

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
 ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 324th  
 MEETING**

(Closing meeting)

Tuesday, 19 December 1961,  
 at 3.10 p.m.



**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 25:</i>	
<i>Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (concluded) . . . . .</i>	343
<i>Completion of the Committee's work. . . . .</i>	348

*Chairman:* Mr. Yordan TCHOBANOV (Bulgaria).

AGENDA ITEM 25

Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (A/4861; A/SPC/L.79 and Corr.1 and 2 and Rev.1, L.80/Rev.1 and Corr.1, L.81 and Corr.1) (concluded)

1. Mr. HAILEMARIAM (Ethiopia) paid a tribute to UNRWA and its Director for the work they were doing on behalf of the Palestine Arab refugees.
2. Whatever might be the reasons given for the exodus of the Arab refugees from Palestine, there could be no doubt that the establishment of the State of Israel was at the root of the question. Being partly responsible for the fate of those unfortunate people, to whom it refused repatriation, Israel should contribute to a just and humane solution of the refugee problem. In all objectivity, he felt that the question of the Arab refugees should be separated from the question of Palestine, so as to avoid sterile controversy.
3. He would abstain from voting on draft resolution A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1, not because he disapproved of the principles stated in that text, but because he regretted that it failed to recall several pertinent General Assembly resolutions and to mention specifically paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III). Furthermore, he thought that it would not be possible to impose negotiations against the will of one of the parties.
4. The United States draft resolution (A/SPC/L.79/Rev.1) approached the question more realistically. Its deficiencies were remedied by amendment A/SPC/L.81 and Corr.1. When a conciliation commission did not enjoy the confidence of all the parties, it should be reconstituted. In the paragraph 4 proposed in that amendment, the word "appropriate" could be inserted before the word "measures". His delegation would vote in favour of the amendment.
5. Mr. PERERA (Ceylon) recalled that Glubb Pasha had described Palestine as a "twice-promised land". That offered an explanation of the conflict which had arisen there. Nevertheless, it might well be asked why Arabs and Jews could not continue to live side by side in harmony, as they had done centuries ago. The Director of UNRWA, in paragraphs 9 and 11 of his report (A/4861), stressed the importance of the politi-

cal, economic and social factors involved; it was in those factors that the United Nations should seek not only the cause but also the solution of the refugee problem.

6. Turning to draft resolution A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1, he observed that negotiation was a means for the peaceful settlement of disputes between States, whereas the case under discussion concerned primarily the fate of a group of refugees. For that reason the draft resolution was not, he felt, pertinent. In the interests of the refugees themselves, the problem should be regarded as one which the United Nations alone could solve.

7. His delegation approved in principle the United States draft resolution (A/SPC/L.79/Rev.1), which reaffirmed principles already recognized by the General Assembly. That draft recalled all the resolutions adopted by the Assembly on the question of the Palestine Arab refugees; it did not, however, stress those which were particularly important in the light of the direction taken by the debate at the current session, namely, resolutions 394 (V), 1456 (XIV) and 1604 (XV). Amendment A/SPC/L.81 and Corr.1 improved the text in that respect, for the wording of the paragraph 4 proposed in the amendment was almost exactly the same as that of paragraph 2 (c) of resolution 394 (V).

8. Mr. ADUSEI-POKU (Ghana) regretted that the resolutions adopted in the past by the United Nations on the question of the Palestine Arab refugees had so far remained a dead letter. He fully appreciated the desire of the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1 to create an atmosphere propitious for negotiation between the parties. But the General Assembly and the Security Council had already addressed similar appeals to the parties and had indicated the way to a solution. The text of that draft appeared to bring the question back to the starting-point, without taking into account the decisions adopted in the meantime. Yet some of them were of particular importance, such as the decisions establishing the terms of reference of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, instructing the Commission to make such arrangements as it might consider necessary for the assessment and payment of compensation, and requesting it to work in close co-operation with UNRWA and other United Nations bodies.

9. The United States draft resolution (A/SPC/L.79/Rev.1), which was based on paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III), was more realistic. The parties could hardly be asked, however, to co-operate with the Commission when the latter did not enjoy the confidence of all concerned. The Conciliation Commission should therefore be reconstituted in such a way as to meet the wishes both of the Arab countries and of Israel. He would vote in favour of the United States draft resolution and the amendment to it (A/SPC/L.81 and Corr.1) proposed by Afghanistan, Indonesia and Pakistan.

10. Mr. ALGARD (Norway) congratulated the Director of UNRWA on the efforts which he had made to alleviate the situation of the Palestine Arab refugees.

11. He would vote in favour of the United States draft resolution (A/SPC/L.79/Rev.1), which dealt exclusively with the question under discussion and was in line with the views of his delegation. He would vote against the amendment to that draft (A/SPC/L.81 and Corr.1), since he did not consider that the Conciliation Commission had failed in its task. He had not been convinced by the arguments invoked in favour of reconstituting the Commission, and was of the opinion that the measures proposed in the amendment's paragraph 4 would infringe the sovereignty of the State of Israel.

