

Dual distribution

Third Session

SUB-COMMITTEE TWO OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SIXTEENTH MEETING

Hold at the Palais de Chaillot, Paris,
on Tuesday, 9 November 1948, at 9 p.m.

CONTENTS:

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): Draft resolution submitted jointly by Belgium, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (A/C.3/315, A/C.3/SC.2/8, A/C.3/SC.2/9, A/C.3/SC.2/11, A/C.3/SC.2/12) (continued): Paragraph 6 (continued) and paragraph 7 of the operative part.

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. G. PEREZ CISNEROS	Cuba
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. J. HOUARD	Belgium
	Mr. H. CHA	China
	A. ADRAOS Bey	Egypt
	Mr. de FOLIN	France
	Mrs. S. L. MENON	India
	Miss KLOMPE	Netherlands
	Mr. W. B. SUTCH	New Zealand
	Mr. LUNDE	Norway
	Mr. H. ALTMAN	Poland
	Mr. BORRISOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. DAVIES	United Kingdom
	Mr. WARREN	United States of America
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. KATZIN	

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 their appropriate symbol number and enclosed in an envelope marked "Urgent". Corrections can be dealt with more speedily by the services concerned if the delegations will be good enough also to incorporate them in a mimeographed copy of the record.

PART III OF THE PROGRESS REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS MEDIATOR FOR 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.3/317, A/C.3/318, A/C.3/SC.2/2, A/C.3/SC.2/W.1):
Paragraph 6 of the operative part (continued)

The CHAIRMAN called for discussion of the amendment to paragraph 6 of the operative part of the joint resolution (A/C.3/315), the amendment submitted by the Egyptian delegation (A/C.3/SC.2/9) and the amendment to that amendment proposed by the New Zealand and Norwegian delegations (A/C.3/SC.2/12).

Mr. DAVIES (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was prepared to accept the principles in the amendments submitted by the Egyptian and by the New Zealand and Norwegian delegations. He considered however, that the resolution should be as concise as possible and that it was unnecessary to insert the amendments. All that was needed was to request from the Secretary-General an assurance that he would comply with the principles contained in the amendments in distributing relief.

Mr. Davies suggested that the Sub-Committee should ask the representative of the Secretary-General to make a statement to that effect and that it should be noted in the summary record. Thus the Sub-Committee could dispense with voting the amendments and continue its work, if their sponsors were willing to accept that method of procedure.

Mr. KATZIN (Secretariat), speaking on behalf of the Secretary-General, said that he would accept the principles set out in the Egyptian, Norwegian and New Zealand amendments. The Secretary-General would stipulate in the directives which he might be called upon to give to the Director for Palestine Refugee Relief that in the equitable distribution of relief full account would be taken, inter alia, of the numerical incidence of the respective communities and that the distribution of relief would be carried out on the basis of need, without distinction because of race, colour, religion or political convictions.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that if a statement made on behalf of the Secretary-General and embodying the principles contained in the Egyptian amendment were merely noted in the summary record of the meeting it would give the impression that the Sub-Committee had unanimously approved that amendment, whereas it had not taken any decision on it.

The USSR delegation found the Egyptian amendment unacceptable. In proposing the immediate allocation of funds which had not yet been collected, the Egyptian delegation was trying to bind the Secretary-General beforehand. The amendment was not a disinterested one; Egypt was trying to draw as much as possible from future contributions by attempting to profit by a method of automatic distribution of relief which took into account neither the urgency of the need nor the principle of non-discrimination.

The Egyptian delegation was thus trying to get accepted, without any checking whatever; figures which had no relation to reality. At the previous meeting it had put forward the figure of 766,000 refugees in place of the 500,000 previously accepted as correct. The Mediator's report (A/689/Add.1) had noted that the Arab countries showed a tendency to exaggerate the number of refugees. Paragraph 11 of that document, for example, stated that computations by Arab authorities had given a total ranging from 740,000 to 780,000 and that those figures had not been verified and confirmed by officials of relief organizations.

