

United Nations

Nations Unies

RESTRICTED

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

ASSEMBLEE
GENERALE

A/C.3/SC.2/SR 6
6 November 1948

ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

Dual distribution

Third Session

SUB-COMMITTEE 2

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SIXTH MEETING

Held at the Palais de Chaillot, Paris,
on Thursday, 4 November 1948, at 3 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Refugees and Displaced Persons: Part Three of the Progress Report
of the United Nations Mediator on Palestine: Assistance to Refugees
(A/648, A/649, A/689/Add.1, A/689/Corr.1, A/C.3/315, A/C.3/316,
A/C.3/SC.2/2) (discussion continued)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. G. de BEAUMONT	France
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	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.

REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS: PART THREE OF THE PROGRESS REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS MEDIATOR ON PALESTINE: ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES (A/648, A/649, A/689/Add.1, A/689/Corr.1, A/C.3/315, A/C.3/316, A/C.3/SC.2/2) (discussion continued)

The CHAIRMAN asked the Sub-Committee to examine, paragraph by paragraph, the draft joint resolution submitted by Belgium, the United States, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom (A/C.3/315). It would be possible to examine the proposed amendments to each paragraph, and to ask for the opinion of the representative of the Secretariat on the points under discussion each time the need for such opinion arose.

Mr. DAVIES (United Kingdom) asked that, provided the New Zealand and French representatives were in agreement, the joint proposal of those two delegations (A/C.3/SC.2/2) should be considered as an amendment.

Mr. GRUMBACH (France) said that he would accept that suggestion if, as he thought, it would help to hasten the proceedings.

After discussion of the method of work to be adopted, during which Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) proposed to start by examination of the operative part of the draft joint resolution of the four Powers, and Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested beginning with the recital, the Cuban representative requested that the debate on procedure should be closed.

At the request of the Chairman, Mr. HILL (Secretariat) informed the Sub-Committee that the Fifth Committee had decided to confine its remarks to article 9 until the Third Committee had put forward concrete proposals concerning the measures which it advocated and the administrative organization which it proposed to create.

Mr. WARREN (United States of America) stated that he saw no reason why the Committee should not proceed immediately to consider the recital. The Sub-Committee would then go on to paragraph 1 and, leaving aside paragraph 2, would continue consideration of the draft paragraph by paragraph. When the questions raised by paragraph 7 had been settled, concrete proposals could be submitted to the Fifth Committee, which could be asked for an opinion on that subject. The Fifth Committee could then also express its views on paragraph 2.

Mr. DAVIES (United Kingdom) asked that the motion for the closing of the debate on procedure, submitted by the Cuban representative, should be put to the vote.

The motion was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) requested that his proposal to begin consideration of the operative part of the draft resolution should be put to the vote.

The proposal was rejected by 5 votes to 7 with 1 abstention.

Mr. WARREN (United States of America) pointed out that there was no appreciable difference between the recitals of the two draft resolutions. Paragraphs 1 and 3 of the recital of the joint French and New Zealand resolution repeated in a shortened form the three paragraphs of the recital of the draft resolution submitted by the four Powers. The essential difference lay in that in paragraph 2 the French and New Zealand resolution indicated the total which was required, according to the report of the Acting Mediator. With regard to that point, he preferred the resolution submitted by the four Powers, which provided that the General Assembly would ask Member States to pay that sum. He thought that it would be preferable if the recital did not mention the figure, since its place was in the operative part.

In conclusion he asked the representatives of France and New Zealand to accept the recital of the four Power draft. If they agreed to do so, the Sub-Committee could pass on to consideration of the Polish amendment.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) pointed out the reasons which prevented him from complying with the request of the United States representative and which moved him to favour retention of paragraph 2 of the New Zealand and French draft resolution. Its authors had mentioned a date in that paragraph in order that the United Nations might not find itself responsible for the care of 500,000 refugees after August 1949. He was, however, perfectly willing to delete from paragraph 2 the figure of \$30,000,000, which had only been introduced at the request of the French delegation. It would be sufficient to mention a "considerable sum".