12. He would abstain from voting on draft resolution A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1, for he thought that a pragmatic approach was in the circumstances preferable.

13. Finally, he expressed regret that consideration of a question so important as that of the Palestine refugees should frequently have given rise to violent polemics, even to the extent of a parallel being drawn between Nazism and the Jewish people—a people which had unquestionably been the principal victim of the Nazi atrocities.

14. Mr. USHER (Ivory Coast) noted that in all the reports concerning the question of the Palestine Arab refugees the view had been expressed that the establishment of peaceful relations between the parties would facilitate a solution of the refugee problem. The sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1 found it difficult to understand why certain members of the Committee should consider that that draft, which simply called for application of the principles of the Charter, was likely to have harmful effects. Some had observed that it was not known with whom negotiations could be conducted, since the territory of the State of Israel had not been defined and its population had increased. But States were not defined in accordance with their populations, and demographic changes in no way affected their identity. After a debate as exhaustive as that which had just taken place, every representative was in possession of full information concerning the problem and should be in a position to take an objective stand. Unfortunately, when a conclusion had to be reached the question of alliances came into play and positions dictated by subjective considerations were taken up.

15. The United States draft resolution (A/SPC/L.79/Rev.1) was identical with the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in the past. It would be no more effective than they had been, for it proposed only "holding" measures and did not go to the heart of the problem. In his view, it would be impossible to impose any sort of measure on parties which were in a state of war.

16. He would vote in favour of amendment A/SPC/L.81 and Corr.1, since he thought that a conciliation commission which lacked the confidence of all the parties should be reconstituted.

17. Mr. ATALLAH (Jordan) drew attention to paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of chapter III of the Conciliation Commission's general progress report covering the period from 11 December 1949 to 23 October 1950, <sup>1/</sup> in which the Commission recognized the validity of the Arab contention that the refugee question should be

given absolute priority over and above all other questions pending between the Arab States and the State of Israel—which meant that the solution of that question was not linked to the opening of negotiations—and accepted the Arab countries' interpretation of paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III). If the Commission had procrastinated, on the pretext that it was difficult to give practical effect to that paragraph, it had been for the purpose of serving the cause of Israel. That was why his delegation criticized the Commission.

18. Mr. LAPIAN (Indonesia) made a further appeal on behalf of amendment A/SPC/L.81 and Corr.1, which would remedy an omission in the United States draft resolution. The addition of the proposed operative paragraph 3 was justified by the fact that the Conciliation Commission had so far failed in its task, that it was no longer representative of the United Nations Organization and that, in order to ensure the implementation of paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III), the Commission must be capable of functioning effectively. With regard to the proposed paragraph 4, the rights of the Palestine Arab refugees had been recognized by earlier General Assembly resolutions, and since the refugees were not in a position to uphold their rights themselves the United Nations must take the necessary steps, as provided in operative paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 394 (V). The United States draft resolution referred to that resolution, but only in very general terms, without stressing those of its provisions which were particularly relevant.

19. Draft resolution A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1 was inspired by laudable motives, but since it was unacceptable to the Arab States it could clearly not achieve its object. What was more, the resolution omitted to mention most of the earlier resolutions of the General Assembly. In the interests of unity, he appealed to the sponsors to withdraw their proposal.

20. Mr. MILLET (France) said that, in the general debate at the 316th meeting, he had indicated the considerations which would guide his delegation in casting its vote on the two draft resolutions before the Committee. Amendment A/SPC/L.81 and Corr.1 had been submitted as the result of criticisms directed against the Conciliation Commission and objections raised regarding the composition of that body, of which France was a member. He would point out in that connexion that the question of the activities and composition of the Conciliation Commission was not before the Committee. He wished to make it clear, however, that France had not asked to be a member of that body, it had simply accepted the General Assembly's request that it should serve in that capacity and had done so with no ulterior motive, but solely in a desire to serve the cause of the refugees and that of peace. If some delegations felt that it was the fault of the Commission that no final solution to the Arab refugee problem had been found, they should not confine themselves to making accusations of a general nature. The time was not appropriate for making insinuations regarding intentions. Specific arguments and facts should be brought forward in a separate debate devoted to the question of the Conciliation Commission. During the present debate, no concrete evidence had been given to indicate that France had not discharged with complete objectivity the task which it had assumed in respect of the Palestine refugees. It was easy to blame the Conciliation Commission when the parties were unable to agree. Finally, as the Iraqi representative had said, a conciliation commission could not dictate the course

<sup>1/</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Supplement No. 18.

to be followed; it could only try to bring the parties closer together. For those reasons and for the reasons of principle which the French delegation had given during the general debate, it would vote against the amendment.

