



**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Refugees and stateless persons (A/1385, A/1396, A/C.3/528, A/C.3/538, A/C.3/540, A/C.3/547, E/1850 and E/1850/Annex) ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . .	341

*Chairman:* Mr. G. J. VAN HEUVEN GOEDHART (Netherlands).

**Refugees and stateless persons (A/1385, A/1396, A/C.3/528, A/C.3/538, A/C.3/540, A/C.3/547, E/1850 and E/1850/Annex) (*continued*)**

[Item 32]\*

**GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)**

(a) PROVISIONS FOR THE FUNCTIONING OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE FOR REFUGEES: DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL; (b) DEFINITION OF THE TERM "REFUGEE" TO BE APPLIED BY THE HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES: RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL; (c) PROBLEMS OF ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES: MEMORANDUM FROM THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF IRO OF 20 OCTOBER 1950; (d) DRAFT CONVENTION RELATING TO THE STATUS OF REFUGEES

1. Mr. MOODIE (Australia) said that, in the opinion of his delegation, the Committee should make an attempt to deal with the draft convention relating to the status of refugees at the current session rather than decide in favour of a conference of plenipotentiaries to complete the drafting of, and to sign, the convention, as had been suggested.

2. The provisions defining the statute of the High Commissioner's Office for Refugees (Economic and Social Council resolution 319 A (XI), annex) were satisfactory as a whole, although in some respects not what the Australian Government would have liked. Nevertheless, the Australian delegation would support it as a fair compromise.

3. With regard to the definition of the term "refugee" to be applied by the High Commissioner for Refugees, the Australian delegation had, at the eleventh session of the Economic and Social Council, supported the definition by categories included in the draft statute. After further consideration of the problem, however, the Australian Government had come to the conclusion that the general definition contained in the United Kingdom

(A/C.3/L.115) and Belgian (A/C.3/L.114) amendments might on the whole be more satisfactory and would therefore vote for it. It seemed wiser not to introduce any limitations with regard to geographical area or to date.

4. As the representative of Venezuela had observed at the previous meeting, it was not essential that the definition to be applied by the High Commissioner should be the same as that embodied in the convention.

5. The Australian delegation considered that the date on which the High Commissioner was to take office, fixed in the draft resolution of the Economic and Social Council as 1 January 1951, should be determined in relation to his assumption of functions exercised by IRO. That might not need to be before 1 April 1951; nevertheless his delegation wished to hear the views of the other delegations.

6. He hoped that the Secretariat would furnish detailed information regarding the arrangements for staff to assist the High Commissioner in his work, as the Australian Government felt that the High Commissioner would not need a large staff until shortly before the termination of IRO. Thus firm arrangements regarding a full staff need not be made before the budget for the following year was established.

7. Mr. J. S. F. BOTHA (Union of South Africa) said that his delegation approved the provisions proposed by the Economic and Social Council for the establishment and functioning of the High Commissioner's Office for Refugees.

8. The delegation of the Union of South Africa felt that the United Kingdom amendment regarding the definition of the term "refugee" (A/C.3/L.115) was admirably clear and objective. It was not however certain that such a definition should be embodied in the provisions relating to the functions of the High Commissioner. The definition proposed by the Economic and Social Council was obviously restrictive, but it should be remembered that the High Commissioner's Office was being established for a specific purpose. The delegation of the Union of South Africa felt that it would

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

therefore be unwise to broaden its functions just then. It should also be borne in mind that the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee of the General Assembly was currently studying the question of the repatriation of Palestine refugees and if the functions of the High Commissioner's Office were broadened, there would be a possibility of overlapping between the two organs.

9. The delegation of the Union of South Africa would therefore prefer to adopt the proposal of the Economic and Social Council with regard to the definition to be applied by the High Commissioner for Refugees, but suggested that the definition proposed by the United Kingdom could be considered for the draft convention. It wished to separate the two questions and to adopt the limited definition to define the functions of the High Commissioner and to consider the broader definition for the draft convention.

10. That solution would be advisable if the Committee decided to convene a conference of plenipotentiaries to complete the drafting of the convention. It would be unwise to lay down the contents of an article of the proposed convention if the whole text was to be referred to another body.

11. The delegation of the Union of South Africa favoured the United Kingdom proposal (A/C.3/L.68) for the convening of a conference to complete the drafting of the convention. As other delegations had already noted, the session of the General Assembly was nearing its end and there was little likelihood that it would be possible to settle the question of the draft convention quickly, even if a drafting committee were set up.