He regretted that the recital of the draft submitted by the four Powers did not have the dignity befitting the resolutions of the General Assembly. He thought that the wording of the joint French and New Zealand resolution was more reserved.

Mr. GRUMBACH (France) stated that the French and New Zealand draft did not contain the quotations which the resolution of the four Powers had taken from the Mediator's report and from the Supplementary Report of the Acting Mediator because its authors thought that the General Assembly should not hide behind the Mediator in order to justify its desire to help the Palestine refugees before the world.

He admitted that that same reason could be cited against paragraph 2 of the French and New Zealand draft resolution. Therefore, for the sake of agreement, he would not oppose the deletion of that paragraph, if the New Zealand representative would consent to that. He wished, however, to retain the text of paragraph 1, which was more concise than that of paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution of the four Powers. The wording of paragraph 3 was identical in both drafts.

ANDRAOS Bey (Egypt) thought that either one or other of the recitals should be adopted in its original form. He did not understand why those, who wished to combine the two texts, desired to delete the content of the second paragraph of the recitals of the draft resolution submitted by France and New Zealand (A/C.3/SC.2/2). He understood even less why the representatives of those two countries had agreed not to mention the sum which the Mediator considered necessary for relief to the Palestine refugees.

If that second paragraph were deleted, only the mention of an indefinite figure would remain in paragraph 3 of the operative clause of draft resolution A/C.3/SC.2/2. The Sub-Committee was thus being asked to initiate a full debate on the wording of the various paragraphs of a draft resolution, without deciding on the extent of the aid to be granted.

It was perfectly obvious that it was the Sub-Committee's task to determine the extent of the assistance which the Palestine refugees were to receive.

When political questions were discussed, the Mediator's statements were eloquently quoted; when, however, it was a question of finance, there was hesitation to accept his evidence.

Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) pointed out that the recital should take into account the reasons which had led the Sub-Committee to approve the measures mentioned in the operative clause. It was therefore logical to quote the Mediator's statements, and that had been done in the first two paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.3/315.

Mr. Dehousse thought that the sum assigned for aid to the refugees should not be mentioned in the recital. He pointed out that, while the French and New Zealand draft resolution stated the figure proposed by the Mediator in the recital, it did not specify the total in the operative clause, but spoke of a sum of "x" dollars. He considered that the total involved should be indicated in the operative clause of the draft resolution, and that seemed to him another reason for giving preference to the resolution submitted jointly by Belgium, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

Mr. WARREN (United States of America) stressed the fact that the Parliaments which would allocate funds for refugee relief, would act in conformity with the resolution which the General Assembly had adopted on that subject; those Parliaments would, of course, want to know what was the basis of the General Assembly's decision. It should be based on the two passages of the Mediator's report, which had been quoted in draft resolution A/C.3/315; that fact should be taken into account. The second quotation of the first paragraph of the recital rightly stressed the urgent necessity of aid. He saw nothing in the wording of the recital to impair the dignity with which the decisions of the General Assembly should be endowed; the second recital acquainted the reader with the situation; the third was almost identical with the corresponding paragraph of the preamble proposed by France and New Zealand in their draft resolution. It was true that the preamble of the latter was shorter, but it was precisely for that reason that it did not say all that it should and that it did not give all the reasons for the decision.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) asked that the Committee should proceed to a discussion paragraph by paragraph, as it had been decided from the beginning, and that the debate on the preamble as a whole should be closed, since the delegations concerned had already expressed their opinions. By adopting resolution A/C.3/315, the Assembly would indicate that it considered the Mediator's statements trustworthy.

The Cuban representative thought that the Sub-Committee had met, precisely, to form an opinion on the Mediator's evidence. The Cuban
dd /delegation

delegation agreed with the analysis of the situation presented by the Mediator. It thought, moreover, that, in the preamble of a resolution concerning assistance to be provided to refugees, it was important to appeal to the conscience of the world.

Mr. Pérez Cisneros would therefore vote for the first two recitals of the draft resolution (A/C.3/315). The third recital was almost identical in both draft resolutions. There should therefore not be any difficulty in adopting it.