21. Mr. HASAN (Pakistan) considered that Israel, like, for example, the Republic of South Africa, should be denied the right to enact unjust laws. Such laws could not extinguish the rights of the Palestine Arab refugees. Like all States Members of the United Nations, Israel must accept its obligations under the Charter. In any case, Israel had not been admitted to the United Nations unconditionally. In the fifth preambular paragraph of General Assembly resolution 273 (III), by which Israel had been admitted to membership in the United Nations, the Assembly had taken note of the declarations and explanations made by the representative of Israel before the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee regarding the implementation of resolutions 181 (II) of 29 November 1947 and 194 (III) of 11 December 1948.<sup>2/</sup> That provision in the preamble defined the status of the State of Israel.

*Mr. Sanz Briz (Spain), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

22. Mr. AKAKPO (Togo) said that the objective of the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1 had been to create an atmosphere of understanding conducive to the restoration of peace. However, for that end to be achieved it would have been necessary for both the Arab States and Israel to consider that draft resolution as a possible basis for negotiations. The discussions had shown that the aim of reconciliation pursued by the sponsors of the resolution was in danger of being jeopardized. Togo therefore wished to withdraw its name from the list of sponsors and would abstain from voting on that draft resolution.

23. Mr. FERREIRA ALDUNATE (Uruguay) said that all Member States must give close attention to the Palestine question, firstly, because it represented a danger to peace, secondly, for humanitarian reasons and, thirdly, because the United Nations had a share of responsibility for it, since resolution 181 (II) providing for the partition of Palestine had brought the problem into existence. Uruguay, together with other delegations, had been led to submit draft resolution A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1 and Corr.1 because the heat of the debate was in danger of overshadowing the plight of more than one million refugees, whose conditions of life were a challenge to the world conscience. The restoration of peace was doubtless necessary for a solution of the problem, but at the same time there could be no peace in the Middle East until the refugee problem was resolved.

24. Draft resolution A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1 and Corr.1 had been criticized for not referring to past United Nations resolutions and for thus appearing to question previous decisions. In actual fact, however, far from disregarding earlier resolutions, the draft resolution was designed to bring about their implementation through negotiations, or indeed by any other peaceful means which would be made possible as a result of negotiations.

25. The Uruguayan delegation would also vote for draft resolution A/SPC/L.79/Rev.1 which was inspired by principles already adopted and which restated the

fact that the rights of the refugees had been established by paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III).

26. On the other hand, his delegation would be unable to vote for the amendment in document A/SPC/L.81 and Corr.1. The proposed operative paragraph 3 was likely to create new difficulties rather than resolve old ones, while operative paragraph 4 seemed to be prejudicial to the sovereignty of a Member State.

27. He urged all delegations to facilitate a solution to the problem by carrying all the United Nations resolutions into effect.

*Mr. Tchobanov (Bulgaria) resumed the Chair.*

28. Mr. CHATTI (Tunisia), speaking on behalf of all the delegations of Arab States, said that those delegations considered the United States draft resolution to be ineffectual because it did not propose any solution, and that they would abstain from voting on that proposal.

29. The Arab delegations considered that the amendment submitted by Afghanistan, Indonesia and Pakistan (A/SPC/L.81 and Corr.1) would make a partial, but real, improvement in the United States resolution. The enlargement of the Conciliation Commission proposed in that amendment would enable the Commission to reflect more faithfully the character of the General Assembly as it now was, and the proposed operative paragraph 4 was in keeping with the provisions of paragraph 3 of resolution 194 (III). The Arab delegations would therefore vote for that amendment and, if it was adopted, for draft resolution A/SPC/L.79/Rev.1 as amended.

30. Where draft resolution A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1 and Corr.1 was concerned, no one doubted the purity of the intentions of its sponsors; they had wished to facilitate a solution to the sad problem of the refugees. But it was regrettable that the Arab delegations should not have been given advance notice of that draft resolution, which envisaged negotiations between parties which were in a state of war—for an armistice was not peace—and which had never had diplomatic relations. Furthermore, while any delegation was free to support whatever position he chose when the Assembly was called upon to decide between two opposing positions, it was morally impermissible, when the question was one of reconciliation, to present the unmodified position of one of the parties as a basis for a compromise. That draft resolution unreservedly supported Israel's position by subordinating any solution of the refugee problem to peace with the Arab States, without taking into account the Arab view that the problem of the Palestine refugees was independent of that of peace. The adoption of the resolution in question would be a victory for Mr. Ben-Gurion, and that was not, he felt sure, the intention of the sponsors.

