



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

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 27:	
Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees ( <i>continued</i> ).....	51

**Chairman: Mr. Jiří NOSEK (Czechoslovakia).**

**AGENDA ITEM 27**

**Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (A/2648 and Add.2, A/2686, chapter IV, section V, A/C.3/L.402, A/C.3/L.403 and Add.1) (*continued*)**

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE (A/C.3/L.402, A/C.3/L.403 AND ADD.1) (*continued*)**

1. Mr. HOOD (Australia) made a few explanatory remarks about the draft resolution which his delegation had joined in sponsoring (A/C.3/L.403 and Add.1). In reply to the comments on the functions of the Advisory Committee on Refugees made by the Chinese representative at the 552nd meeting, he explained that it was in order to enable the programme to be put into operation as soon as possible that paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution specified that that Committee should, at its next session, determine the amount of contributions towards the fund. That could not be done if the amount had to be determined by a new organ established by the Economic and Social Council. Operative paragraph 2 was based solely on a desire to expedite the adoption of practical measures.

2. He could not share the concern expressed by some representatives that the programme envisaged in the draft resolution might duplicate the work of other international bodies, particularly the Inter-Governmental Committee for European Migration.

3. Although his delegation had the highest regard for the manner in which Sweden had always carried out its international responsibilities, the procedure proposed by the Swedish delegation in its draft resolution was unacceptable to his delegation, which felt that the proposed new fund should be derived solely from voluntary contributions. The Australian delegation would therefore vote against the Swedish draft resolution.

4. Mrs. MARZUKI (Indonesia) said that her Government had always regarded the refugee problem as primarily a humanitarian matter. To the extent within its power it had always supported United Nations efforts to remedy the pitiful situation of the refugees,

particularly the Palestine and Korean refugees. Her delegation was fully aware that the responsibility which the United Nations had assumed for the refugees under the High Commissioner's mandate flowed directly from the principles set forth in the United Nations Charter. There were no refugees in Indonesia who came within the High Commissioner's mandate. Nevertheless, her Government thought that the international community as a whole should attempt to solve the problem, and that was why her delegation's attitude towards the draft resolutions under consideration was based solely on humanitarian considerations.

5. As regards the Swedish draft resolution (A/C.3/L.402), she paid a tribute to the Swedish representative's efforts to improve the international assistance given to refugees by making regular provision in the United Nations budget for the funds required for that purpose. However, in view of the explanation given by the Secretary of the Committee (551st meeting) on the financial implications of the draft resolution and having regard to the procedure which would have to be followed if long-range projects were to be financed out of the regular budget of the United Nations, she was afraid that the method of financing proposed in paragraph 2 of the operative part would not permit of a practical and effective solution to the problem. Her delegation could not, moreover, support operative paragraph 1, which gave the impression that economic integration was the best solution that could be devised. She regretted that the draft resolution did not provide for other possible methods, such as voluntary repatriation and resettlement. The Indonesian delegation therefore could not support the Swedish draft resolution.

6. As regards the eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.3/L.403 and Add.1), she explained that her Government would be unable at that time to contribute to the fund mentioned in operative paragraph 2. Nevertheless, the authors of the draft resolution had been guided by humanitarian considerations, and the Indonesian delegation would support any attempt to alleviate the burden on the countries of residence. It would vote for the draft resolution in that spirit.

7. Mr. PEREZ DE ARCE (Chile) recalled the steps which had been taken by his Government regarding the admission of refugees and which were described in paragraph 183 of the High Commissioner's report (A/2648). Immigrants settling in Chile enjoyed the same rights as the rest of the population. Chilean authorities selected immigrants on the basis of the needs of agriculture and industry. They wished to ensure that the new arrivals intended to settle permanently with their families in Chile and make it their new homeland. Unfortunately, that psychological factor, to which the Chilean authorities attached great importance, was not always understood by the refugees.

Chile could not help the High Commissioner as much as it would like, for it was confronted with special problems. His delegation wished, however, to congratulate the High Commissioner on the humanitarian work he had undertaken.

8. His delegation would vote against the Swedish draft resolution (A/C.3/L.402) but it reserved its position on the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.403 and Add.1).

