

United Nations

Nations Unies

RESTRICTED

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

ASSEMBLEE
GENERALE

A/C.3/SC.2/SR 13
12 November 1948

ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

Dual distribution

Third Session

SUB-COMMITTEE 2 OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTEENTH MEETING

Held at the Palais de Chaillot, Paris,
on Monday, 8 November 1948, at 3 p.m.

CONTENTS:

PALESTINIAN REFUGEES: PART III OF THE PROGRESS REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS MEDIATOR FOR PALESTINE: ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES (A/648, A/689, A/689/Add.1, A/689/Corr.1, A/C.3/315, A/C.3/316, A/C.3/317, A/C.3/318, A/C.3/SC.2/2, A/C.3/SC.2/W.1) (discussion continued)

JOINT DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY BELGIUM, THE NETHERLANDS, THE UNITED KINGDOM AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (A/C.3/315, A/C.3/SC.2/4, A/C.3/SC.2/5, A/C.3/318, A/C.3/SC.2/6) (discussion continued)

Paragraph 3 of the operative part (discussion continued)

Chairman:

Mr. de BEAUMONT

France

Rapporteur:

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS

Cuba

Any corrections of this record should be submitted in writing, in either of the working languages (English or French), and within two working days, to Mr. E. Delavenay, Director, Official Records Division, Room 3015, Palais de Chaillot. Corrections should be accompanied by or incorporated in a letter, on headed notepaper, bearing the appropriate symbol number and enclosed in an envelope marked "Urgent". Corrections can be dealt with more speedily by the services concerned if delegations will be good enough also to incorporate them in a mimeographed copy of the record.

PALESTINIAN REFUGEES: PART III OF THE PROGRESS REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS MEDIATOR FOR PALESTINE: ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES (A/648, A/689, A/689/Add.1, A/689/Corr.1, A/C.3/315, A/C.3/316, A/C.3/317, A/C.3/318, A/C.3/SC.2/2, A/C.3/SC.2/W 1) (discussion continued).

JOINT DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY BELGIUM, THE NETHERLANDS, THE UNITED KINGDOM, AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (A/C.3/315, A/C.3/SC.2/4, A/C.3/SC.2/5, A/C.3/318, A/C.3/SC.2/6) (discussion continued).

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) pointed out that the admission of the public to the meetings of the Sub-Committee had not been arranged and that it was regrettable to give the impression that the Sub-Committee was holding closed meetings while actually its meetings were open in accordance with article 55 of the rules of procedure. He therefore asked the Secretariat to issue the necessary instructions.

After a brief discussion, the CHAIRMAN stated that the necessary instructions would be issued so that the meetings would be recognized as open to the public.

Mr. WARREN (United States of America) proposed that the Sub-Committee should have a night meeting following the present meeting in order to expedite its work.

The proposal was rejected by 6 votes to 5.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Sub-Committee could, if necessary, reconsider the question of a night meeting at the close of the meeting.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) explained that he had voted against the proposal to hold a night meeting because he had to attend the night meeting of the Joint Second and Third Committee which would be held at the same time.
PARAGRAPH 3 OF THE OPERATIVE PART (discussion continued)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Sub-Committee to continue its discussion of paragraph 3 of the draft resolution (A/C.3/315) and the amendments to that paragraph proposed by the delegations of Norway (A/C.3/SC.2/5), of New Zealand and France (A/C.3/SC.2/4), and of Venezuela (A/C.3/318 and A/C.3/SC.2/6). In accordance with the Sub-Committee's decision to decide first on the body of the paragraph with drafting amendments and later on additional amendments, he first submitted an oral amendment by the Norwegian delegation at the Sub-Committee's previous meeting. That amendment proposed to add to the beginning of paragraph 3 the words: "and non-member States" after

/the words

the words "urges all States Members".

Mr. DAVIES (United Kingdom) accepted the Norwegian amendment.

Mr. PEREZ-CISNEROS (Cuba) thought that the United Nations could not invite non-member States to share in a programme carried out under its auspices, especially since some of the non-member States had been refused membership in the United Nations by the Security Council and remained outside of the Organization. He accepted the principle of associating all countries without distinction in that humanitarian task, but could not accept the drafting proposed by the representative of Norway.