The United Nations should base the allocation of relief on the principle of equity, taking urgency of need into account, and should not practice discrimination. The Egyptian delegation's opposition to those principles obviously sprang from its negative attitude towards the New Zealand and Norwegian amendment to its amendment. The USSR delegation called attention to the representative of Egypt's manoeuvre which consisted in withdrawing the amendment which he had just proposed and in getting the Secretary-General to adopt the principles contained in it. The representative of Egypt was free to withdraw his amendment, but such a withdrawal did not authorize him to impose upon the Secretary-General the principles contained in it. The Secretary-General could take action only if he were so authorized by a decision voted upon by the Sub-Committee.

The Secretary-General should base the directives which he would give to the Director for Palestine Refugee Relief, not upon figures supplied by the representative of Egypt which were obviously exaggerated but on verified data and avoid applying an automatic method of distribution which would deprive the neediest refugees of relief.

Thus, under pretext of saving the Sub-Committee's time, the representative of the United Kingdom and the representative of the Secretary-General were yielding in the Egyptian representative's manoeuvre.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) recalled that the International Children's Emergency Fund was already supplying assistance to mothers and children among Palestinian refugees. The principles according to which it was to distribute relief were stated in resolution 57 (I) of the General Assembly setting up the ICEF, which read in part, with reference to the distribution of supplies: "Equitable and efficient dispensation or distribution of all supplies or other assistance, on the basis of need, without discrimination because of race, creed, nationality status or political belief".

The New Zealand delegation had felt at first that those principles constituted sufficient guidance for the assistance to be provided by the United Nations to Palestinian refugees; it had later, however, deemed it useful to include them in its amendment to the Egyptian amendment in order to supplement the latter. As the statement made by the representative of the Secretary-General would appear in the summary record of the meeting, the New Zealand amendment was no longer necessary.

For that reason the New Zealand delegation, with the agreement of the delegation of Norway, withdrew the amendment submitted jointly by the two delegations, on the understanding that the Egyptian amendment would likewise be withdrawn. There would be no mention in the resolution of the question of distribution of supplies, but it would be understood that distribution would take place in accordance with the principles stated by the delegations of Egypt, New Zealand and Norway.

Mr. LUNDE (Norway) supported Mr. Sutch's remarks.

In reply to the observations made by Mr. Borisov, ANDRAOS Bey (Egypt) pointed out that the attitude of Egypt with regard to the problem of refugees and that of Palestine was not prompted by any ulterior motive. Egypt was not seeking any financial or political advantage in that affair. On the contrary, it had already made a considerable contribution to the relief to refugees and would continue its efforts in that field.

Andraos Bey pointed out that the events that had taken place in Palestine since the death of Count Bernadotte, such as repeated violations of the truce and continuation of the war, had increased and were continually increasing the number of refugees. The figure of 766,000 refugees was unfortunately far from being final and would go on increasing.

As regards the sub-amendment proposed by the delegations of New Zealand and Norway, Andraos Bey recalled that, far from rejecting it, his delegation had received it favourably.

/If the

If the USSR representative thought that the Egyptian delegation had given an exaggerated figure, Andraos Bey did not understand why he was opposed to the principle of distribution of relief in proportion to the size of the communities to be assisted. It would, moreover, not be the Egyptian delegation, but the specialized agencies which would be responsible for estimating the number of refugees.

In conclusion, he stressed the fact that when the attention of his delegation had been drawn to the elementary character of the principles of equity which it had laid down in its amendment and which had already been stated in the Charter, it had considered that it would be more fitting to leave it to the Secretary-General himself to make a statement and to formulate the fundamental principles, according to which a fair distribution of relief should be administered.

Consequently, the Egyptian delegation wished to withdraw its amendment and proposed that the Sub-Committee should proceed immediately to the examination of paragraph 7 of the resolution.

Mr. KATZIN (Secretariat) pointed out that provisions would be distributed among the refugees, and that account would be taken of all the elements of the problem, their number, their needs, etc., etc., without consideration of race, colour, religion or political opinion. He assured the USSR representative that distribution would be fair and that the number of refugees and their needs would be determined objectively by the United Nations Director for Palestine Refugee Relief, and not by the parties concerned.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) regretted that the Egyptian representative, instead of replying to the objections raised by the USSR delegation, had confined himself to stating, without bringing forward any proofs on the matter, that Egypt was not concerned in the distribution of relief and that the figures furnished by it were exact. On the contrary, those figures were exaggerated, as was shown by the difference, in the case of Northern Syria, between the statement of the Arab authorities that there were 30,000 refugees, and that of the relief organizations which had only reported 15,800 refugees. Egypt, however, was only seeking to defend the interests of oil concerns and of war-mongers, who were responsible for the sufferings and the death of those unhappy people whom it was now proposed to aid by automatic methods.