9. Mr. MENDOZA FLEURY (Venezuela) said that the people and the Government of Venezuela, guided by a spirit of international solidarity, were fully cognizant of the tragic fate of the refugees. Within the limits of its means, Venezuela would continue to help in the search for a solution to the problem. Unfortunately, the United Nations endeavours in that field were limited by financial difficulties, and Venezuela itself was experiencing the same type of difficulties on a domestic scale. His delegation had already explained in the Economic and Social Council<sup>1</sup> the steps his Government had taken to admit refugees. The attitude which Venezuela had displayed in the matter accorded with the traditions common to all the American States.

10. His delegation had abstained from voting on Economic and Social Council resolution 549 (XVIII) because of budgetary difficulties and would be compelled for the same reason to abstain when the Swedish draft resolution (A/C.3/L.402) was put to the vote. On the other hand, it would vote for the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.403 and Add.1), because the system of voluntary contributions was the only approach which his Government could accept at that time.

11. Mr. LUCIO (Mexico) said that his delegation would vote for the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.403 and Add.1) which provided for a programme of concerted practical action for a satisfactory solution of the refugee problem in the light of existing conditions. For economic reasons and for reasons of demographic policy, his Government had not always been able to assist the Office of the High Commissioner. It wished, however, to give its moral support to the humanitarian work being done by the High Commissioner, and in that spirit his delegation would vote for the joint draft resolution.

12. Mr. FAROUHAR (Iran) recalled that in the general debate he had given the assurance that his delegation would vote for any resolution which would enable the High Commissioner to carry out his task and that his Government would give the High Commissioner all the support necessary to solve the refugee problem in Iran. As the High Commissioner had visited Iran, he was acquainted with the urgent economic problems confronting that country and knew that unfortunately it could not contribute to the fund proposed in the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.403 and Add.1).

13. He regretted that the sponsors of the joint draft resolution had not considered it necessary in the fourth paragraph of the preamble to reflect the views expressed by many delegations on the capital importance of international responsibility in regard to the refugee problem. That paragraph placed the responsibility for the refugees within the mandate of the High Commissioner upon the countries of residence. In order that every delegation might express its views on the subject, he

asked for a separate vote on the paragraph. Iran had given asylum to those who had requested it, and he could not agree that, in the final analysis, responsibility for the refugees within the mandate of the High Commissioner who were living in Iran should rest upon his country.

14. He was very pleased to note that General Assembly resolution 728 (VIII) had been mentioned in the fifth paragraph of the preamble of the draft resolution. His delegation regarded voluntary repatriation as one of the best solutions for the refugee problem. It would vote for the joint draft resolution but would abstain from voting on the fourth paragraph of the preamble if no amendments were forthcoming.

15. He would, to his great regret, be unable to vote for the Swedish draft resolution (A/C.3/L.402).

16. Mr. MATHEW (India) had listened with great interest to the statements made by the High Commissioner and the various representatives. His delegation was well aware of the magnitude of the problems confronting the High Commissioner, for unfortunately there were millions of refugees in India. He would not review the reasons for the refugee problem in his country; the important thing was not to dwell on past events but to try to remedy the situation by taking the necessary measures. Although he was not personally familiar with the current situation of the refugees within the mandate of the High Commissioner, he knew that their position was tragic. His Government would be unable to contribute to the contemplated fund, because assistance to the refugees within its own territory represented a heavy financial burden. He recalled, however, that India had already supplied financial assistance to refugees in Palestine and Korea.

17. As India did not want to influence in any way the organization of a programme in which it would be unable to participate, his delegation would abstain from voting on the two draft resolutions before the Committee. His delegation felt sure that its abstention would not be misinterpreted, in view of the measures that India had already adopted to assist refugees, and that abstention would in no way affect his delegation's vote in the Fifth Committee when the financial aspects of the two draft resolutions were discussed.

18. Mr. CHAPUT (Canada) said that on the whole the objectives stated in the High Commissioner's report (A/2648 and Add.2) and in the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.403 and Add.1) met with his delegation's approval. The High Commissioner and his fellow workers should be congratulated on the work that they had undertaken to relieve the suffering of the refugees. His Government sincerely hoped that the implementation of the High Commissioner's recommendations would at last furnish a solution to a problem with which the United Nations had long been concerned.

