

United Nations

Nations Unies

RESTRICTED

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

ASSEMBLEE
GENERALE

A/C.3/SC.2/SR 19
15 November 1948

ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

Third Session

THIRD COMMITTEE

.SUB-COMMITTEE 2

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE NINETEENTH MEETING

Held at the Palais de Chaillot, Paris,
on Friday, 12 November 1948, at 11 a.m.

CONTENTS:

Palestinian refugees: Part three 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.2/2 Corr.1, A/C.3/SC.2/5, A/C.3/SC.2/6, A/C.3/SC.2/7, A/C.3/SC.2/8, A/C.3/SC.2/9, A/C.3/SC.2/10, A/C.3/SC.2/11, A/C.3/SC.2/12, A/C.3/SC.2/13, A/C.3/SC.2/14, A/C.3/SC.2/W.1) (continued):

Draft report to the Third Committee (A/C.3/SC.2/14)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. G. de BEAUMONT	France
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. G. PEREZ CISNEROS	Cuba
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. HOUARD	Belgium
	Mr. E. ANZE-MATIENZO	Bolivia
	Mr. H. CHA	China
	Mr. HAMMAD later ANDRAOS Bey	Egypt
	Mr. GRUMBACH	France
	Mrs. S. L. MENON	India
	Mrs. KLOMPE	Netherlands
	Mrs. A. LIONAES	Norway
	Mr. H. ALTMAN	Poland
	Mr. BORISOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. DAVIES later Sir Hugh DOW	United Kingdom
	Mr. SANDIFER	United States of America
	Mr. RODRIGUEZ-JIMENEZ	Venezuela
<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 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 THREE 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.2/2 Corr.1, A/C.3/SC.2/5, A/C.3/SC.2/6, A/C.3/SC.2/7, A/C.3/SC.2/8, A/C.3/SC.2/9, A/C.3/SC.2/10, A/C.3/SC.2/11, A/C.3/SC.2/12, A/C.3/SC.2/13, A/C.3/SC.2/14, A/C.3/SC.2/W.1) (continued)

Draft Report to the Third Committee (A/C.3/SC.2/14)

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), Rapporteur, remarked that he had only been able to spend one day working on his draft report. The assistance provided by the Secretariat had enabled him to prepare it quickly, but the draft report was not perfect and therefore he would be glad to hear any criticisms and observations which members of the Sub-Committee might have to make. In particular, the fourth part of the report containing statements by the representatives of the Secretary-General, had not been drawn up with all the care he would have wished to bring to it. He had not had time to classify the various interventions of the Secretary-General's representatives according to their nature, and instead of making a synthesis of them, he had been forced to limit himself to enumerating them. However, he thought that that part was very complete, for he had followed the declarations very closely. He pointed out finally that the English text of the draft report had an error on the first page. That text indicated that the original was English, whereas it was French.

He also drew the attention of members of the Sub-Committee to an alteration he had made in the form of the original draft resolution. On page 20 of his report, he had altered the position of article 10, which he had inserted in place of article 8. That was a very slight alteration which, in his opinion, was perfectly logical. In fact, article 8 indicated the general plan and the two following articles gave the details of the plan, the first dealing with directions to the United Nations Director for Palestine Refugee Relief, and the second with the creation of an Advisory Committee.

These alterations were approved.

As to the method to be followed for studying his draft report, the Rapporteur thought it should be read, since the members of the Sub-Committee had only been able to consider it during the present meeting. However, he was at the disposal of the Sub-Committee, which might adopt the procedure it thought most appropriate.

/Mr. GRUMBACH (France)

Mr. GRUMBACH (France) thought it unnecessary to re-read the parts of the report dealing with the Secretary-General's statements, the report of the Fifth Committee, and the draft resolution, as well as the text of the annexes. In his opinion, the reading should be limited to the part of the report dealing with the general debate (Part II pages 5 to 8 of the English text).

Mr. DAVIES (United Kingdom) pointed out a printing error in the English text of the preamble; instead of "this implementation", it should read "their implementation". He pointed out the error because the preamble reproduced the exact words of the Mediator.

The CHAIRMAN assured him that the error would be corrected.