Mr. PLAZA (Venezuela) proposed that the drafting of the Norwegian proposal should be amended as follows: at the end of paragraph 3 add the phrase "and declares its willingness to accept voluntary contributions to that end from non-member States."

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) accepted the proposal.

Mr. CHA (China) stated that, in the opinion of his delegation, the invitation should not be extended to non-member States. Some of them had been refused membership in the United Nations. Since the relief programme was being sponsored by the United Nations, the Member States should assume full responsibility for it, and they were in a position to do so. Finally Mr. Cha could not see to what States the representative of Norway referred.

Replying to the remarks of the Cuban representative, Mrs. LIONARS (Norway) pointed out that an invitation had been extended to non-member States in the case of the International Children's Emergency Fund and that in that way Switzerland had been able to make a substantial contribution. In connexion with the remarks of the Chinese representative she stressed the fact that the Norwegian delegation's proposal referred to countries such as Switzerland, which cherished peace and which had not suffered from the war. Finally, she was prepared to accept the drafting proposed by the Venezuelan representative.

Mr. HAMMAD (Egypt) pointed out that the question presented no special importance for his delegation because paragraphs 7 and 10 of the resolution contemplated an appeal for the collaboration of specialized agencies and voluntary agencies among them, particularly, the Red Cross,

which included neutral States not Members of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN put the Norwegian proposal, as amended by the Venezuelan representative to the vote.

The proposal was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 3 as amended to the vote.

Paragraph 3 as amended was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. PLAZA (Venezuela) explained that he had abstained from voting on paragraph 3 for reasons he had given at the previous meeting, when he had presented his amendment to set a time limit.

The CHAIRMAN then submitted to the Sub-Committee the amendment proposed by Norway (A/C.3/SC.2/5) as an addition to the basic text just adopted.

Mrs. LIONAES (Norway) stated that her delegation had voted for the first paragraph of the proposal of New Zealand and France providing for the inclusion in the United Nations budget of a special section of \$5,000,000 for the relief of Palestine refugees and wished in its amendment to stress the need for all Member States to take part in that humanitarian work. The example of the International Refugee Organization and the International Children's Emergency Fund and the results of the Mediator's appeal, showed that the bonds of international solidarity were not as strong as might be desired. The amendment, however, did not impose any additional financial obligation on Member States because it maintained the voluntary nature of the contributions.

Mr. DAVIES (United Kingdom) expressed doubt regarding the need for the Norwegian amendment in view of its ambiguity. It was to be feared that the proposal to apportion the contributions among Member States in accordance with the scale of their contributions to the United Nations budget would result in the limitation of the contribution of certain States which might perhaps have contributed more. It was therefore preferable to keep the contributions entirely voluntary.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) expressed his delegation's view that although the principle of compulsory contributions had been rejected, it was essential to emphasize that the responsibility for making a voluntary

contribution rested on each Member of the United Nations. A broader participation must be achieved than had been the case with the International Refugee Organization and the International Children's Emergency Fund. As the Norwegian delegation's proposal represented an effort in that direction, the New Zealand delegation would support it.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) shared the United Kingdom representative's views. The Cuban delegation had supported the principle of voluntary contributions and considered the text proposed by Norway ambiguous. That text stated that contributions would be voluntary but that each Member State was expected to make a contribution; and moreover that Member States would not be expected to contribute in greater proportion than their contributions to the United Nations budget, but that they could contribute more if they so desired. The Cuban delegation could therefore not support the Norwegian amendment,

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that the Norwegian proposal was merely repetition in another form of the principle of compulsory contributions proposed by New Zealand and France and rejected by the Sub-Committee. The USSR delegation would therefore vote against the amendment.

Mr. ANZE-MATIENZO (Bolivia) stated that his delegation still supported the principle of voluntary contributions. The spirit of the Norwegian amendment was the same as that which had motivated the proposal of New Zealand and France. The Norwegian amendment went even further, since in a first part it specified a compulsory minimum and in a second part it indicated that Member States could contribute more should they so desire. Thus, only the supplementary contribution would really be a voluntary contribution. The Bolivian delegation would therefore vote against the Norwegian amendment.

Mr. GRUMBACH (France) emphasized that the Norwegian amendment was not a mere repetition of the proposal of New Zealand and France because it was based on the principle of voluntary contributions while the proposal of New Zealand and France provided for compulsory contributions. The French delegation could not do less than support the Norwegian amendment, which was much milder than the text which it had itself proposed.