19. In that connexion his delegation wished to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that the financial goals fixed for certain of the international assistance programmes already approved by the General Assembly might well exceed the amount that the Member and non-member States were willing to contribute. The United Nations should be careful not to adopt a refugee assistance programme that would not enlist sufficient financial support. Canada had already participated in United Nations programmes for assisting refugees, both by receiving a large number of refugees and by making a financial contribution. Since the publication

<sup>1</sup> See document E/AC.7/SR.284.

of the High Commissioner's report, his Government had made a further contribution of \$50,000 to the High Commissioner's programme for the current year and a contribution of \$50,000 to the Inter-Governmental Committee for European Migration.

20. It should also be noted that the refugees admitted to Canada enjoyed the same rights as other immigrants. In view of the large number of persons who desired to emigrate to Canada, it was clear that it was not his Government's purpose to maintain refugee camps as reservoirs of cheap labour. Like other immigrants, the refugees who came to Canada were absolutely free to return, if they so desired, to the countries where they had originally found asylum.

21. His delegation believed that the implementation of the recommendations contained in the joint draft resolution would be a major step towards a permanent solution of the refugee problem. His Government approved of the proposal that financial contributions for the execution of the High Commissioner's programme should be sought by the Negotiating Committee for Extra-Budgetary Funds and hoped that its efforts would be successful. With respect to the creation of an advisory body, his Government would willingly support any measures designed to provide a more effective system of control.

22. His delegation would vote in favour of the joint draft resolution but in doing so would in no way commit itself to contributing to a refugee assistance programme that the General Assembly might adopt. His Government's final attitude would depend in large part upon the extent to which other governments participated in the financing of the programme.

23. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) said that her Government favoured the earliest possible implementation of the refugee programme by the three methods contemplated, namely, voluntary repatriation, resettlement and integration, all with the consent of the countries concerned. The problem was one of the greatest importance to Greece, which was caring for 15,000 refugees within the mandate of the High Commissioner, and had formerly cared for a still larger number.

24. Her delegation would be unable to vote for the Swedish draft resolution (A/C.3/L.402), because it considered that in existing budgetary circumstances the United Nations could not easily allocate the funds necessary for carrying out the proposed programme.

25. Her delegation believed, after studying the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.403 and Add.1), that in view of the generous and encouraging statements made by several delegations, the system of voluntary contributions proposed in paragraph 2 of the operative part would produce satisfactory results. It also approved of operative paragraph 4.

26. She had already asked for a separate vote on the fourth paragraph of the preamble, which placed the entire responsibility for refugees within the mandate of the High Commissioner on the countries of asylum, whose geographical position had led successive waves of refugees to settle on their territory. However, Greece, which was a country of asylum, was not shirking its international responsibilities. In spite of its extremely difficult financial situation and the terrible trials which it had undergone, it had spent the equivalent of \$3 million on assistance to refugees since 1946 and over \$200,000 was allocated annually for that purpose under

the budget. The Rhodes Home for the Aged, which was maintained solely by the Greek Government, was caring for approximately one hundred foreign refugees. Moreover, the Government was granting allowances to 64 aged foreign refugees not in institutions and to 108 refugee students to enable them to continue their studies. To supplement that information, she recalled certain facts mentioned by the representative of the High Commissioner in Greece which, in her opinion, should be drawn to the General Assembly's attention. Those facts would help to show that there was a strong case for United Nations assistance to Greece. Greece, an overpopulated country with very limited resources, had on several occasions been devastated, and was currently engaged in reconstruction. In the past thirty-five years, about 25 per cent of the population had been uprooted by wars, guerilla bands and earthquakes, while others, victims of events outside Greece, had entered the country as refugees, repatriated persons and exiles. They had not all been settled yet, and still more homeless refugees were continually arriving. To those might be added the hostages returned by Hungary, Romania, Czechoslovakia and other countries. All those displaced groups had been aided by the Government, housed and fed, without distinction of race, nationality or religion. That was a heavy burden on a country endeavouring to rebuild its economy and its finances and to raise its standard of living, which was lower than that of the other countries of Europe. In view of those circumstances, her delegation could not accept the fourth paragraph of the preamble as it stood, and that was the reason why it had been unable to join in sponsoring the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.403 and Add.1).

27. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was not at all satisfied with the High Commissioner's work and would be unable to support a proposal approving the policy that he had followed. It was therefore unable to support the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.403 and Add.1).