31. The opposition of the Arab States to Israel was not, as had been insinuated, a manifestation of anti-Semitism. The Arabs were opposed only to Zionism and entertained no hostility whatever towards the Jews, who, in Tunisia and Morocco, for example, often held high official positions. But whereas a Jew was loyal to his country, a Zionist was solely concerned to repudiate his.

32. If the Zionists had been as tolerant as the Arabs in religious and racial matters, Israel would not have come into existence and consequently there would have been no refugee problem. The Arabs had never disputed the right of the Jews to live in Palestine, and a

<sup>2/</sup> *Ibid.*, Third Session, second part, *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, 45th meeting.

Jewish national home could have existed within a free and independent Palestinian State of many religions: Lebanon afforded an excellent example of such a State. The Zionists, however, wanted a specifically Jewish State and they also dreamt of building an empire of Israel from the Nile to the Euphrates, an ambition about which Zionist propaganda now kept silent but of which it had once made no secret. Moreover, Israel's deeds constantly contradicted its words. While it claimed to stand for democracy and freedom, it oppressed the Arabs who had remained in Israel, both as a matter of racial discrimination and in order to discourage the refugees from choosing repatriation. In the circumstances, the legal arguments which Israel continually invoked, and which had already been refuted, were very incongruous coming from a country which constantly defied legality and law. It derogated from the sacred character of legality to use it to justify ill-gotten gains, whether they were the territories occupied by Israel in violation of the decision on partition or the property confiscated from Arabs expelled from their country. The sovereignty with which Israel tried to justify such actions was really only the law of the strongest: if that law were applied throughout the world, it would create millions of other refugees and would lead directly to a new world war.

33. Of course Israel sought to justify its annexations by alleging that the Arab States had never accepted General Assembly resolution 181 (II) on partition. If, however, a State which did not recognize a decision of the United Nations lost its rights, the very existence of Israel should be challenged, for Israel had never recognized the decisions of the United Nations except the one to which it owed its existence.

34. It would therefore be better for Israel's supporters to stop using legal arguments, to be logical with themselves and to admit that the problem was far more political than legal.

35. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1 and Corr.1, he recalled that a draft resolution (A/SPC/L.77 and Rev.1) on similar lines had been submitted by the delegations of Cyprus, India and Indonesia in the debate on the question of Bolzano. Since Italy, one of the two parties, had not agreed to the initiative of those two Powers, they had withdrawn their draft resolution, which had remained a dead letter. Draft resolution A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1 and Corr.1 would also be unworkable, for it was impossible for the Arab States to accept it and to carry out its provisions.

36. The reasons for that were as follows: (a) the item on the agenda concerned the refugees, not peace between the Arab States and Israel; (b) the refugee question was a problem between Israel and the refugees themselves, to whom the United Nations, at the time of partition, had given guarantees which must now be put into effect; (c) Israel refused any settlement of the problem, using the presence of the refugees to put pressure on the Arabs and to make them accept its conditions for peace; (d) those conditions were based on recognition of Israel as a State within its present frontiers and on the denial of the Palestine refugees' right to repatriation—conditions which were unacceptable to the Arabs, and (e) the draft resolution made the refugee question dependent on that of negotiations between Israel and the Arabs and made no reference to the past decisions of the United Nations.

37. The Arab States could not even try to improve the draft resolution by means of amendments, because it was unacceptable in both substance and form. He ap-

pealed to the sponsors simply to withdraw it. If that appeal was not heeded, the Committee would have to consider the complications which the adoption of the draft resolution might entail. Even in that case, however, the Arabs of Africa would not forget their solidarity with their brothers in the African continent, who had united to build the Africa of the future, or the interests which they shared with the Arabs of the East and with all the countries which formed the uncommitted section of the world in fighting colonialism and neo-colonialism, bringing about the destruction of "apartheid", struggling against under-development and building a society in which peace, social justice, prosperity and freedom would prevail.

38. Mr. DIMECHKIE (Lebanon), replying to the representative of Norway, said that when the Arab States had compared Zionism to Nazism, they had not meant to suggest that there was an association between the two political movements, but simply to point out the similarity between them. In any case, he did not wish to attribute Zionist opinions to the majority of Jews, among whom he had many friends.

39. Mr. COMAY (Israel), exercising his right of reply, said that he wished first to refute the strange argument whereby Pakistan had tried to prove that, while Israel's sovereignty was unreservedly confirmed in the operative part of resolution 273 (III), it was limited by the preamble. The preamble recalled two previous General Assembly resolutions and mentioned the declarations made by the representative of Israel in respect of the implementation of the said resolutions. Neither of those parts could in itself constitute a limitation of sovereignty, since the declarations concerned had not in any way provided ground for any infringement of Israel's sovereignty. The only obligations which the resolution imposed on the State of Israel were those of the Charter, which were common to all Member States. Israel had no need to defend its sovereignty, which was an obvious fact. It was for those who attacked that sovereignty to prove their case, if they could.