Mr. HAMMAD (Egypt) congratulated the Rapporteur on having presented such a masterly report, especially in view of the extremely limited time at his disposal. He hoped that the exceptional quality of the report would make both the various representatives and the staff of the Secretariat take it as a model.

As to the procedure to be followed, he was in complete agreement with the method suggested by the French representative, while reserving the right to present his observations during the reading of the various paragraphs of the report.

The CHAIRMAN also congratulated the Rapporteur on the presentation, order and method of his report. He stressed, in particular, that the list of quotations and references it included would greatly facilitate the work of the Third Committee. The report was besides in complete harmony with the brilliant and very effective part played by its author, Mr. Perez Cisneros, in the Sub-Committee's discussions.

As to the procedure to be followed, he proposed that the method indicated by the French representative be adopted, that was to say that the examination of the report be limited to the part concerning the general debate (pages 5 to 8 of the English text). The reading of each paragraph would be followed by a discussion in which representatives might communicate any observations or criticisms the reading had suggested to them. Finally, the representative of the Secretary-General would make some observations on the fourth part of the report which dealt with statements by representatives of the Secretary-General.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), Rapporteur, said he fully agreed with that procedure.

The procedure indicated by the Chairman was adopted.

Part II: General Debate: Preamble

The preamble was adopted without comment.

Paragraph 1: Debate on the Ad Hoc Committee

Mr. SANDIFER (United States of America) thought the seventh line of the first sub-paragraph did not exactly express his delegation's intention. His delegation wished to give the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions the responsibility for assisting the Secretary-General to establish general directions. For that reason he would like the phrase "to assist the Secretary-General to establish general directions" to be inserted after the words Advisory Committee in Administration and Budgetary Questions. The words "suggested for the Ad Hoc Committee" would then be deleted.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba); Rapporteur, was sorry he had not succeeded in fully expressing the intention of the United States delegation. If the Committee had no objection he was ready to accept the amendment proposed by that delegation.

It was so decided.

Paragraph 2: Debate on the Financial Question

First Sub-Paragraph

Mr. GRUMBACH (France) recognized the quality of the drafting of the sub-paragraph which, however, was somewhat incomplete. It did not in fact mention an important point on which the delegations of France and New Zealand had laid great stress. He recalled that, while those delegations had wished for definite guarantees regarding the loan of \$5,000,000, they had also stressed their desire to see a concrete form given to the principle of international solidarity. If only the purely financial side of the proposal made by those two delegations was mentioned, a very important element was omitted, and thus a complete picture was not given of the debates which had taken place in the Sub-Committee.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), Rapporteur, thought the French representative's request expressed a perfectly legitimate feeling. If the Sub-Committee agreed, he would insert that explanation in the second paragraph.

It was so decided.

Second and Third Sub-Paragraphs

In the absence of any objection the second and third sub-paragraphs were adopted.

Fourth Sub-Paragraph

Mr. SANDIFER (United States of America) thought the first sentence of the fourth sub-paragraph was not quite satisfactory. He thought that the Sub-Committee had not "recognized" these questions as "justified" and he saw in the sentence a too categorical statement.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), Rapporteur, recalled that all the delegations which had given their opinions on the proposals of Norway and Venezuela, even those which had opposed them, had none the less recognized that they were perfectly legitimate. They had been rejected because of the factor of urgency, but the majority of the Sub-Committee had recognized them as justified. Therefore he thought that sentence satisfactorily represented the tone of the debates which had taken place.

Mr. GRUMBACH (France) shared the opinion of the United States representative. To his mind, the word "rejected", which also appeared in that sentence was rather strong, since a number of delegations had in fact recognized the legitimacy of the proposals of New Zealand and Venezuela. However, a vote had taken place and it was necessary for the report to mention that. For that reason he proposed that the word "rejected" should be replaced by the words "were not retained" which, in his opinion, while reporting the last stage of the discussion, was less brusque than the word "rejected".

Moreover, he pointed out that one could not say that "questions" had been rejected, or even discussed. Therefore he preferred the word "proposals".

Mr. DAVIES (United Kingdom) wished for some explanations on the position of the French delegation. He did not quite see whether the latter accepted the term "justified". He recalled that a number of delegations had opposed the proposals and for that reason he endorsed the view of the United States representative, and also proposed that the word "justified" be deleted.