He did not think that it was necessary to put the second recital of the draft resolution into the preamble. He agreed with the Belgian representative that its place was in the operative clause, since it was the very aim of the resolution to define the total to be used in aiding refugees. On no account should the Committee be content with an algebraical "x", as New Zealand and France had been in the operative clause of their draft resolution. Here again, it was a matter of trusting the estimates submitted by the Mediator.

Mr. GRUMBACH (France) said that the funds to be assigned for refugee relief were represented by the letter "x" in the third paragraph of the operative clause of the French and New Zealand draft resolution, because, when that resolution had been prepared, paragraphs 2 and 9 of resolution A/C.3/315 had been referred to the Fifth Committee, which was to make a decision on the point. He pointed out that the letter "x" represented the sum which was to be taken from the Working Capital Fund as an advance, and not the total required for refugee relief. Paragraph 3 of the operative clause of the draft resolution (A/C.3/SC.2/2) had been prepared in order to allow Governments quickly to repay the United Nations treasury. It was not certain when the sums to be obtained by voluntary contributions destined to finance the whole relief programme would allow repayment of the sum taken from the Working Capital Fund.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) pointed out that the word "urges" at the beginning of the English translation of the third paragraph of the operative clause of document A/C.3/SC.2/2, did not correctly translate the idea which the representatives of New Zealand and France wished to convey. They had wished to give an obligatory character to the supplementary contributions required from Member States in the third paragraph. The French text began with the word "invites".

Mr. LUNDE (Norway) proposed a suspension of the meeting, in application of article 107 of the rules of procedure.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) asked for a roll-call to be taken on that proposal.

A vote was taken by roll-call as follows:

In favour: Bolivia, China, Norway, New Zealand, Poland,
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: Belgium, Cuba, France, Egypt, India, the Netherlands,
the United Kingdom, the United States of America,
Venezuela.

The proposal was rejected by 9 votes to 6.

Mr. DAVIES (United Kingdom) asked for closure of the debate and that the preamble of the joint draft resolution should be put to the vote.

The closure of the debate was decided upon by 12 votes to 3.

As the vote was being taken, Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that article 106 of the rules of procedure permitted two members to oppose the motion of closure. The Chairman had proceeded to the vote without giving the floor to those who opposed the closure of the debate.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) agreed with the USSR representative, and stated that the decision that had been taken was the result of a faulty application of the rules of procedure.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that article 106 provided for two speakers to be allowed to speak on the closure of the debate in opposition to that motion. He could only have given permission to speak, if somebody had asked to speak.

Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) supported the Chairman and stated that the explanation of the rules of procedure which he had given was legally correct.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) was of the same opinion.

Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that the motion for the closure could not apply to texts which had not yet been studied, particularly to the text submitted by the Polish delegation. It could only apply to the two draft resolutions which the Sub-Committee had considered during the meeting.

Mr. DAVIES (United Kingdom) said that, in proposing the closure of the debate, he had not wished to prevent the discussion of texts which had not yet been studied.

Having heard the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, Poland, Cuba and Belgium, the Chairman stated that the debate was closed only on the preamble of the two draft resolutions which the Sub-Committee had studied. It remained open on the texts which had not yet been discussed, particularly on the amendment submitted by the Polish delegation (A/C.3/315).

Mr. DAVIES (United Kingdom) asked that the first three paragraphs, constituting the preamble of the draft resolution (A/C.3/315), should be put to the vote. If that resolution was adopted, there would be no need to vote on the preamble to the draft resolution submitted by France and New Zealand. (A/C.3/SC 2/2).

Mr. GRUMBACH (France) and Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) objected to that interpretation.

Mr. GRUMBACH (France) pointed out that he had agreed to consider the joint French and New Zealand proposal as an amendment to the joint draft resolution of the four Powers (A/C.3/315).

There was a discussion on whether the draft resolution should be considered as an amendment or as an independent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN announced that in virtue of rule 82 of the rules of procedure the draft resolution submitted by France and New Zealand could not be considered as an amendment.