40. The representative of Pakistan had referred also to international law. He himself would like to hear of a single case in which an international trustee had been appointed under international law; he pointed out that the Iraqi Government, following the usual practice, had appointed an Iraqi trustee for the goods of Jews who had emigrated.

41. The representative of Tunisia had said that the Arab States were at war with Israel. In that case, Israel was forced to take that fact into account when it considered the requests of the Arab States, including their requests for compulsory repatriation. It lay with the Arabs to decide whether they wished to achieve their ends by war or by peaceful means. The United Nations, however, had no such choice, since it did not recognize war as a means of action. That was yet another point in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1 and Corr.1.

42. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq), answering the representative of Israel, said that the Jews had not been expelled from Iraq but had been offered a free choice. The property of those who had left had been handed over to a trustee and had not been expropriated or used for the benefit of the national economy, as had been the case in Palestine.

43. The Arab States did not and could not ask for the compulsory repatriation of the refugees. The refugee

problem was not a dispute between the Arab States and Israel, which would be a matter for negotiation between them. The Arab States were not entitled to negotiate on the refugees' rights. All they could and did ask was that the refugees should have a free choice.

44. Mr. CHATTI (Tunisia), replying to the representative of Israel, pointed out that he had not said that the Arab States were at war with Israel, but that a state of war still existed. That was true, because only an armistice had been signed.

45. Mr. KAPONGO (Congo, Leopoldville) drew attention to the human aspect of the problem of the refugees and deplored the fact that the whole debate had produced nothing new which might improve their lot. The best thing to do would be to call upon the Conciliation Commission to arrange for the two parties to be brought together for an exchange of views on the refugee question. From that point of view, draft resolution A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1 and Corr.1 was complementary to draft resolution A/SPC/L.79/Rev.1, not opposed to it. The amendment in document A/SPC/L.81 and Corr.1 seemed unnecessary, since the ideas they embodied were already implicit in draft resolution A/SPC/L.79/Rev.1.

46. Mr. BLAKE (United States of America) said that, owing to certain legal objections to the change in Mr. Davis' title, his delegation had withdrawn the revised text of its draft resolution in favour of the original text (A/SPC/L.79 and Corr.1 and 2).

47. The CHAIRMAN announced that, under the rules of procedure, draft resolutions A/SPC/L.79 and Corr.1 and 2 and A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1 and Corr.1 would be voted on in the order in which they had been submitted, the amendment A/SPC/L.81 and Corr.1 to the United States draft resolution being voted on first.

48. Mr. DANKARO (Nigeria) asked for the new paragraphs 3 and 4 proposed in the amendment A/SPC/L.81 and Corr.1 to be put to the vote one by one.

*A vote was taken by roll-call on the proposed new paragraph 3 in the amendment A/SPC/L.81 and Corr.1.*

*Spain, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Spain, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Gabon, Ceylon, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia.

*Against:* Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay.

*Abstaining:* Thailand, Togo, Uruguay, Venezuela, Bolivia, Burma, Canada, Chad, Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iran, Italy, Liberia, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand, Peru, Philippines, Sierra Leone.

*The new paragraph 3 was adopted by 47 votes to 27, with 24 abstentions.*

*A vote was taken by roll-call on the proposed new paragraph 4 in the amendment A/SPC/L.81 and Corr.1.*

*Tunisia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroun, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syria.

*Against:* Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Sweden.

*Abstaining:* Venezuela, Bolivia, Burma, Chad, China, Cyprus, Ecuador, El Salvador, Greece, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Thailand, Togo.

*The proposed new paragraph 4 in the amendment was adopted by 42 votes to 36, with 20 abstentions.*

49. Mr. LOKMAN (Mauritania) asked for a separate vote on the words "non-contributing Governments to contribute, and" in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.79 and Corr.1 and 2.

*The words "non-contributing Governments to contribute, and" were adopted by 49 votes to 1, with 44 abstentions.*

*A vote was taken on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.79 and Corr.1 and 2.*

*Operative paragraph 2 as a whole was adopted by 68 votes to none, with 29 abstentions.*

*A vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution A/SPC/L.79 and Corr.1 and 2 as a whole, as amended.*

*Cambodia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Cambodia, Cameroun, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

*Against:* Israel.

*Abstaining:* Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Thailand, Togo, Venezuela, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma.

*The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was approved by 74 votes to 1, with 23 abstentions.*

*A vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1 and Corr.1 was taken by roll-call.*

*Mauritania, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Paraguay, Sierra Leone, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Cameroun, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar.

*Against:* Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mali.

*Abstaining:* Mexico, Nepal, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Burma, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Ethiopia, France, Greece, Ireland.