The Norwegian amendment was rejected by 11 votes to 3.

The CHAIRMAN then submitted to the Sub-Committee the third paragraph of the proposal of New Zealand and France (A/C.3/SC 2/4).

Mr. GRUMBACH (France), in agreement with the representative of New Zealand, made it clear that the paragraph would have to be modified in accordance with the decisions taken by the Sub-Committee. He proposed that it should be amended as follows:

"Contributions in funds could be paid in other currencies than the United States dollar insofar as the operations of the relief organization can be carried out in those currencies."

The paragraph would then become a new paragraph of article 3.

Mr. DAVIES (United Kingdom) accepted the text as amended.

The amendment presented by New Zealand and France was unanimously adopted.

The CHAIRMAN called for discussion of the amendment submitted by the delegation of Venezuela (A/C.3/318 and A/C.3/SC.2/6).

Mr. PLAZA (Venezuela) stated that he could not concur in the opinion of certain delegations which held that the Sub-Committee should not consider the means of repaying the \$5,000,000 to be drawn from the Working Capital Fund.

It was the Sub-Committee's duty to submit definite proposals to the Fifth Committee in that regard. The manner of repayment was not specified because paragraph 3 contemplated various possibilities for the payment of contributions and gave the States their choice. In the event of all States taking advantage of their right to pay in kind, it would be impossible to repay in dollars the \$5,000,000 drawn from the Working Capital Fund.

The formula proposed by Venezuela eliminated that disadvantage: 17 per cent had to be paid in specie in order to make possible the repayment of the loan. On the basis of a total contribution of \$29,500,000, 17 per cent represented approximately the \$5,000,000 needed to repay the loan. Moreover, an optional and not a compulsory provision was involved. The principle just adopted by the Sub-Committee to the effect that contributions in specie could be made in other currencies besides United States dollars would apply to countries poor in hard currency. In addition, the report of the Fifth Committee (A/C.3/323) pointed out that certain countries would undertake to make their contributions in dollars rather than in another currency or in kind.

The Venezuelan delegation's proposal took account of that, since it provided that once the sum of \$5,000,000 had been collected, the Secretary-General should notify Member States that they were thenceforward at liberty to remit the whole of their contribution in kind. The Venezuelan delegation's proposal made it possible also to ensure repayment of the loan of \$5,000,000, under the very terms of the resolution, whereas hitherto that guarantee had appeared only in a separate document, the report of the Fifth Committee. Finally, it took into consideration the arguments for international solidarity presented by the French delegation since the repayment would be a charge on all States Members of the United Nations.

Mr. KATZIN (Secretariat) stated that the Secretary-General appreciated the Venezuelan representative's intention, since he wished to be assured that the sum taken from the Working Capital Fund would be repaid in United States dollars. Nevertheless, the Secretary-General considered it his duty to inform the Sub-Committee that it was impossible to put that proposal into practice.

To say that 17 per cent of the contributions would be paid in specie in order to repay the advance from the Working Capital Fund in no way ensured its repayment in United States dollars, as the Sub-Committee had decided that contributions in specie could be made in other currencies.

On the other hand, the sum to be refunded in dollars could not be fixed now. In order to decide that sum it would be necessary first to know what was to be paid in specie.

It was possible that the contributions would be made quickly enough to make it unnecessary to draw \$5,000,000 from the Working Capital Fund. In that case, the Secretary-General would inform the various Governments, indicating the nature of the contributions most needed. Complex negotiations would have to be undertaken in order to decide, according to the case, whether there was need of contributions in cash or of other provisions, which would have to be specified. It was, however, also possible that the sum required would exceed the estimated figure, for it should not be forgotten that certain services such as the transport of provisions would have to be paid for in cash and perhaps in dollars. Thus it was possible that at a given time the Secretary-General might find it more useful if a Government undertook the responsibility for the transport of supplies than payment in dollars.

In view of all these reasons, it was preferable to do nothing which might hamper the Secretary-General in taking, at the proper time, the measures which appeared to him the most useful in the circumstances.

