

To deal with the situation outlined above, the Director-General makes the following recommendations:

1. Applications for registration to be refused after December 31, 1949;
2. Care and maintenance to be discontinued after June 30, 1950;
3. Resettlement and repatriation program to be continued for one year (to June 30, 1951);
4. Legal and protection program to be continued (this is dealt with more fully in Sections 3 and 4).

If this proposal is adopted, the Director-General expects to repatriate or resettle a further 195,000 refugees, leaving a "hard core" of about 175,000 (for further suggestions regarding this see sections 3 and 4). The estimated cost of this extension of the program would be about \$55,000,000. The Canadian share, calculated on the same basis as at present, would be just under two million dollars.

### III. *Continuing Refugee Problems after June 30, 1951*

Continuing refugee problems fall into two groups, those connected with the work done by I.R.O., and those which have been dealt with by one kind of international machinery or another since the First Great War.

The first group concerns responsibility for the "hard core" of 175,000 refugees expected to be left by June 30, 1951 and also legal protection and assistance in readjustment for those refugees for whom I.R.O. has at any time assumed responsibility. It shades into the second group, which centers in the problem of statelessness, however and whenever acquired. This problem has been under consideration by the Secretary-General of the United Nations who has suggested, for examination by the Ninth Session of the Economic and Social Council, four possible ways of dealing with it. Whichever of the suggested methods for dealing with statelessness may be chosen, it would apply equally well to the residual problems of I.R.O.

### IV. *Choice of Methods for dealing with continuing Refugee Problems*

Two of the methods suggested by the Secretary-General, that is the creation either of a unit within the Secretariat or of a semi-autonomous part of that body charged with the responsibility for refugee problems, would mean that the cost would be borne by the U.N. budget and this shared by all members of the organization. The other two suggestions—continuation of I.R.O. in a modified form, or the creation of a new specialized agency—would probably concentrate financial responsibility in a smaller group. In particular a continuation of I.R.O. would mulct still further the countries which have already made a heavy financial outlay.

The arguments used in favour of continuing I.R.O.—use of the experience and administrative machinery already in existence—are not impressive, since there is no obvious difficulty in absorbing into the Secretariat as much as may be needed.

On the other hand, there might be something to be said for retaining the "voluntary principle" wherever possible, as an antidote to the tendency to saddle the U.N. budget with numerous projects enthusiastically supported by those members whose voting power considerably outweighs their financial generosity. This argument does not, however, apply with full force to a problem so truly international in its implications as that of statelessness.