*The draft resolution was rejected by 44 votes to 34, with 20 abstentions.*

50. Mr. CROWE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had voted in favour of United States draft resolution A/SPC/L.79 and Corr.1 and 2 because it felt that the draft resolution made a constructive contribution towards a solution of the problem. It did not vote in favour of the other proposals, which did not seem to it to be calculated to serve that end.

51. Mr. BLAKE (United States of America) said that as the amendment in document A/SPC/L.81 and Corr.1 had received less than the two-thirds majority necessary for adoption by the Assembly, they would probably not be maintained at the plenary meeting. It was that assumption which had prompted his delegation to vote in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.79 and Corr.1 and 2 in its amended form.

52. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1 and Corr.1, his delegation, while associating itself with the lofty principles underlying the text, considered that the practical steps it advocated would not contribute to the success of Mr. Johnson's mission. It had therefore been unable to support the draft resolution.

53. Mr. USHER (Ivory Coast) thanked the Tunisian delegation for having helped to relax the atmosphere of the discussion by bringing greater understanding into it. The result of the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1 and Corr.1, which his delegation had

co-sponsored, showed that the Committee was almost equally divided on the question. He hoped that the lapse of time before the next session would be used to find a solution which would go to the very root of the problem. For the first time, the problem had been placed in its true light and a courageous effort should be made to find an adequate solution. The United States draft resolution (A/SPC/L.79 and Corr.1 and 2), which his delegation had supported, offered a solution of detail, the application of which would have been facilitated by the adoption of the comprehensive solution advocated in draft resolution A/SPC/L.80/Rev.1 and Corr.1.

54. Mr. CHATTI (Tunisia) thanked the Ivory Coast representative for his statement. Tunisia, which had shown its attachment to the cause of African unity, fully appreciated that statement, which proved that although at the moment differences of opinion had divided the Arab countries from some of the African countries, that would not prevent those countries from cooperating in the future in the construction of an Africa in which all countries would work together in peace and freedom.

55. Mr. LOKMAN (Mauritania) said that he had requested a separate vote on the words "non-contributing Governments to contribute, and" because he considered that all the contributions made by Governments went indirectly to the State of Israel. It was permissible for Governments which were helping the Agency financially to continue to do so, but he had wished to draw the attention of non-contributing Governments to the effect of any change in their attitude.

56. Mr. DAVIS (Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East) wished to express his gratitude to all delegations for the attention they had devoted to the problem of the refugees and to thank them for their kind remarks on the Agency's work.

#### Completion of the Committee's work

57. Mr. NAYERI (Iran) congratulated and thanked the Chairman and officers of the Committee. He also thanked the Secretariat.

58. Mr. PERERA (Ceylon), speaking on behalf of his country, Afghanistan, Burma, India, Indonesia and Nepal, Mr. ALBERTSSON (Iceland), speaking on behalf of his own country and Denmark, Finland, Italy, Norway and Sweden, Mr. MILLET (France), Mr. DANKARO (Nigeria), speaking on behalf of his own country and the Federation of Malaya, Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq), speaking on behalf of the Arab countries, Mr. PACLIK (Czechoslovakia), on behalf of the Socialist countries, Mr. COLLET (Guinea), speaking on behalf of his own country and Ghana, Mali and Yugoslavia, Mr. GOMEZ ROBLEDO (Mexico), on behalf of the Latin American countries, Mr. USHER (Ivory Coast), speaking on behalf of the countries of the Brazzaville group, Mr. COMAY (Israel), Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America), Mr. HASAN (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of his own country, Somalia and Turkey, Mr. COOPER (Liberia) and Mr. CROWE (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of his own country and Canada, New Zealand and Australia, associated themselves with the thanks expressed by the representative of Iran.

59. The CHAIRMAN, speaking for himself and the officers of the Committee, thanked the members of the Committee for their kind words.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.

# WHERE TO BUY UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

## AFRICA

**CAMEROON:** LIBRAIRIE DU PEUPLE AFRICAINE  
La Gérante, B.P. 1197, Yaoundé.

**ETHIOPIA:** INTERNATIONAL PRESS AGENCY  
P. O. Box 120, Addis Ababa.

**GHANA:** UNIVERSITY BOOKSHOP  
University College of Ghana, Legon, Accra.

**MOROCCO:** CENTRE DE DIFFUSION DOCUMENTAIRE DU B.E.P.I., 8, rue Michaux-Bellaire, Rabat.

**SOUTH AFRICA:** VAN SCHAIK'S BOOKSTORE (PTY) LTD.  
Church Street, Box 724, Pretoria.

**UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC:** LIBRAIRIE "LA RENAISSANCE D'EGYPTE"  
9 Sh. Adly Pasha, Cairo.