28. As to the draft resolution submitted by the Swedish representative (A/C.3/L.402), whose motives were unquestioned, he did not think that the proposed method would lead to an appropriate solution of the refugee problem. Moreover, the Secretary of the Committee had said that the application of operative paragraph 2 would require a supplementary appropriation of \$3,200,000 in the 1955 budget. At a time when United Nations bodies were seeking to reduce their expenditures, it was inopportune for the Third Committee to adopt a proposal entailing additional expenditures of such magnitude. Viewed in that light, the Swedish draft resolution appeared to be ill-advised. Furthermore, as its provisions would contribute nothing towards a real solution of the refugee problem, in view of the High Commissioner's continuing concern with resettlement and integration rather than repatriation, his delegation could not support that proposal.

29. Mr. KOS (Yugoslavia) wished to make certain statements of principle. Both draft resolutions seemed to indicate that in the view of their sponsors, the creation of a new fund might lead to a satisfactory solution of the problem of certain groups of refugees. His delegation did not share that view, for in its opinion, as the war refugees were in themselves difficult cases whose situation it had not as yet been possible to solve, the proposed new fund would not help to bring about a solution.

30. The High Commissioner should, moreover, consider those post-war refugees from a strictly humanitarian point of view and avoid all political considerations. In reality, very few refugees could justifiably maintain that they were victims of political persecution. In order to further the solution of the problem, therefore, the classification that the High Commissioner apparently wished to adopt should be rejected.

31. The Yugoslav delegation was far from convinced that integration in the country of residence was the best possible solution in the existing circumstances. Some countries were in great economic difficulties and would not be able to integrate many refugees. Any such attempt at integration might cause friction among nations and would be an element of disunion among them. He failed to see why there should be fewer opportunities of resettlement overseas than there had been a few years previously. Probably if suitable aid were given to the immigration countries they would find it more advantageous and would be more willing to receive refugees.

32. It had been rightly pointed out during the discussion that if a new fund were established, the number of refugees might increase. In that connexion, he referred to the experience of his Government, citing in particular the case of a young Yugoslav who had pretended to be a political refugee in order to reap certain benefits. The majority of the so-called political refugees, not counting criminals to whom the provisions of bilateral extradition treaties were applicable, fell into two categories. The first comprised relatives of refugees who had been long settled abroad; those people could, if they wished, obtain valid passports from the Yugoslav authorities. The other was composed of young people who had been deceived by misleading propaganda and who, repelled by the prospect of work, dreamed of an easy life in the Land of Cockaigne; some of them, disappointed in what they had found abroad, had already returned to Yugoslavia.

33. In his programme the High Commissioner provided for grants of scholarships to refugees. The Yugoslav representative felt that the money would be used to better advantage in helping students of Member States and that it would be a waste to spend it on unstable elements.

34. For all those reasons, the establishment of the new fund would not really solve the problem. In any event, Yugoslavia would be unable to contribute to the fund, but that did not mean that it was unwilling to co-operate with the High Commissioner.

35. The Swedish draft resolution (A/C.3/L.402) had two major defects. First, it said that integration offered the best prospects of solving the problem—a statement with which the Yugoslav delegation disagreed. Secondly, the proposal would result in raising the contributions of Member States. The United Nations would be wrong to allocate funds from its regular budget to finance direct action in a field in which several organizations had been working for nine years without marked success.

36. With regard to the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.403 and Add.1), his delegation reserved its position on the usefulness of the proposed new fund, but would support paragraphs 4 and 5 of the operative part whereby the management of the fund was placed under appropriate control.

37. Mrs. ELLIOT (United Kingdom) emphasized that the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.403 and Add.1) mentioned the three possible solutions indicated by the High Commissioner in his report. The proposal seemed sound, and her delegation would vote for the text as it stood.

38. The United Kingdom Government had already expressed its doubts regarding some aspects of the High Commissioner's programme, in particular the use of the good offices of the Negotiating Committee. The problem was undeniably serious and difficult to resolve. The High Commissioner and his fellow workers had made an earnest effort, and her Government had already assisted within the means at its disposal, but unfortunately it was not then in a position to make any further financial commitment. As it was necessary, however, for the Committee to give the High Commissioner the moral support he required, her delegation would join the great majority which undoubtedly would vote for the joint draft resolution.