The RAPPORTEUR proposed, in order to reconcile the varying points of view, that the word "often" be replaced by the word "sometimes"

/or

or "in certain cases". That alteration did not change the essential meaning of the sentence but it indicated more strongly the opposition which those proposals had met.

The CHAIRMAN summing up the situation, remarked that the sub-paragraph should undergo three alterations: first, in the first line, the word "questions" should be replaced by the word "proposals"; second, the meaning of the word "often" should be made less strong by replacing it by the expression "in certain cases"; third, the word "rejected" should similarly be made less strong by replacing it by "have not been retained".

The sub-paragraph as amended was adopted.

Fifth Sub-Paragraph

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that in the fifth sub-paragraph of paragraph 2 the position of his delegation had not been indicated as clearly as was necessary. He pointed out that the text of that sub-paragraph was unbalanced: four lines were given to the position of his delegation and eight lines to the position of the delegations which had opposed the amendment it had submitted. For that reason he wished to replace the sentences relating to his delegation by a new text which he proposed to draw up himself and give to the Rapporteur. That would enable a more objective character to be given to that sub-paragraph. If he could not act thus, he proposed that all mention of the position taken by his delegation be deleted.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), Rapporteur, made his excuses to the USSR delegation for not having completely expressed the latter's position. He was quite ready to accept an amendment to his text. However, he pointed out that once the report had been adopted, it would be considered as coming from the whole Sub-Committee. Therefore he thought it necessary to submit the amendment of the USSR delegation to the opinion of the members of the Sub-Committee. Moreover, he wished to know the form of that amendment before inserting it in the text.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought he had full right to clarify his delegation's position; that right belonged solely to his delegation and not to the Rapporteur or the members of the Sub-Committee. Either the text he proposed to draw up to clarify his delegation's position could be accepted or everything in the sub-paragraph relating to his delegation's position could be completely omitted.

Mr. DAVIES (United Kingdom) considered that if the Rapporteur accepted the USSR delegation's amendment, the Sub-Committee was not bound to take a decision upon it, but could, as it were, delegate its powers to the Rapporteur. Mr. Davies would agree to the deletion in the fifth sub-paragraph of everything referring to the USSR delegation and to his own delegation. He would, however, prefer that that sub-paragraph should mention the position of his own delegation and that of the USSR delegation.

Further, Mr. Davies wished a few words to be added to the ninth line of the text of that sub-paragraph. He recalled that his delegation had stressed that its Government was prepared to contribute a large sum to the refugee assistance programme in spite of the damage that the United Kingdom had sustained from air raids and the economic and financial sacrifices that that country had been obliged to make. That second point was not mentioned in the text, and Mr. Davies wished that sentence to be altered as follows: "... had, however, not only suffered great damage, but had made heavy economic and financial sacrifices".

Mr. GRUMBACH (France) pointed out an omission in the fifth line of that paragraph. If reference was made to the summary record of the twelfth meeting of the Sub-Committee (A/C.3/SC.2/SR 12, page 9), it would be seen that the French representative had stated that France also had suffered greatly in the last world war, but that she would nevertheless make as large a contribution as possible to relief for Palestinian refugees. In that sub-paragraph Norway and the Netherlands were mentioned, but France was left out.

As regards the amendment submitted by the USSR delegation, Mr. Grumbach drew the attention of the members of the Sub-Committee to the possible danger which might be involved by including all the statements of the various delegations in a report of that nature. Little remained of the French delegation's statements, although they did seem to him to be important (especially where the Ad Hoc Committee was concerned). Mr. Grumbach stated, however, that he quite understood that a document of that kind had to be concise and could not take everything that was said during debates into account.

Unlike the United Kingdom representative, Mr. Grumbach did not think that the passages in that sub-paragraph referring to the USSR and United Kingdom delegations should be deleted. He stated that the USSR delegation was right in insisting that the text was unbalanced (four lines were given to that delegation and eight to the other delegations). He thought therefore that eight to ten lines of the text under consideration should be devoted to the position of the USSR delegation. He further requested the USSR

/delegation

delegation to take the factor of balance into consideration when drawing up its amendment, so as to avoid going too far in the other direction.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), Rapporteur, expressed his regret for having omitted the name of France from the fifth line of the text of that sub-paragraph. He thanked the French delegation for its spirit of comprehension, and for the help it had given in drawing up his report.