## ASIA

**BURMA:** CURATOR, GOVT. BOOK DEPOT  
Rangoon.

**CAMBODIA:** ENTREPRISE KHMÈRE DE LIBRAIRIE  
Imprimerie & Papeterie Sarl, Phnom-Penh.

**CEYLON:** LAKE HOUSE BOOKSHOP  
Assoc. Newspapers of Ceylon, P. O. Box 244,  
Colombo.

**CHINA:**  
THE WORLD BOOK COMPANY, LTD.  
99 Chung King Road, 1st Section, Taipeh,  
Taiwan.

THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, LTD.  
211 Honan Road, Shanghai.

**HONG KONG:** THE SWINDON BOOK COMPANY  
25 Nathan Road, Kowloon.

**INDIA:**  
ORIENT LONGMANS  
Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, New Delhi  
and Hyderabad.

OXFORD BOOK & STATIONERY COMPANY  
New Delhi and Calcutta.

P. VARADACHARY & COMPANY  
Madras.

**INDONESIA:** PEMBANGUNAN, LTD.  
Gunung Sahari 84, Djakarta.

**JAPAN:** MARUZEN COMPANY, LTD.  
6 Tori-Nichome, Nihonbashi, Tokyo.

**KOREA, REPUBLIC OF:** EUL-YOO PUBLISHING CO., LTD.,  
5, 2-KA, Chongno, Seoul.

**PAKISTAN:**  
THE PAKISTAN CO-OPERATIVE BOOK SOCIETY  
Dacca, East Pakistan.

PUBLISHERS UNITED, LTD.  
Lahore.

THOMAS & THOMAS  
Karachi.

**PHILIPPINES:** ALEMAR'S BOOK STORE  
769 Rizal Avenue, Manila.

**SINGAPORE:** THE CITY BOOK STORE, LTD.  
Collyer Quay.

**THAILAND:** PRAMUAN MIT, LTD.  
55 Chakrawat Road, Wat Tuk, Bangkok.

**VIET-NAM, REPUBLIC OF:** LIBRAIRIE-PAPETERIE  
XUAN THU,  
185, rue Tu-do, B.P. 283, Saïgon.

**BELGIUM:** AGENCE ET MESSAGERIES  
DE LA PRESSE, S. A.  
14-22, rue du Persil, Bruxelles.

**CZECHOSLOVAKIA:** ČESKOSLOVENSKÝ  
SPISOVATEL,  
Národní Třída 9, Praha 1.

**DENMARK:** EJNAR MUNKSGAARD, LTD.  
Nørregade 6, København, K.

**FINLAND:** AKATEEMINEN KIRJAKAUPPA  
2 Keskuskatu, Helsinki.

**FRANCE:** ÉDITIONS A. PÉDONE  
13, rue Soufflot, Paris (V<sup>e</sup>).

**GERMANY, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF:**  
R. EISENSCHMIDT  
Schwanthaler Str. 59, Frankfurt/Main.  
ELWERT UND MEURER  
Hauptstrasse 101, Berlin-Schöneberg.  
ALEXANDER HORN  
Spiegelgasse 9, Wiesbaden.  
W. E. SAARBACH  
Gertrudenstrasse 30, Köln (1).

**GREECE:** KAUFFMANN BOOKSHOP  
28 Stadion Street, Athens.

**ICELAND:** BÓKAVERZLUN SIGFÚSAR  
EYMUNDSSONAR H. F.  
Austurstraeti 18, Reykjavík.

**IRELAND:** STATIONERY OFFICE  
Dublin.

**ITALY:** LIBRERIA COMMISSIONARIA  
SANSONI,  
Via Gino Capponi 26, Firenze,  
and Via D.A. Azuni 15/A, Roma.

**LUXEMBOURG:** LIBRAIRIE J. TRAUSCH-  
SCHUMMER,  
Place du Théâtre, Luxembourg.

**NETHERLANDS:** N.V. MARTINUS NIJHOFF  
Lange Voorhout 9, 's-Gravenhage.

**NORWAY:** JOHAN GRUNDT TANUM  
Karl Johansgate, 41, Oslo.

**PORTUGAL:** LIVRARIA RODRIGUES Y CIA.  
186 Rua Aurea, Lisboa.

**SPAIN:**  
LIBRERIA BOSCH  
11 Ronda Universidad, Barcelona.  
LIBRERIA MUNDI-PRENSA  
Castello 37, Madrid.

**SWEDEN:** C. E. FRITZE'S KUNGL. HOVBOK-  
HANDEL A-B  
Fredsgatan 2, Stockholm.

**SWITZERLAND:**  
LIBRAIRIE PAYOT, S. A.  
Lausanne, Genève.  
HANS RAUNHARDT  
Kirchgasse 17, Zürich 1.

**TURKEY:** LIBRAIRIE HACHETTE  
469 Istiklal Caddesi, Beyoglu, Istanbul.

**UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS:**  
MEZHODUNARODNAYA KNYIGA  
Smolenskaya Ploshchad, Moskva.

**UNITED KINGDOM:** H. M. STATIONERY  
OFFICE,  
P. O. Box 569, London, S.E.1  
(and HMSO branches in Belfast, Birmingham,  
Bristol, Cardiff, Edinburgh, Manchester).