12. Moreover, the convention might be of interest to a number of nations which were not represented in the United Nations and which might well be able to make a valuable contribution to the drafting of the proposed instrument. In all fairness, those countries should be given an opportunity to participate in the discussion of the matter.

13. In conclusion, he doubted whether it was desirable that the Third Committee should be asked to draft the definitive text of an international convention involving a great many technical problems. While many of the larger delegations might include experts on the matter, the same was not necessarily true of the smaller delegations.

14. The delegation of the Union of South Africa had put forward its views in a spirit of co-operation and would welcome any constructive proposals which might be presented during the debate.

15. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the problem of refugees and stateless persons had been on the agenda of the General Assembly for five years and had been the subject of numerous and fruitless recommendations; nevertheless it was still unsolved. Tens of thousands of men and women, deported and reduced to slavery by order of Hitler, were still vegetating in camps, far away from their homes. The full responsibility for that regrettable situation rested with the Governments of the United Kingdom, France and the United States of America, which were deliberately opposed to the solution of the problem.

16. If those governments had observed the provisions of the agreements for the repatriation of prisoners and displaced persons concluded at the end of the Second World War as loyally as the Government of the USSR, the problem would long since have been settled and the question would have disappeared from the agenda of the Third Committee. Meanwhile, in violation of international agreements and of the decision taken on 15 December 1946 by the General Assembly (resolution 62 (I)), which had recognized that the main task, as regards displaced persons, was to encourage and to assist in every way possible their early return to their country of origin, the Governments of the United Kingdom, of France and of the United States had endeavoured to sabotage the repatriation of displaced persons and to replace it by what was styled "resettlement".

17. In that connexion, the communication from IRO (A/C.3/540) showed that between 1 July 1947 and 31 August 1950 that organization had dealt with 1,479,644 refugees but had repatriated only 70,538, not even 5 per cent of the total. On the other hand, during the same period, IRO had resettled 806,257 persons or more than 50 per cent of the total number. The figures were significant for they showed that instead of seeking to repatriate the greatest possible number of displaced persons, IRO had been principally concerned with supplying cheap labour to certain Powers.

18. The occupation authorities in the Western zones of Germany and Austria, in collaboration with IRO, had taken measures to frustrate repatriation; they had put outlaws, quislings and traitors in charge of the camps. They had organized a dishonest campaign against repatriation, had prevented the Soviet authorities from visiting displaced persons' camps and had prohibited the publication of newspapers and magazines in Russian, in order to prevent the refugees from obtaining any information whatsoever on the situation in their country of origin, thus violating resolution 8 (I) of the General Assembly. The United States authorities had even barred the Soviet organs responsible for the repatriation of Soviet citizens from operating in the Western zone of Germany under United States administration and imposed severe penalties on displaced persons who dared to express a desire to return home.

19. The delegation of the USSR and the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR had already cited numerous examples of the unfair treatment of refugees and displaced persons. Their statements had never been challenged, and for good reason. He would simply direct the Committee's attention to the plight of children of Soviet origin who had been taken away from their families by the Nazis and whom the American authorities refused to send home, on the ground that their origin was unknown or was not sufficiently established. The children concerned were children who were too young to remember the names of their parents or even, in some cases, children whose identity was known. Nevertheless, in order to avoid returning them to their families, the United Kingdom and United States authorities lost no time in sending them overseas and then it was reported in the United States and the United Kingdom newspapers that such and such a ship had recently arrived in Australia with sick, undernourished or handicapped children, born in the USSR or the East European countries. In so doing, the United States and the

United Kingdom seemed to be far from conforming to the humanitarian principles they constantly invoked.

20. The representative of the Ukrainian SSR noted that, under the cloak of repatriation, or rather "resettlement", the occupation authorities took all the young and healthy refugees from the camps and left the old, the sick and the invalids to their fate. In the communication from IRO (A/C.3/540) it was stated that the position of refugees in Germany and in Austria was still uncertain because of economic or political difficulties and that the problem would require the attention of the United Nations High Commissioner, both with regard to the legal protection of refugees and with regard to their physical condition and well being. So long as the camps had contained able-bodied refugees, IRO had used them as a sort of labour reservoir from which certain Powers drew the workers they needed. The reservoirs were running low and the United Kingdom and the United States of America were contributing less and less to the budget of IRO. They wanted the United Nations to assume responsibility for the remaining refugees, that is, for those who were incapable of working. The High Commissioner's Office was to be established to enable both countries to realize their selfish purposes.