It would therefore be necessary to vote first on the draft resolution (A/C.3/315) which had been first submitted, then proceed to a vote on the other (A/C.3/SC.2/2) and finally establish a definite text by amalgamating the parts of the two resolutions which had been adopted.

Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that the second recital of the draft resolution of France and New Zealand cited

a figure which could only be justified if the decision to appoint fifty officials had already been taken. It was to the nomination of those officials that the difference between the figure of \$30,000,000 cited in the preamble of the draft resolution (A/C.3/SC.2/2) and the \$29,500,000 mentioned in the second paragraph of the operative clause of the draft resolution (A/C.3/315) must be imputed. A decision on the appointment of these officials could only be taken after obtaining budget estimates in accordance with rule 142 of the rules of procedure. He therefore proposed that that paragraph should be referred to the Fifth Committee.

The CHAIRMAN having proposed to adjourn the debate, Mr. DAVIES (United Kingdom) urged that the Sub-Committee should not adjourn, after such a long debate, before reaching a decision on the first three paragraphs of the preamble (A/C.3/315).

Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a vote paragraph by paragraph, and Mr. GRUMBACE (France) asked for a separate vote on the first two lines down to the words "immediate urgency".

The first two lines of the first paragraph of the draft resolution (A/C.3/315) down to the words "immediate urgency", were unanimously adopted.

The remainder of the first paragraph was adopted by 11 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The second paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 11 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the English text of the third paragraph spoke of "minimum conditions" whereas the French text spoke of "conditions essentielles". He asked the Sub-Committee to make the French text conform with the English text. Moreover, the Russian translation of the word "essentielles" led one to believe that a condition concerned with the re-establishment of peace was in question.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the word "essentielles" correctly translated into French the idea expressed by the English text.

Mr. DAVIES (United Kingdom) having declared himself ready to accept the word "essential" in the English text, Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) formally proposed that that expression should be used in both texts, substituting "essential" for "minimum" in the English text.

Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that that proposal placed him in an even more difficult position, since he wished, on the contrary, to make the French text conform with the original English, which he considered correct. It would be truly absurd to say that the distribution of aid to the refugees would result in hastening the pacification of Palestine.

It was not correct to say that by alleviating the conditions of starvation and distress among the Palestinian refugees, a condition essential to the success of the United Nations efforts to re-establish peace in that country was being fulfilled.

The USSR delegation might strongly oppose the last paragraph for reasons of substance. All that could be said of the assistance given to the refugees was, as the English text said, that it was one of the minimum conditions. In fact, the aid did not deal directly with the problem of the re-establishment of peace; the present situation in Palestine and, in particular, the condition of the refugees was due to the very absence of peace. In order to be logical, the problem should be stated in exactly the opposite way.

The CHAIRMAN announced that the French and Egyptian representatives agreed to the use of the word "minima" in the French text. He put to the vote the third paragraph of the recitals of the draft resolution (A/C.3/315), it being understood that the French text would read: "considerant que l'une des conditions minima du succès".

That paragraph was unanimously adopted.

Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) said that, while accepting the word "minima", he did not in any way consider that the third paragraph would be absurd if the word "essentiellles" were used, but he would not go into an explanation on that point in order not to prolong the debate.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) said there was no need to vote on paragraphs 1 and 3 of the recitals of the draft resolution presented jointly by his delegation and that of France (A/C.3/SC.2/2), but he requested a vote on the second paragraph of that resolution.

After a brief discussion, it was agreed that, if the second paragraph was adopted, the place in which it should be inserted would be decided after a decision had been taken on the amendment submitted by the Polish delegation.

Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) repeated that a decision could not be taken on a text mentioning the figure of \$30,000,000 because the mention of that figure was equivalent to saying that the Sub-Committee accepted among other things the sum of \$500,000 for administrative expenses.

As he had said before, rule 142 of the rules of procedure should be applied and the paragraph should be referred to the Fifth Committee for study.

The CHAIRMAN, on a motion for adjournment, applied rule 107 of the rules of procedure.

It was decided to adjourn.

The meeting rose at 8.30 p.m.