

## **Reuniting Families and Meeting the Needs of Refugees**

**By: Colin White**

During the UNHCR committee meeting at MUNSA XXIV, many ideas were discussed pertaining to different methods of refugee family reunification and giving services to the refugees who would otherwise have no access to those services.

The meeting started with the delegation of Vietnam presenting their solution, which was an NGO (Non-Government Organization). The delegation had pushed for this solution because the solution does not support corruption, would be funded by the UNHCR and could be run by the respective countries. However, the delegation of Australia questioned the viability of multiple NGOs, especially those which dwell in communist countries and in countries run by dictatorships. In response to this solution, the delegation of Saudi Arabia said: "Only certain countries should oversee the NGO. Those specific countries should have experience handling large influxes of refugees so that the process goes as smoothly as possible." The delegation of Uzbekistan agreed with the proposition of a single NGO and suggested that refugees be given legal aid so that they can support themselves and be able to enter countries safely and legally.

However, some delegates were not so quick to support that proposal. For example, the delegation of Sweden argued that the process of making a single NGO is dangerous because it universalizes the refugee crisis. In response to this, the delegation of Vietnam answered that there should be multiple NGOs, which are facilitated by the country it is in. The delegation of Australia warned against trusting an NGO saying that they could become corrupt over time. The delegation of the United Kingdom responded by saying that the NGO should be overseen by the UNHCR and argued that the UNHCR could make sure that the NGO stayed with its original mission.

The discussion turned back into the legal help refugees should receive. Some countries wanted to work towards a reformation of laws regarding immigration. However, the delegates of Sweden and Israel argued that state sovereignty must be preserved, and changing many of these laws would go against state sovereignty. The delegation of Uzbekistan offered their solution, which was hiring law students to support refugees in court. However, the delegation of Belgium argued that law students are untested and could easily lose a very important case. The delegation of Uzbekistan elaborated saying that those law students would have passed the bar exam, and would be certified lawyers. The delegate of Lebanon argued that international cases are the hardest cases to perform and the refugees should not be represented by an inexperienced lawyer. Uzbekistan suggested that a bar test be made for lawyers who desire to represent refugees in court, while also encouraging non-active and retired lawyers to represent refugees.

There were many different ideas shared in the UNHCR room. However, one ideal that all the delegates had in common was that it is necessary to take certain actions in order to find a solution that betters the world.