21. The occupation authorities sought to sabotage repatriation because they wished to recruit spies from the refugees and displaced persons. They chose from the camps young men familiar with the languages and customs of the countries of Eastern Europe and, after a strict examination, made them sign a three-year contract and swear an oath of allegiance. Agents of the United States paid their recruits twenty to fifty dollars a day and even more. It might be asked whether that was the use to be made of the funds to which the representative of the Netherlands had referred at the previous meeting.

22. After the defeat of Hitler, certain nazi agents had taken refuge in Western Germany to seek the protection of the authorities and to avoid just punishment for their crimes. Those war criminals were merely waiting for the establishment of the High Commissioner's Office for Refugees in order to claim its legal protection.

23. The High Commissioner's Office was obviously not intended to assist refugees; it could only be an obstacle to repatriation and give legal sanction to an unacceptable situation. The Ukrainian delegation would therefore oppose the establishment of the High Commissioner's Office and would consequently be unable to support the Economic and Social Council's draft resolution.

24. The refugee problem could be satisfactorily solved only if the nations were determined to apply the provisions of the agreements regarding repatriation. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR supported without reservation the draft resolution of the Byelorussian SSR (A/C.3/L.120), under which the General Assembly was to invite all Member States to conform to the provisions of resolution 8 (I) of 12 February 1946 and request the Governments of Member States, in whose territories there were still refugees and displaced persons, to submit to the Secretary-General full information regarding such refugees and displaced persons.

25. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) said the attacks against her government were not new,

and those who made the attacks apparently considered them less important than in the past. At earlier sessions of the General Assembly Mr. Vyshinsky himself had come to the Committee to deliver the attacks, and she felt sorry for his young colleagues who had to repeat the same old charges.

26. She recalled that it had been decided at the first session of the General Assembly that no one should be repatriated against his will. It was therefore in pursuance of that provision that a certain number of displaced persons had not returned to their country of origin.

27. The Ukrainian SSR representative had referred to conditions in the camps. The United States representative had herself visited the camps in 1946 and 1948 and, while they were makeshift, they were nevertheless not managed in the manner described by the Ukrainian SSR representative.

28. She pointed out that the arguments adduced by the representative of the Ukrainian SSR seemed to be lacking in logic for he accused the United States of America of trying to obtain cheap labour and at the same time of bringing into the country children suffering from a deficiency or sickness. Most of the children whose identity it had been possible to establish had been sent back to their native countries whenever it was certain that a family was ready to take care of them. As for those whose identity it had not been possible to establish—and that unfortunately was something which happened after every war and one of the principal reasons for striving to prevent such calamities—every effort had been made to find them new homes.

29. Most of the sources of information on which the Ukrainian SSR representative had based his charges were American. It seemed that a country whose Press had the right to criticize certain things showed by that fact that it was ready and willing to remedy abuses which unhappily were inevitable, and that, far from wishing to hide anything from the public, it simply tried to interest them in worthy causes.

30. Turning to the definition of the term "refugee", she said that her delegation supported the formula proposed by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 319 B (XI)—a formula different in form from the one used in the draft Constitution of the International Refugee Organization adopted by the General Assembly in 1946, by its resolution 62 (I)—which would enable the action undertaken by the General Assembly four years previously to be completed without placing added responsibilities on the United Nations. When, by its resolution 8 (I), the General Assembly recognized that the refugee problem was "international in scope and nature" it meant that assistance to refugees was too heavy a burden on the countries sheltering refugees which could not bear all the expenditure unaided; it was therefore necessary to appeal to all countries to cooperate in solving the problem. That resolution referred to a special group of refugees, namely the European refugees who had been displaced by the Second World War. The resolution was not in any way discriminatory as regards other parts of the world; it merely laid down that the question of the fate of the European refugees was the most urgent and that efforts should be made to improve their lot immediately.