39. Mr. RODRIGUEZ-FABREGAT (Uruguay) drew the attention of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.403 and Add.1) to a point of primary importance.

40. The last paragraph of the preamble contained a reference to "certain groups" of refugees, but no further clarification was given. Although he did not think that the phrase had any political implications or alluded to possible arbitrary discrimination against some refugees, it would be better to avoid any possible misunderstanding and specify the exact meaning of the expression.

41. If any group of unfortunates was deserving of special attention, it was certainly the families of the refugees, the women and children who shared the lot of their husbands and fathers. The great physical and moral sufferings of the refugees were too well known to need a detailed description. Among so many negative aspects there was but one source of life and hope: the family circle, with its promise of a better future.

42. He stressed that point not for sentimental reasons, but because women and children formed an important part of society. Governments had to be made to realize that. That consideration would certainly shed a new light on the problem of receiving refugees. When it came to women and children, all matters were seen from another angle. Humaneness and awareness of future needs caused the competent authorities to relax the strictest regulations.

43. Certainly all members of the Committee wished to extend special protection to that category of refugees. The United Nations had always unhesitatingly come to the aid of women and children who were victims of natural calamities or of war. Various examples of its constant solicitude could be cited.

44. For all those reasons, he requested the authors of the joint draft resolution to add the following words at the end of operative paragraph 1: "and also for the special problems of certain family groups of refugees". The meaning of the vague expression used in the last paragraph of the preamble would thus be clarified in accordance with the lofty humanitarian principles by which the United Nations had always been guided. He hoped that the authors of the draft resolution would accept his suggestion; if not, he reserved the right to submit an amendment to that effect.

45. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that he had carefully studied the two draft resolutions before the Committee and felt that both texts should be altered. Another delegation was going to submit amendments which he supported. For the time being, he would confine himself to drawing attention to some specific points.

46. With regard to the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.403 and Add.1), the provisions of operative paragraph 6 seemed to be especially controversial, since they were liable to set a dangerous precedent. The geographical position of most of the countries of residence should be taken into account. The United States of America, for example, was bounded by two oceans and had common frontiers only with States where a certain political stability prevailed, but that did not apply to many European and Asian countries. It was impossible to tell whether or not civil wars might arise in any given area. The neighbouring countries which received political refugees would be called upon to assume full financial responsibility under the precedent which it was proposed to create. The sponsors of the draft resolution could not have intended such consequences. Moreover, the High Commissioner had never maintained that a final solution of the refugee problem would be reached in five years. He only hoped to establish within that period a permanent basis for dealing with the problem. The situation at the end of that period could not be foreseen; the number of refugees might be even higher then. In that case, it would be wrong to impose on the countries of residence the obligation of integrating the refugees. The Greek and Yugoslav representatives had pointed out the difficulties of integration in a country with a precarious economy. An over-populated country could not with impunity assume full responsibility for a large group of refugees. Operative paragraph 6 was therefore unacceptable in its existing form and should be amended.

47. Many delegations had rejected the Swedish draft resolution (A/C.3/L.402) out of hand on the ground of its financial implications. Nevertheless, the proposal should be considered more carefully. Sweden's devotion to humanitarian causes was worthy of respect, and its undeniable impartiality and objectivity required that its views should be taken into account. He would be prepared to vote for that draft resolution if it were amended. In any case, his delegation's attitude would depend on the fate of some amendments to be submitted by another delegation.

48. Miss AGUILAR (Peru) expressed her delegation's views on the refugee problem which, owing to its humanitarian importance, called for a rapid solution. The High Commissioner's work, as described in his latest report to the General Assembly (A/2648 and Add.2), made it possible to view the future with optimism and deserved the support of all the Members of the United Nations. The Peruvian delegation was glad to see that the Members of the Organization in many respects shared the High Commissioner's concern and was pleased at the understanding and spirit of co-operation that had been shown.

49. The Peruvian Government was always prepared to assist in any humanitarian work, but unfortunately its possibilities were limited by obligations imposed by the economic and social development of Peru. The Peruvian delegation could not at that time undertake any new financial obligations. For that reason, in spite

of her respect for the high motives which had inspired the Swedish draft resolution (A/C.3/L.402), she regretted that she could not support it. She would vote for the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.403 and Add.1), which showed a constructive attitude towards the refugee problem. Nevertheless, she hoped that the sponsors of that resolution would accept the Uruguayan amendment.