Mr. ANZE-MATIENZO (Bolivia) pointed out that the first idea had been to repay the \$5,000,000 which would be drawn from the Working Capital Fund in dollars. When the Norwegian amendment had been submitted, the Venezuelan amendment appeared to be its logical continuation. In fact, the first amendment asked Member States each to contribute to the relief work in the same proportion as they contributed to the United Nations budget. If that had been decided, it would have been possible to determine that 17 per cent should be paid in cash in the same proportions because the advance granted by the United Nations would have to be repaid in dollars. Mr. Anze-Matienzo recognized the value of the Venezuelan proposal. In view of the fact, however, that the Sub-Committee had not adopted the principle of the Norwegian amendment, since contributions could be made in currencies other than dollars and also in kind, he did not understand how the amount to be paid in specie by each Member State could be determined. Moreover, the representative of the Secretary-General pointed to the technical difficulties which rendered the adoption of the Venezuelan proposal impractical. In view of the difficulties of administration, Mr. Anze-Matienzo considered that that matter should be referred to the Fifth Committee.

Mr. PLAZA (Venezuela) thanked the representative of the Secretary-General and the representative of Bolivia. He pointed out that one of the arguments put forward against his view was that the proportion of 17 per cent might not be adequate to repay the sum mentioned in paragraph 9. None of the proposed alternatives to paragraph 3, however, suggested precise methods of repayment.

If \$5,000,000 were advanced from the Working Capital Fund, the figure of 17 per cent was correct. If the advance was lower than that sum, the percentage of contributions to be paid in specie would be reduced. The Secretary-General should therefore inform the Member States what sum he had had to take from the Working Capital Fund and should indicate what proportion of their contribution would have to be paid in dollars. The text could consequently be amended. The Venezuelan representative would not therefore object if the statement as to the percentage of contributions to be paid in dollars were modified, if necessary.

On the other hand, if the sum paid in dollars in the cash contributions exceeded the total drawn from the Working Capital Fund, the Secretary-General would have to inform the Member States as soon as the payments had covered the advance taken from the fund and point out that it

dd /was no

was no longer necessary to send payments in dollars.

Mr. Plaza did not therefore think that the arguments brought against his proposal were sufficiently convincing to persuade him to withdraw it. He would therefore maintain it.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered the amendment submitted by Venezuela was entirely acceptable. Those who opposed it were wrong. Those remarks applied to the representative of Bolivia and, in a certain measure, to the representative of the Secretariat. The latter stated that the situation was complex and confused. That was the root of his desire to avoid any risks. That was not surprising, since the Secretariat was too used to having enough dollars at its disposal, while it was not used to keeping tight accounts.

If 17 per cent of the total contributions were granted in dollars, the guarantee was already reliable, but it should be remembered that the International Children's Emergency Fund had granted \$6,000,000 for relief to the Palestine refugees, so that \$11,000,000, or 37 per cent. of the total contributions, was already guaranteed in dollars. Moreover, it was to be hoped that a greater contribution would be made in dollars by those Member States to whom aid to Palestine refugees was of particular concern. The Secretariat's fears were therefore unjustified. There was no cause for the suppositions which disturbed the minds of representatives.

The Venezuelan representative was justified in considering that those who could not pay in dollars should be able to make contributions in kind.

Mr. KATZIN (Secretariat) repeated that in the present state of affairs it was impossible to fix the percentage of each country's contributions to be paid in dollars and the percentage to be paid in kind. Repayment of the sums drawn from the Working Capital Fund was carried out according to a system which was automatically followed under the control of the Secretary-General.

It would be easier to accept a clause stating that the sum advanced by the Working Capital Fund would be refunded, when the Secretary-General had sufficient cash, in dollars and other currencies, at his disposal.

He thought that the remarks made by the USSR representatives were the result of a misunderstanding. The Secretariat was not trying to obtain a larger sum in dollars. There was at present no reason for believing that the contributions paid in dollars would be inadequate. If that were so, the Secretary-General would ask Member States to make additional contributions in dollars. If on the contrary, there was an

excess of dollars, he would ask Members to pay the remaining contributions in other currencies, or he would buy provisions with the sums received. The Secretary-General would inform the Members when sufficient payment in different currencies had been made to fulfil the financial obligations that had been undertaken.