31. The two amendments submitted regarding the definition of the term "refugee" widened the High Commissioner's powers and placed a heavier responsibility on the General Assembly. They did not specify exactly which refugees they proposed should come under the new definition nor which country should be their country of residence. Before adopting such a vague solution, she thought the difficulties which the United Nations had already experienced in meeting its obligations in connexion with the Palestine refugees should be remembered, and some consideration given to the heavy burden which would be placed on the United Nations by the Korean refugees.
32. She pointed out that the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.3/L.115) did not explain whether the High Commissioner's jurisdiction would extend to German refugees in Germany or to refugees in Pakistan. It should be noted that those two categories of refugees were being protected by the countries in which they resided. The United Kingdom amendment pledged the responsibility of the United Nations in the future and deprived the General Assembly of freedom of action.
33. The definition suggested by the Economic and Social Council did not however prevent the United Nations from later expanding its action on behalf of the refugees if it thought that was necessary.
34. She appealed to the various representatives to finish the drafting of the convention which had been begun a year previously, in order that a definitive text might be approved by the General Assembly before the end of its current session and ratified by governments before the terms of reference of the International Refugee Organization expired in September 1951, since that would give greater weight to the convention.
35. She supported the proposal to set up a sub-committee to facilitate the Committee's task.
36. Mr. ROCHEFORT (France) wished to reply to certain charges made against his country.
37. The French Government had been accused of torturing Spanish refugees. It had been compelled, for internal security reasons, to arrest 180 Spaniards. It had given them the option of residing in a certain part of France or of going to the Soviet Union. Only 30 had opted for the latter solution.
38. As regards other criticisms levelled against France, he thought their effect had been to bring the Committee to the point it had reached a year previously. It had been claimed that the texts of which France was one of the authors were ungenerous, that they were the outcome of selfishness and examples of short-sightedness. It had also been stated that France had changed its attitude and that it was trying to justify itself, and an endeavour had been made to make the French delegation contradict itself.
39. He recalled that the French delegation had not spoken only for itself; it had tried also to represent a part of the opinion held by the Committee. That could easily be verified by reading the summary records of the meetings of the fourth session.
40. The French delegation had played that part with the avowed desire to bring about conciliation. Moreover, many other delegations had urged the French delegation to reconcile its point of view with that of the United States delegation. He referred in that connexion to the statements made at the fourth session by Mrs. Wilson (Canada), Mr. Azkoul (Lebanon), Mr. Beaufort (Netherlands) and Mr. Bokhari (Pakistan). The French delegation had at no time submitted a draft general definition to the Committee.
41. He recalled the various phases of the discussions. First, there was the United States' informal proposal which simply listed the groups coming under the Constitution of the International Refugee Organization and against which a French draft proposal had been submitted and discussed but not put to the vote. According to that proposal the High Commissioner would have to envisage the inclusion in his terms of reference of categories of refugees not dealt with by the International Refugee Organization for financial reasons, as well as persons who might in the future be deprived of the protection of their own countries for political, religious or racial reasons. It was well to recall that various members of the Committee had then tried to harmonize the two texts.
42. It was easy to adopt a generous attitude and accuse those who had done the most work but it was very clear that without them no body would have been set up and consequently there would be no need to improve it. It would be unjust, by a skilful use of general formulas and generous declarations, to bring accusations of selfish motives against the delegations thanks to whose efforts the question had not been buried.
43. France had taken part in the work of conciliation, which for it was absolutely necessary. In such a matter neither statements nor votes were of much avail. What counted in regard to the convention was the drafting of a text which States could sign, a text by which certain countries would agree to admit refugees to their territories even if those refugees were likely to introduce a competitive element into the labour market and increase unemployment.
44. To attribute selfish motives to countries which not only had helped to ease the lot of refugees from Europe, but also had shown a spirit of international solidarity in dealing with other problems such as that of the Arab refugees was to display a serious want of thought. What counted was international solidarity, and not simple formulas. Otherwise accusations of selfishness might be brought against the States which had taken part materially in the work of the International Refugee Organization under the pretext that the terms of reference of that Organization were not broad enough.
45. It was true that that spirit of international solidarity was common to all delegations in so far as principles were concerned. All States were eager to recognize that the General Assembly had responsibilities of a general nature and that no discrimination should be made between refugees. That attitude was in perfect accordance with the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which France had requested should be mentioned in the preamble to the draft convention. It was the question of methods which had given cause to divergencies of opinion. The scope of the task to be entrusted forthwith to the High Commissioner should be defined, in other words the exact share of the responsibilities which the General Assembly intended to delegate to the High Commissioner.