50. Mr. NUÑEZ (Costa Rica) observed that his country was one of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/L.403 and Add.1) and that they had sought to summarize the views expressed by members of the Committee in the general debate. The Swedish delegation was certainly pursuing the same ends and the action provided for in its draft resolution (A/C.3/L.402), with the exception of operative paragraph 2, would be taken if the joint draft were adopted, since the two drafts differed substantively only on the question of financing. He understood the high motives that had prompted the Swedish delegation to draft paragraph 2 of its text, but there were some very weighty arguments, especially psychological ones, in favour of the system of voluntary contributions. It should be borne in mind that the right of States to take their decisions freely was one of the fundamental principles of the United Nations; that principle should be respected in the case under consideration as in all others. Certain countries had stated that they were in complete disagreement with the methods used by the High Commissioner to solve the refugee problem. If the funds needed by the High Commissioner for his work were appropriated from the United Nations budget, those countries would hardly like the position of having to contribute financially to work of which they did not approve.

51. The Costa Rican delegation hoped that voluntary contributions would be sufficiently large to enable the High Commissioner to carry out his work. The contributions made in the past by the Ford Foundation, the World Council of Churches and other relief organizations augured well for the future. In view of all he had said, he hoped that the Swedish delegation would join the other delegations that had supported the joint draft resolution.

52. Although he had not yet consulted the other sponsors of the joint draft resolution, he thought that the Uruguayan amendment was acceptable. Some delegations had asked for a separate vote on the fourth paragraph of the preamble; he thought that that suggestion too was acceptable, since it was important not to give the impression of underestimating the responsibility of the international community towards the refugees.

53. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) pointed out that, in his statement in the general debate, he had stressed the responsibility of the international community towards the refugees. He had then believed that he was voicing a principle acknowledged by all the Members of the United Nations. The very fact that the question was on the Committee's agenda and that each delegation had had to take a decision and vote on the matter should suffice to show that the whole world agreed that the problem was international. Even the delegations which opposed the High Commissioner's activities recognized that responsibility, since, after they had denounced the existing methods, they had proposed alternative measures. The draft resolutions, one of which would certainly be adopted, had emphasized that

responsibility by proposing the establishment of a special fund. He had made those preliminary comments in order to be able to determine the extent to which the two draft resolutions in their existing form reflected the generally recognized principle of international responsibility towards refugees.

54. The Swedish draft resolution (A/C.3/L.402) expressed that principle satisfactorily and drew the logical conclusion from it inasmuch as it proposed that, since the settlement of the refugee problem was a normal activity of the United Nations, the necessary funds should be appropriated from the Organization's budget. The Lebanese delegation could therefore vote for that draft resolution in principle.

55. It wished, however, to submit a slight amendment to it. The following words should be added to the last paragraph of the preamble: "who do not wish to return to their countries of origin". He was sure that those words were implied by the sponsor, but thought that they should be inserted explicitly, to avoid any misunderstanding.

56. If the Swedish draft resolution were not adopted, the Lebanese delegation might consider voting for the joint draft (A/C.3/L.403 and Add.1). He was using the word "consider" advisedly, because he did not think that the draft in its existing form properly reflected the principle, acknowledged by the Members of the Organization, of the joint responsibility incumbent on the international community in respect of refugees. The draft even contained phrases which were in flagrant contradiction with that fundamental principle. Various amendments would therefore have to be made to the draft resolution before the Lebanese delegation could accept it. He felt sure that no Member of the United Nations would agree, for instance, that certain countries should bear the entire financial burden involved in the solution of the problem, merely because of their geographical position or because they had been generous in giving asylum to the refugees. And yet, certain sentences in the draft resolution seemed to imply just that.

57. That was why, on behalf of his own delegation and of all the Arab delegations, he wished to propose the following amendments to the draft resolution, it being clearly understood that when it was put to the vote, the attitude of those delegations would depend on whether the amendments were accepted or rejected.