As regards the \$6,000,000 granted by the International Children's Emergency Fund, they constituted additional aid destined only to supplement the minimum rations with the products necessary for children and expectant and nursing mothers. They were not part of the funds necessary to supply the refugees with the minimum rations, which the Third Committee wished to secure for them.

Mr. PLAZA (Venezuela) pointed out that the percentages laid down in his draft amendment were based on the figures quoted in the basic document (A/C.3/315), namely \$29,500,000 on the one hand and \$5,000,000 on the other. It was obvious that the Secretary-General was free to modify the percentage if those figures were changed. The amendment could therefore be applied in practice.

Mr. Plaza explained that in submitting his amendment, he desired above all to defend the interests of his country. However little his country's contribution to the United Nations budget might be, it seemed to him desirable to determine the method of repayment of the advance granted by the Working Capital Fund and the manner in which Member States could contribute to the relief work. He therefore asked that his proposal should be put to the vote in order that it might be clearly stated whether the Sub-Committee wished to place the provisions which his delegation deemed necessary in paragraph 3 of the operative part, or whether it rejected them.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) stated that he would vote in favour of the amendment submitted by Venezuela, since the arguments advanced by its representative and by that of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics did in fact contain positive elements.

Mr. WARREN (United States of America), quoting the explanations provided by the representative of the Secretariat, said that he doubted whether the amendment under discussion could achieve the desired aim. The provision that Member States should pay 17 per cent of their contribution in cash did not guarantee the repayment in dollars of an advance of \$5,000,000. In order to do that the desired fraction should be paid in dollars or in any other convertible currency. If such a clause were adopted, certain countries, which were prepared to offer stocks of commodities at

their disposal, but which lacked convertible currency, might hesitate to make any contribution at all.

The United States representative agreed that all the Member States, without exception, should take part in the repayment of the \$5,000,000. The facts should, nevertheless, be taken into account and the impossible should not be demanded. There was, moreover, every reason to hope that the contributions of the countries with convertible currencies at their disposal would be adequate to repay the advance of \$5,000,000.

As regards the second part of the Venezuelan amendment (A/C.3/SC.2/6), Mr. Warren agreed with the representative of the Secretariat that to fix the total of the advance at \$5,000,000 did not mean that the dollar expenses incurred by relief work for refugees would correspond to that total. It was in fact very probable that, as soon as the \$5,000,000 was repaid, the Secretariat would be confronted with new expenses in convertible currencies, such as the chartering of ships or the purchase of certain essential commodities. In any case, the Secretariat would not fail to keep Member States informed and especially to let them know in the event of the advance being repaid. That was a normal procedure, which spared the Sub-Committee the necessity of inserting an ad hoc text.

The CHAIRMAN put the Venezuelan amendment (A/C.3/318 and A/C.3/SC.2/6) to the vote.

The amendment was rejected by 10 votes to 4.

The CHAIRMAN read the complete text of paragraph 3 with the additions adopted by the sub-committee.

Paragraph 3 was adopted without opposition, but with 1 abstention.

Mr. HAMMAD (Egypt) suggested that the words dès que possible in the French text should be replaced by the expression aussitôt que possible.

The CHAIRMAN and Mr. GRUMBACH (France) agreed.

That drafting change in the French text was adopted without opposition.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the United States delegation had suggested that a night meeting should be held. He proposed that it should be held on Tuesday, 9 November, in order that the members of the Sub-Committee could be warned a day in advance.

After a brief discussion, in which Mr. GRUMBACH (France), Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) and Mr. WARREN (United States of America) took part, Mr. DAVIES (United Kingdom) pointed out that the only method of avoiding night meetings was to speed up the debates.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), prompted by the procedure presently in force in the Third Committee, suggested on the one hand that each delegation should be limited to two statements, the first statement not to exceed ten minutes and the second five minutes, and on the other hand that a time limit should be set for the submission of amendments.

Following on statements by Mr. GRUMBACH (France) and Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand), the Cuban representative pointed out that the first part of his proposal applied within the limits of the provisions adopted by the Third Committee, while the second part related only to amendments to the draft resolution (A/C.3/315). Those amendments should be submitted before noon on 9 November.

The first part of the Cuban proposal was adopted by 11 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The second part of the Cuban proposal was adopted by 12 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN put the proposal, that in principle, a night meeting should be held on 9 November, to the vote.

The proposal was adopted by 6 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.