46. As he had stated at the preceding meeting with reference to the convention, it was essential for the High Commissioner to know exactly which refugees would be placed under his protection. There was some doubt whether the definition proposed by the United Kingdom declaration, supported by the Belgian delegation, would include the 8 million refugees from Pakistan and Kashmir, the 6 or 8 million *Volksdeutsche*, whose nationality was not always clearly determined, and the 700,000 Arab refugees.

47. The Belgian representative had proposed that IRO should be asked what, for the High Commissioner, should be considered as cases of distress. It was doubtful whether IRO would be able to make such a calculation, since that category would include the Arabs, many of the refugees from Pakistan and the Germans. Such a calculation would result in astronomical totals.

48. The General Assembly had extended its protection to the Arabs by setting up two bodies, an office to deal with relief questions and a conciliation commission. It now proposed to set up a new organ to deal with repatriation and resettlement. It could therefore be said that the General Assembly had already delegated certain of its powers with regard to the Arab refugees and that it had delegated those powers to organs other than the High Commissioner's Office. If the general definition were adopted, however, could it be said that there seemed to be any reason for believing that the Arab States would offer to share with other countries the funds at their disposal? Otherwise, the so-called general definition should be converted into an exclusion clause. It was possible that the High Commissioner might be empowered to take the decision for himself. That solution would involve considerable political difficulties. It would be difficult for the High Commissioner to make a decision if he found himself between a country which maintained that the persons concerned in any particular case were refugees and another country which maintained that the persons concerned were not refugees. In any case, it would be advisable before embarking on either course to consult the Commission currently entrusted with the problem of Arab refugees.

49. Instead of settling the important problem of the powers which be delegated immediately to the High Commissioner, the definition proposed by the United Kingdom and Belgium in fact obliged the High Commissioner, if he carried out his task conscientiously, to ask the advice of the General Assembly and, if he was imprudent, to take decisions which might subsequently be repudiated. According to the Economic and Social Council proposal, on the other hand, the High Commissioner would have a specific task to perform from the moment that he entered upon his duties. Moreover, that definition of competence would not prevent the General Assembly from receiving a request, at any time and from any one of its Members, to extend the High Commissioner's terms of reference. In that case the Secretary-General would presumably ask the High Commissioner for his technical advice on the problem. By adopting that formula one would arrive at the same result and in exactly the same time.

50. He doubted whether the time had really come to put an end to an international solidarity which had achieved positive results and which had proved its

worth. Although it was true that at one point the Committee had been faced with two different ideas, one of which manifested the optimism of the New World while the other showed the bitterness of the Old World, the French delegation wished to conciliate those two points of view, especially in view of the fact that the formula it had proposed had been adopted in the Committee by a small group of States, that is to say, by 19 votes to 10, with 15 abstentions, and in the absence of 12 members.<sup>1</sup> It had thought it advisable not to place the two different views in opposition to each other.

51. All the delegations were in reality equally concerned and were called upon to work for a common cause; the difference between the two formulas was perhaps only one of drafting and he therefore appealed to delegations which opposed the text submitted by the Council to reconsider their positions.

52. Mr. LEQUESNE (United Kingdom) stated that, in listening to the French representative's recapitulation of past history, he had hoped to be able to understand the reasons why the French Government had withdrawn the support that it had given a year before to the wider definition and why that government had decided to uphold an argument which did not do justice to the magnitude of the problem.

53. The French representative had stated that he had supported the first definition through idealism, but that he now felt obliged to maintain the contrary argument in a spirit of compromise. The United Kingdom representative did not wish to conceal his idealism and, although he recognized the value of some compromise, doubted whether such a compromise could be reached when an ideal was at stake.

54. The United States representative had recalled that the definition proposed by the Council was based on the one adopted by the General Assembly in 1946, when it had had to define the statute of IRO. It had to be noted, however, that the aims to be achieved at that time differed from the existing purposes. The Constitution of IRO had been drafted with a view to giving material assistance to refugees. It had therefore been reasonable to define specifically the obligations which the organization was to undertake. In the existing case, however, the question was not one of carrying out an extensive financial operation, but of defining the term "refugee" in a manner which would reflect the obligations undertaken by the United Nations. It was therefore quite normal that the definition should be broad. The United Kingdom delegation wished to reiterate that it was not essential to adopt the same definition in the High Commissioner's terms of reference and in the convention.