58. The first amendment was to the third paragraph of the preamble. He proposed that the words "by the countries of residence" should be deleted; they did not add anything to the meaning and might, on the other hand, give a wrong impression. It was not quite right to say that the countries of residence had been the only ones to make efforts on behalf of the refugees: the countries which had received refugees as immigrants might feel offended and think that their efforts were not appreciated. If the list was to be complete, it would be necessary to mention also the efforts of the countries of origin which had reopened their doors to some of their citizens, the efforts of the voluntary and the non-governmental organizations, the High Commissioner's Office, etc. Such a list would be long and useless. It would therefore be better simply to delete the words he had mentioned.

59. The second amendment called for the deletion, in the fourth paragraph of the preamble, of the words

"while the ultimate responsibility for the refugees within the mandate of the High Commissioner falls upon the countries of residence". In his opinion, those words ran absolutely counter to the principle of international responsibility. If a regrettable but true fact was merely being noted, he might perhaps accept those words, but they seemed to lay down a principle, the very principle to which the Lebanese and all the other Arab delegations were strongly opposed. The beginning of the paragraph would then read: "*Considering* that certain of the countries of residence have to face . . .", the rest of the paragraph remaining unchanged.

60. The third amendment was to paragraph 5 of the operative part, where the same tendency to put all the responsibility for the refugee problem onto the countries of residence was once again evident. He proposed that the words: "including plans for adequate financial contributions from sources within the countries of residence", should be replaced by the words: "taking into account any contributions from the countries of residence". In its existing form paragraph 5 was not acceptable for reasons of principle and for practical reasons. First of all, he did not see how the High Commissioner could prepare plans without knowing what the amount of the contributions would be. All that the High Commissioner could do was to take into account the contributions which the countries of residence might make, whether out of government funds or through voluntary organizations. Moreover, the High Commissioner himself had expressed the hope that if a refugee fund was established, such a generous gesture would be matched by a similar effort on the part of the countries of residence; but that had been no more than a hope.

61. Paragraph 6 of the operative part was, in his opinion, the most dangerous. He was grateful to the Saudi Arabian representative for having facilitated his task by formulating some criticisms of the paragraph and underlining its dangers: on the one hand, it might create a precedent, and on the other, it did not take into account the difficulties which the countries of residence might encounter when the High Commissioner's mandate expired.

62. But, quite apart from those dangers, the existing text of paragraph 6 might give rise to many other misunderstandings.

63. First of all, it seemed to be a kind of accusation levelled at the countries of residence, since it gave the impression that the High Commissioner's programme was an ideal one. Consequently, if with such a programme the problem of the refugees was not solved, the implication was that the fault lay with the countries of residence, which should redeem their errors by accepting thereafter full responsibility for the refugees, should any still require assistance. But that was the wrong way to present the question. The High Commissioner had himself declared that his programme was limited, as were the means at his disposal for its implementation, and he had admitted that his programme could not solve all the problems. It would therefore be quite wrong to absolve the United Nations from any responsibility towards the refugees once the programme had been implemented and throw that responsibility entirely on the countries of residence.

64. Moreover, paragraph 6 gave the impression that the \$12 million requested by the High Commissioner

was considered to be enough to solve the problem. Yet there was no reason to believe that it would be.

65. Finally, to ask the countries of residence to commit themselves to assuming full responsibility for the refugees, should any of them still require assistance at the end of the stipulated period, was a direct invitation to all the other organizations that might feel inclined to help them to terminate all assistance. He was convinced that the sponsors of the draft resolution had no such intention, but it was important not to risk giving such an impression.

66. He therefore proposed that the clause towards the end of paragraph 6: "they will assume full financial responsibility" should be replaced by the words: "they will provide all the assistance within their power".

67. In conclusion, he wished to make a suggestion of his own with regard to paragraph 7. Nowhere in the

whole long resolution was there a direct appeal to the governments of Member and non-member States to make contributions. Paragraph 3 authorized the High Commissioner to make appeals, but on the High Commissioner's own admission the appeals he had already made had been practically without effect; that was why he had turned to the United Nations, in the hope that its action would be more effective. The United Nations should therefore appeal explicitly to the Member States to make contributions. He suggested that paragraph 7 should be amended accordingly. The following text might prove acceptable:

*"Calls upon the Member and non-member States of the United Nations to make contributions to the fund and to co-operate to the utmost with the High Commissioner in carrying out that programme."*

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.