Concerning the USSR amendment, the Rapporteur quite understood that the USSR delegation was better qualified than any one else to define its own position, and stated that he was quite prepared to accept that delegation's amendment. It seemed logical to him, however, that that amendment should be accepted by the members of the Sub-Committee. He thanked them for the confidence they had shown in him, and concluded by stating that he would insert the USSR delegation's amendment in the text of his report. He requested the USSR delegation to be good enough to give him fairly rapidly the text of its amendment, to enable him to submit his report to the Third Committee on the agreed date.

He would also take the United Kingdom representative's remarks into account.

Mrs. KLOMPE (Netherlands) noticed that the text of that sub-paragraph made specific mention of the gifts of various countries; she would be glad if it could also refer to the contribution of 5,000 blankets made by the Netherlands Government. Although that was only a modest contribution compared with that of the United Kingdom, she would be grateful if that sub-paragraph could make specific mention of it.

ANDREOS Bey (Egypt), while recognizing the value of the contributions made by various Members and, in particular, by the Netherlands, nevertheless considered that the Sub-Committee's report should not give the names of all the donors.

For the Committee's guidance and in reply to the insinuations of certain delegations, which had accused Egypt of being selfish and commercially-minded, the Egyptian representative read a telegram from the Egyptian Prime Minister to the effect that his Government, having already sent 4,000 tons of flour and foodstuffs for the assistance of the Palestinian refugees, had decided to make a loan of 10,000 tons of wheat, although its own wheat imports were not quite complete. He was merely pointing out the fact, but was not at all anxious that it should be mentioned in the report.

/Mrs. KLOMPE

Mrs. KLOMPE (Netherlands) agreed as to the difficulties involved by her proposal, which she withdrew.

Paragraph 3: The question of the equitable distribution of relief

In the absence of any objection, the first sub-paragraph was adopted.

Second Sub-paragraph

Mr. HOUARD (Belgium) believed that all the delegations had been in agreement on the two principles dealt with in the first sub-paragraph. Therefore, the expression "every point of view" might replace "certain points of view" in the second sub-paragraph.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), Rapporteur, recalled that there had been a somewhat long discussion arising from a remark made by the Egyptian representative on the proposed amendment by New Zealand and Norway. The Egyptian representative had considered that amendment open to dangerous interpretation. In particular, he thought that the expression "on the basis of need" was not sufficiently flexible, and did not allow of consideration of such important factors as transport.

ANDRAOS Bey (Egypt) confirmed the Rapporteur's remark, adding that it was at the suggestion of the Secretary-General's representative that the Sub-Committee had given up the idea of including those amendments in its draft resolution, as the General Assembly's resolution 57 (I) was sufficient in that respect. The word "different" might be preferable to "certain".

In reply to a remark by the United States representative, who preferred the word "certain" to "various" in the English text, the Egyptian representative was of the opinion that in French the word "certain" had a more restrictive effect than the word "divers". He therefore proposed adoption of the word "divers" in the French text, which was the original text of the report; the word "certain" could be kept in English.

That proposal was adopted.

Third Sub-paragraph

Mrs. MENON (India) proposed deletion of the third sub-paragraph which, she considered, was made unnecessary by the first and second sub-paragraphs. The Director for Relief did not need directions of that nature. The sole consideration should be assistance to refugees. It would be an affront to the United Nations, to its staff and to the other institutions to allude to distinctions of race, colour, religion or political opinion.

/Delegations

Delegations which had felt misgivings on that point should take heart.

The representative of France had said that United Nations assistance was a concrete manifestation of international solidarity. Mrs. Menon went further in thinking that it was a manifestation of human solidarity and sympathy.

ANDRACOS Bey (Egypt) wished to make two points, one of substance, the other of form.

If the report was intended to give a true picture of the Sub-Committee's discussions, and not just an expression of pious hopes, it must be admitted that the third sub-paragraph reflected the discussions that had really taken place. The delegations of New Zealand, Norway and Egypt had withdrawn their amendments following the statement of the Secretary-General's representative, which had been accepted by the whole Sub-Committee. Now it was proposed to delete the third sub-paragraph. The Egyptian representative noted with astonishment that the proposal came from the delegation of India, a country which was suffering from racial discrimination and had been obliged to complain of the treatment meted out to its nations in the Union of South Africa. How could the Indian delegation consider that the principle of the equality of race was so well established that it was useless to allude to it?