55. It had been alleged that the definition proposed by the United Kingdom was not precise, that it did not name specifically the persons to which it applied and that it enlarged the United Nations responsibilities. He wished to remind the United States delegation that the United Kingdom proposal authorized the High Commissioner to extend his protection to any persons who required such protection and who could not obtain it from any government.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Third Committee, 264th meeting.*

56. In asking whether the United Kingdom definition included certain specific cases, the representative of France had seemed to ignore the fact that the definition took into account all the responsibilities in the matter that had been undertaken by the United Nations. The other definition showed prudence and even timidity, since it tended to avoid any obligations other than those which had already been recognized and accepted.

57. It had been asserted that the United Kingdom definition constituted a blank cheque signed by the United Nations; but since the Charter had given the United Nations a blank cheque in political matters, there was no reason to be more timid on the humanitarian plane, especially in view of the fact that the question was one of legal protection, and not of material assistance, as the French representative seemed to think. Furthermore, the United States representative's argument that the United Kingdom's definition would deprive the General Assembly of its freedom of action was unfounded.

58. In conclusion, he stated that the definition he had proposed would enable the High Commissioner to carry out conscientiously all the responsibilities which the United Nations ought to undertake with regard to the problem of refugees.

59. Mr. ROCHEFORT (France) pointed out that the United Kingdom representative's statement was contradictory in certain respects. It was impossible to assert, on the one hand, that the High Commissioner's terms of reference should be extended as far as possible and that the United Nations should set to work without delay and, on the other hand, that it was essential to wait until the IRO had ceased to exist; that opinion was shared by the delegation of Australia, which seemed to be in favour of a general definition.

60. In connexion with the argument that the High Commissioner would merely have to ensure the legal protection of the refugees, he quoted several paragraphs of the memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/1385), which proved without any doubt that the High Commissioner had a part to play in questions of relief.

61. It was difficult to know what was the real point of view of the United Kingdom representative, who claimed that it was strictly a matter of legal protection. Legal protection would not constitute an adequate or sustaining diet for the refugees. The Belgian representative had stressed the necessity of relieving cases of distress.

62. He recalled that the United Kingdom representative had referred frequently to refugees without any protection: he considered, however, that hardly any enjoyed no protection whatsoever, even if it were only the protection offered by the receiving country. Under the United Kingdom formula, would not the receiving country be able to disguise the kind of protection it gave to the refugees there, in order to exclude them from international protection?

63. Had not the United Kingdom Government stated, in reply to a request from the International Red Cross Refugee Committee, that it alone would be responsible for the refugees whom it sheltered in its territory? That was one of the dangers of an excessively general formula, which would enable any government to make vague and gratuitous statements and would prove to be totally ineffective.

64. He was surprised that the United Kingdom representative did not believe that it would be possible to reach a compromise and, consequently, to improve the text proposed by the Economic and Social Council. He recalled that at the fourth session of the General Assembly the Committee had been inspired by a sincere wish to reach agreement and to overcome all drafting difficulties.

65. It was true that in 1949 other delegations had urged the United States and France to conciliate their points of view: the idealist and realist concepts had seemed to coincide.

66. He believed in the advantages of realist idealism and idealist realism, or a formula which would be idealistic and reasonable at the same time. He suggested that the general nature of the United Kingdom formula might represent a façade for less generous motives than those which had inspired the more bourgeois formula made with a full knowledge of the facts.

67. The CHAIRMAN stated that, in compliance with a wish expressed by the Australian representative, who had asked the Secretariat to give the Committee a report on the plans concerning the staff which was to assist the High Commissioner, Mr. Alexander (Secretariat) would make a statement on the matter.

68. Mr. ALEXANDER (Secretariat) stated that provisional plans had been drafted with regard to the staff to assist the High Commissioner and pointed out that it would be unnecessary to complete the numbers of that staff immediately, since IRO would continue its operations until 1 October 1951.

69. He explained the methods whereby the budgetary estimates concerning that item would be submitted to the General Assembly. When the Third Committee concluded its debates and the statute of the High Commissioner was established, the Secretariat would submit to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions a document on the financial implications of the decisions that had been taken. The Advisory Committee would study the document, and would transmit it, with or without amendments, to the Fifth Committee. The Economic and Social Council had already received, at its eleventh session, in document E/1802, an indication of the staff that would be necessary.

70. The actual numbers of the staff to be employed on a given date would depend upon three factors, the date on which the High Commissioner would commence his duties (1 January 1951 had been mentioned); the date of the expiry of the agreements concluded between IRO and certain Member States; and the date on which, by agreement with IRO, the High Commissioner would assume his functions of protection and after which it might be necessary to increase the staff.