/ANDRAOS Bey

ANDRACS Bey (Egypt) stated that he did not consider it his duty to reply to the USSR representative.

PARAGRAPH 7 OF THE OPERATIVE PART

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Sub-Committee should proceed to the examination of the amendments which Belgium, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, jointly (A/C.3/SC.2/11) and Cuba (A/C.3/SC.2/8) proposed to paragraph 7.

Mr. DAVIES (United Kingdom) recalled that a fortnight had elapsed since, on 29 October, the four countries submitted their draft resolution. He urged that the Sub-Committee should leave the Secretary-General the task of deciding organizational details. It was in that spirit that the amendment of Belgium, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, whose adoption he requested, had been drafted.

He announced that his Government had decided, in addition to the 100,000 pounds already given, to make a contribution valued at a 1,000,000 pounds sterling in kind and in services. By that gesture, his Government had hoped to encourage other States to indicate their contributions to the sum of \$29,500,000 which represented the essential minimum.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) paid tribute to the generosity of the United Kingdom. He did not wish unduly to retard the adoption of the amendment of Belgium, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, and of paragraph 7, but he wished to provide the relief organization with an adequate administration, and he considered it at least necessary first to ask the representative of the Secretary-General under what conditions he contemplated calling on the services of the various Governments, the specialized agencies, the International Red Cross Committee, the Red Cross League and other voluntary organizations.

Mr. de FOLIN (France) said his delegation was disposed not to urge the adoption of paragraphs 7 and 8 of the French and New Zealand draft. The amendment of the United Kingdom, Belgium and the Netherlands satisfied him since, if it was adopted, the General Assembly would take note of the memoranda by the Secretary-General and that they corresponded to the preoccupations to which those two paragraphs bore witness. But his delegation maintained paragraph 9 of the draft mentioned, relating to the establishment of a special advisory committee.

/Mr. HOUARD

Mr. HOUARD (Belgium) wondered whether in the French text of the four Powers' draft resolution, paragraph 7, the expression le cas echeant which was the translation of the words "as appropriate", did not imply a restriction, whereas the Secretary-General recommended appealing as largely as possible to the agencies mentioned. With that reservation, he associated himself with the United Kingdom representative to request the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) thought that in asking the General Assembly to take note of the memoranda by the Secretary-General, the amendment of Belgium, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom (A/C.3/SC.2/11) did not take sufficient account of the fact that criticisms had been made of the Secretary-General's plan. He thought it preferable, as proposed by the Cuban amendment, to request the Secretary-General to act "in general conformity with the plan attached as an appendix to the resolution". Moreover, the General Assembly had to deal with a request from the Secretary-General, judging by the words "the General Assembly would" (A/C.3/SC.2/W.1). The Committee should therefore state its opinion on the different points, particularly on the appointment of a United Nations Director for Palestine Refugee Relief (a), the invitation to be made to organizations (c), and the appointment of a Policy Committee (e). This would enable the Sub-Committee to examine paragraph 9 of the French and New Zealand draft.

Mr. KATZIN (Secretariat) explained that the Secretary-General in presenting a detailed plan to the Sub-Committee hoped to avoid the necessity of its entering into the details of administrative questions. It was not necessary for it to pronounce itself on all the different points of that plan if paragraph 7 of the resolution was maintained, since that left the Secretary-General the responsibility for executive measures. But it would be necessary to insert in the joint draft resolution certain supplementary paragraphs dealing with the Secretary-General's responsibility, in particular on the two following points: the authorization to appoint a United Nations Director for Palestine Refugee Relief and the provisions relating to the special advisory committee.

In reply to a question from the United States representative, he pointed out that the plan could be annexed to the resolution, although the Secretariat would prefer that the Sub-Committee should consider it merely as a document presented for information, and, in that case, the provisions of paragraph 7 of the resolution would sufficiently indicate the Secretary-General's responsibility.

The meeting rose at 9.55 p.m.