With regard to the point of form, the Egyptian representative did not care for the translation from French of the word "directives" into the word "directions" in English. Would not the word "directives" be acceptable in English?

Mrs. MENON (India) feared that the Egyptian representative had not quite understood. What she had actually said was that the third sub-paragraph was useless, but only owing to the presence of the two preceding sub-paragraphs. It was precisely because such discrimination existed that allusion to it should not be made in a text indicating to the Secretary-General the principles on which he was to work.

Mrs. Menon formally maintained her proposal.

Mr. GRUMBACH (France) stated, in defence of the Indian representative, that she had displayed splendid confidence in the Charter. It was true that if frequent reference was made to a principle, the impression was created that such principle was not firmly established.

The principle of equality of race was, however, so often violated that it became necessary to reaffirm it. Moreover, the allusion to which Mrs. Menon took exception appeared in the report and not in the draft resolution. Far

/from taking

from taking from its value, such allusion gave that principle strength and precision.

Mr. CHA (China) hoped that the third sub-paragraph of paragraph 3 would be maintained; it defined the nature of the directions that the Secretary-General might have to give to the Director of Relief.

The word "directives" was currently accepted in English to-day.

Sir Hugh DOW (United Kingdom) shared the Egyptian representative's point of view that the third sub-paragraph should stand. Mrs. Menon had considered that the two preceding sub-paragraphs rendered that sub-paragraph superfluous. However, it was not merely a question of requesting the Secretary-General to accept the principle of equality of race, which would in fact be useless; the intention was to request the Secretary-General to incorporate that principle in his instructions to the Director of Relief.

The United Kingdom representative preferred the word "directions" to be kept, as being older and better established.

Mr. KATZIN (Secretariat) stated that from the Secretary-General's point of view it would be better to keep that sub-paragraph in the report. The Secretary-General would thus know by what principles, according to the Sub-Committee, he should be guided. The same thing had occurred in the case of the International Refugee Organization and the International Children's Emergency Fund. The Secretary-General further recognized that relief to refugees should be in relation to their needs.

The third sub-paragraph of paragraph 3 was retained by 11 votes to 1.

In the absence of other objections, paragraph 3, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 4: Amendment concerning countries of refuge

In the absence of any objection, paragraph 4 was adopted.

Paragraph 5: Amendment on the political problem

Mr. ALTMAN (Poland) did not consider that the title of the paragraph brought out clearly the Polish delegation's real concern. Indeed, the Polish draft amendment did not deal with the substance of the political problem in Palestine. It was only intended to secure recognition of the fact that the problem of the Palestinian refugees was closely connected with a political problem which had not yet been solved. Mr. Altman therefore proposed to amend as follows the reading of paragraph 5: "Amendment on the relationship between the refugee problem and the political situation in Palestine".

That amendment was adopted.

Mr. SANDIFER (United States of America) thought that the expression "was strictly limited to the humanitarian aspect of that problem" at the end of paragraph 5 had much too wide a scope. It would be appropriate there merely to repeat the terms of reference of the Sub-Committee, and to say "was limited to the question of aid to the Palestinian refugees".

The RAPPORTEUR proposed the following drafting: "was limited to the humanitarian aspect of aid to the Palestinian refugees".

In the absence of any observation, that drafting was adopted.

In the absence of any other objection paragraph 5, as amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN, on the proposal of the French representative, deemed it unnecessary to proceed to the examination of paragraph 6, which did not deal with the debates in the Sub-Committee, but with a statement by a representative of the International Children's Emergency Fund.

Agreed.

PART IV OF THE REPORT: STATEMENTS BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.

Mr. KATZIN (Secretariat) appreciated the exactness and conciseness of that part of the report.

He had only a few observations to make on points of detail.

On page 15, lines 10 and 11, the sentence "The voluntary organizations could not work as United Nations specialized agencies" would be more exact if the words "specialized agencies" were replaced by the word "instruments".

In the first sentence of the second paragraph on page 15, the expression "all displacements of refugees" was far too comprehensive. The Director for Relief would actually be responsible only for the movements of refugees within the zones in which they found themselves at present, in the case of displacements of camps, for example. He asked therefore that that sentence should be amended on the lines he had just indicated.

