

tection of refugees. Paragraph two proposed the election of the High Commissioner by the General Assembly instead of by ECOSOC.

(3) Australian amendment (A/C.3/L.31). We voted in favour of the first paragraph of this amendment which enables the High Commissioner to discharge the functions defined in the resolution plus any such other functions as the General Assembly may confer upon him. This amendment ensured a desirable flexibility to the terms of reference of the High Commissioner's Office. We abstained on the second paragraph of the Australian amendment, on the ground that it was repetitious, which would have specifically stated that the High Commissioner could engage in repatriation and resettlement activities, as the General Assembly may determine.

(4) United Kingdom amendment to the French-United States resolution (A/C.3/L.32). The original text of the resolution provided that the High Commissioner should receive policy directions from the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, and that he should report to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council. The United Kingdom amendment left it to the General Assembly to define the relationship between the High Commissioner, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. We voted in favour of this amendment because, through the working out of a suitable formula, these amendments make it possible to counter-balance the freedom of action resulting from the election of the High Commissioner by the General Assembly. These amendments were adopted.

(5) Israeli amendment to the French-United States resolution (A/C.3/L.33). We voted in favour of paragraph one of this amendment and abstained on paragraph two. Paragraph one was an improvement in the wording of the resolution, and paragraph two was repetitious.

(6) Draft resolution submitted by France and the United States (A/C.3/L.29). We voted in favour of the United States alternative concerning the definition of refugees, as it was more restrictive. The United States alternative, however, was defeated by a small majority. We voted in favour of the French alternative proposal regarding material assistance. The French text enables the High Commissioner to administer assistance funds which he may receive from public and private sources. The French proposal was approved by a majority of 3 with 16 abstentions. Canada voted in favour of the French alternative proposal regarding the method of appointment of the High Commissioner, which was adopted by 19 yes, 10 no and 15 abstentions. The amended text of the resolution was adopted as a whole by 24 in favour, 12 against (including the United States) and 10 abstentions.

(7) French draft resolution (A/C.3/L.27). This resolution called for all states to furnish assistance to IRO particularly with regard to the admission and care of refugees. It also postponed the consideration of the problem of assistance to the Fifth Session of the General Assembly. We voted in favour of this academic resolution which was approved by 18 yes, 8 no and 18 abstentions.

16. It is to be noted that the United States Delegation finally voted against the amended draft resolution they had sponsored with the French. I should think that Mr. Warren, the principal adviser of the United States Delegation on this matter, is