71. Mr. MOODIE (Australia) thanked the Secretariat for its prompt reply to his question.

72. The French representative's remarks led him to believe that he had not expressed himself clearly enough: the fact that Australia favoured a wider definition did not mean that the decision on the High Commissioner's terms of reference could be postponed until the following year. On the contrary, a decision on that question was a matter of urgency.

73. The CHAIRMAN thanked Mr. Alexander and stated that the general debate would be closed soon since there was only one more speaker on the list, namely, the representative of the USSR, who was to take the floor at the beginning of the next meeting.

74. He called upon the Committee to decide on the order in which it would continue its debates on the question of refugees and stateless persons.

75. In view of the general nature of the draft resolution submitted by the Byelorussian SSR (A/C.3/L.120), it might be advisable to consider it after considering the four sub-divisions which, according to the agenda, corresponded to the various aspects of the question.

76. Mr. KOUSSOFF (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) stated that, in view of the fact that his draft proposed a solution of the problem as a whole, the Byelorussian delegation would prefer the Committee to consider it before the sub-divisions of the agenda item. Nevertheless, it was prepared to accept the Chairman's ruling.

77. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that if the Byelorussian draft was adopted, it would exclude all other proposals, since it provided for a totally different solution.

78. He therefore considered that the draft should be put to the vote before the four sub-divisions of the item.

79. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote his proposal that the draft resolution submitted by the Byelorussian SSR should be considered after the four sub-divisions of the question of refugees and stateless persons.

*The proposal was rejected by 5 votes to 1, with 35 abstentions.*

80. With regard to the order in which the four sub-divisions should be considered, the CHAIRMAN pointed out that parts (b) and (d) were related and that it might therefore be advisable to consider part (a) first, then part (b) and part of part (d), then part (c), and finally the remainder of part (d).

81. Mr. LEQUESNE (United Kingdom) thought that it would be advisable to begin with part (b) and adopt the order (b), (a), (d), (c).

82. Mr. PLEIC (Yugoslavia) shared this view. The definition of the term "refugee" was the most important problem. Its solution would facilitate the consideration of the statute of the High Commissioner's Office and even that of the convention.

83. Mr. LESAGE (Canada) agreed with the United Kingdom representative and in support of his view quoted chapter III, section C, of the draft statute (Economic and Social Council resolution 319 A (XI), annex), which referred to the persons to whom the High Commissioner's terms of reference applied.

84. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) pointed out that the representatives of the United Kingdom and of Venezuela had referred to the possibility of including different

definitions in the convention and in the statute of the High Commissioner's Office. She could not see, therefore, why it was necessary to consider part (b) first, but would make no formal objection to following the proposed order.

85. Mr. ROCHEFORT (France) stated that his delegation was prepared to accept the proposed procedure, but that it did not agree that the definition of the term "refugee" should be separated from the convention itself. It was difficult to decide whom the convention should protect until it was known what that convention would include.

86. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United Kingdom proposal that the parts be considered in the following order: (b), (a), (d), (c).

*The proposal was adopted by 30 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.*

87. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to fix the time limit for the submission of amendments to part (b).

88. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) stated that his delegation, together with ten or fifteen others, was in the process of drafting an amendment which had not yet been completed but would probably be ready on the following Tuesday.

89. In reply to Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America), who wished to know what subject the Committee would deal with at its meetings on Monday, the CHAIRMAN proposed that the time limit for submission of amendments should be fixed for 3 p.m. Monday, 27 November.

90. At the request of Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America), Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said he would make every effort to have the amendments ready by 2 p.m. on Monday, in order that the Committee could peruse them before the debate.

91. In reply to the CHAIRMAN's request that the Committee should also fix a time limit for amendments to part (a), Mr. LEQUESNE (United Kingdom) suggested that that date should be the same as for the amendments relating to part (b).

92. Mr. ROCHEFORT (France) thought that it was somewhat premature to take a decision on the matter. The Committee should not establish the order of its debates on other items until it knew the results of the discussion of the first item. According to whether the definition by categories or the general definition was adopted, certain delegations would be faced with a new situation and would have to ask for new instructions, if they were aware of their responsibilities. They would not, therefore, have time to submit amendments by the following Monday.

93. The CHAIRMAN decided to postpone the question until a subsequent meeting.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.