**YUGOSLAVIA:**  
CANKARJEVA ZALOŽBA  
Ljubljana, Slovenia.  
DRŽAVNO PREDUZEĆE  
Jugoslovenska Knjiga, Terazije 27/11,  
Beograd.  
PROSVJETA  
5, Trg Bratstva i Jedinstva, Zagreb.  
PROSVETA PUBLISHING HOUSE  
Import-Export Division, P. O. Box 559,  
Terazije 16/1, Beograd.

## EUROPE

**AUSTRIA:**  
GEROLD & COMPANY  
Graben 31, Wien, 1.  
B. WÜLLERSTORFF  
Markus Sittikusstrasse 10, Salzburg.

## LATIN AMERICA

**ARGENTINA:** EDITORIAL SUDAMERICANA, S. A.  
Aisina 500, Buenos Aires.

**BOLIVIA:** LIBRERIA SELECCIONES  
Casilla 972, La Paz.

**BRAZIL:** LIVRARIA AGIR  
Rua Mexico 98-B, Caixa Postal 3291,  
Rio de Janeiro.

**CHILE:**  
EDITORIAL DEL PACÍFICO  
Ahumada 57, Santiago.  
LIBRERIA IVENS  
Casilla 205, Santiago.

**COLOMBIA:** LIBRERIA BUCHHOLZ  
Av. Jiménez de Quesada 8-40, Bogotá.

**COSTA RICA:** IMPRENTA Y LIBRERIA TREJOS  
Apartado 1313, San José.

**CUBA:** LA CASA BELGA  
O'Reilly 455, La Habana.

**DOMINICAN REPUBLIC:** LIBRERIA DOMINICANA  
Mercedes 49, Santo Domingo.

**ECUADOR:** LIBRERIA CIENTIFICA  
Casilla 362, Guayaquil.

**EL SALVADOR:** MANUEL NAVAS Y CIA.  
1a. Avenida sur 37, San Salvador.

**GUATEMALA:** SOCIEDAD ECONOMICA-  
FINANCIERA,  
6a. Av. 14-33, Guatemala City.

**HAITI:** LIBRAIRIE "À LA CARAVELLE"  
Port-au-Prince.

**HONDURAS:** LIBRERIA PANAMERICANA  
Tegucigalpa.

**MEXICO:** EDITORIAL HERMES, S. A.  
Ignacio Mariscal 41, México, D. F.

**PANAMA:** JOSE MENENDEZ  
Agencia Internacional de Publicaciones,  
Apartado 2052, Av. 8A, sur 21-58, Panamá.

**PARAGUAY:** AGENCIA DE LIBRERIAS  
DE SALVADOR NIZZA  
Calle Pte. Franco No. 39-43, Asunción.

**PERU:** LIBRERIA INTERNACIONAL  
DEL PERU, S. A. Casilla 1417, Lima.

**URUGUAY:** REPRESENTACION DE EDITORIALES,  
PROF. H. D'ELIA  
Plaza Cagancha 1342, 1° piso, Montevideo.

**VENEZUELA:** LIBRERIA DEL ESTE,  
Av. Miranda, No. 52, Edf. Galipán, Caracas.

## MIDDLE EAST

**IRAQ:** MACKENZIE'S BOOKSHOP  
Baghdad.

**ISRAEL:** BLUMSTEIN'S BOOKSTORES  
35 Allenby Rd. and 48 Nachlat Benjamin St.,  
Tel Aviv.

**JORDAN:** JOSEPH I. BAHOUS & CO.  
Dar-ul-Kutub, Box 66, Amman.

**LEBANON:** KHAYAT'S COLLEGE BOOK  
COOPERATIVE,  
92-94, rue Bliss, Beirut.

## NORTH AMERICA

**CANADA:** THE QUEEN'S PRINTER  
Ottawa, Ontario.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:** SALES SECTION,  
UNITED NATIONS, New York.

## OCEANIA

**AUSTRALIA:** MELBOURNE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
369 Lonsdale Street, Melbourne, C.1.

**NEW ZEALAND:** UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION  
OF NEW ZEALAND, C.P.O. 1011, Wellington.

[62E1]

Orders and inquiries from countries where sales agencies have not yet been established may be sent to: Sales Section, United Nations, New York, U.S.A., or to Sales Section, United Nations, Palais des Nations, Geneva, Switzerland.

Litho in U.N.

Price: \$U.S. 4.00; 28/6 stg.; Sw. fr. 17.00  
(or equivalent in other currencies)

61-77111-March 1962-550

620

PROPERTY OF  
PUBLISHING DIVISION  
UNITED NATIONS