14, with 14 abstentions, the Committee decided not to reconsider its decision on the joint Haitian and Lebanese proposal.

54. In explaining their votes, members of the Committee wished to make it clear that the criticisms in the Third Committee of the work "The Refugee in the Post War World" should not be interpreted as restricting the right of the Secretary-General and of the High Commissioner to seek the collaboration of independent experts in future, so long as the latter assumed responsibility for

/their conclusions,

their conclusions, and that it was vital not to prejudice the principle of free speech. Other delegations were of the opinion that the proposal adopted by the Committee was not satisfactory since it did not contain sufficiently radical provisions.

55. Replying to the Saudi Arabian representative's question as to how many copies of the work remained in the possession of the United Nations and the High Commissioner, the Secretary informed the Committee that 4,100 copies in English and 2,000 in French had been printed; 1,000 copies in English and 500 copies in French had been distributed to sales agents; 1,600 English and 1,000 French copies had been allocated for general distribution, and there remain in stock 100 English and 80 French copies. The appropriate departments of the Secretariat at Geneva and New York had already been instructed to cease distribution of the publication.

56. In accordance with the Third Committee's decision, the Rapporteur quotes below the undertaking given by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the Secretary-General of the United Nations:

(a) A press release will be issued stating categorically that the work does not constitute a United Nations document and that neither the Secretariat nor the High Commissioner is in any way responsible for its contents;

(b) The United Nations seal and symbol will be removed from all the copies still in the hands of the United Nations;

(c) All circulation of the work through the Secretariat or the High Commissioner will cease immediately;

(d) The High Commissioner will insert a notice in the copies of the work still available, to the effect that the authors thereof are alone responsible for the ideas and opinions expressed therein.

57. In accordance with the same decision, the Rapporteur also states that the Committee declared itself satisfied with the assurances given by the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General and considers the incident closed so far as it is concerned.

III

ASSISTANCE AND PROTECTION OF REFUGEES

A

The General Assembly,

1. Takes note of part I and part II of the annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees^{1/} submitted through the Economic and Social Council to the General Assembly in accordance with paragraph 11 of the Statute of his Office;
2. Expresses its satisfaction at the conclusion of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees;
3. Invites Member States and non-member States which have demonstrated their interest in the solution of the refugee problem to become parties to that Convention as soon as possible;
4. Reiterates its call upon governments to co-operate with the High Commissioner as recommended in its resolution 428(V) of 14 December 1950.

B

The General Assembly,

Taking note of the communication of the International Refugee Organization on residual refugee problems^{2/}, and, the observations of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees contained in his report^{3/} on the problem of assistance submitted in accordance with resolution 430(V) of 14 December 1950,

Having noted the serious unsolved problems which in certain areas will face refugees who will not have been repatriated or resettled by the end of the operations of the International Refugee Organization,

Bearing in mind the urgency of finding solutions for the refugee problem, including the repatriation to their countries of origin of refugees who express the desire to return there,

1. Authorizes the High Commissioner, under paragraph 10 of the Statute of his Office, to issue an appeal for funds for the purpose of enabling emergency aid to be given to the most needy groups among refugees within his mandate;

/2. Recommends

1/ A/2011, Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Supplement No. 19.

2/ A/1948.

3/ A/2011, Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Supplement No. 9, Part III.

2. Recommends all States directly affected by the refugee problem, as well as the appropriate specialized agencies and other inter-governmental agencies concerned, to pay special attention to this problem when drawing up and executing programmes of economic reconstruction and development; and requests the High Commissioner to contribute to the promotion of activities in this field, paying due regard to the desirability of repatriating to their countries of origin refugees who express the desire to return there.

3. Appeals to States interested in migration to give to refugees within the mandate of the High Commissioner every possible opportunity to participate in and benefit from projects to promote migration.