/In the next

In the next sentence, the word "It" should replace "He" in the English text.

Finally, in the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 16, he proposed the insertion of the words "to the extent possible" after "would keep in mind".

Moreover, the Secretariat had prepared a new collection (A/C.3/SC.2/W.1/Corr.2) to the memorandum by the Secretary-General. That document took account of the amendments the Sub-Committee had made to its draft resolution since the first memorandum had been drawn up.

The Secretary-General wished to draw the attention of the Sub-Committee to the fact that negotiations were being carried on between the Secretariat, on the one hand, and the International Red Cross and other bodies on the other. The International Red Cross had stated its position very clearly, in a document which Mr. Katzin had been asked to read to the Sub-Committee. However, because of the lateness of the hour, he thought he might limit himself to placing that document before the Third Committee.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), Rapporteur, took careful note of the amendments suggested by the representative of the Secretariat. Those amendments would only make the Sub-Committee's report more precise. He was inclined, if the Sub-Committee agreed, to amend Annex II of the report taking account of the second correction drafted by the Secretariat.

Agreed.

Amendment of the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to
the fifth sub-paragraph of paragraph 2 of Part II of the Report (continued)

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) presented the amendment he had previously announced, which was as follows:

1. delete the first words, so that the fifth sub-paragraph began by "The delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics".
2. insert the words "supported by the delegation of Poland" before the word "proposed".
3. substitute for the phrase following the word "proposed" the exact terms of the USSR amendment as in document A/C.3/SC.2/7.

Up to that point the new drafting would be no longer than the original.

4. insert at the end of the text of the USSR amendment the sentence: "The USSR representative explained that his amendment did not exclude the general principles contained in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution and was intended merely to throw a more equitable light on matters".*
5. add at the end of the sub-paragraph the following sentence: "The USSR representative remarked that the United Kingdom representative did not perhaps realize the significance of German occupation for a territory which had been subjected not only to savage preliminary bombing, but also to total destruction as a result of occupation by the German barbarians."*

*Provisional translation.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), Rapporteur, thanked the USSR representative for providing the text requested of him. In this way it would no doubt be possible to present the Sub-Committee's report to the Third Committee within the desired time.

The CHAIRMAN proposed to put to the vote the fifth sub-paragraph as altered by the USSR amendment.

/Mr. HOUARD

Mr. HOUARD (Belgium) remarked that it was contrary to custom to record in a report replies made by delegations as the result of a decision. The last sentence proposed by the USSR delegation would be in its correct place at the beginning, rather than at the end, of the sub-paragraph. Otherwise, all delegations would have the right to request the insertion of replies they had given as the result of a decision.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), Rapporteur, thought that if the insertion of the sentence proposed by the USSR delegation were accepted, it should also be placed where it desired it to be. It was true that the argument in the last part of its amendment had been adduced only in reply to arguments presented by the United Kingdom representative; it was not a statement which had sprung spontaneously from the discussion.

Mr. MORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not think it was too much to ask that the report should record simply what had happened in the course of the discussion. Despite the view of the Belgian representative, the USSR delegation had a right to ask that the report should mention its argument as well as that of the representative of the United Kingdom. It should record both arguments or neither.

The USSR delegation considered, furthermore, that its amendment need not be voted on. The Sub-Committee could not force a delegation to say something which it did not want to say. The USSR argument followed logically upon that of the United Kingdom. That was the way in which the debate had unfolded, as the Rapporteur must surely recall.

The CHAIRMAN agreed with the USSR representative that the report should record the course of the debates before the Sub-Committee. The summary records showed whether a delegation had made certain observations or not.

During the present meeting, however, each sub-paragraph as amended had been submitted to the Sub-Committee for approval. That should also be done in the case of the fifth sub-paragraph of paragraph 2, unless the Sub-Committee had complete confidence that the Rapporteur would write in a text which recorded what had actually been said.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), Rapporteur, said he had a personal recollection that the discussion had comprised firstly, the USSR proposal, secondly, the arguments against it, thirdly, fresh arguments by the USSR delegation, and finally, the vote. If the actual order of the discussion was to be observed, the sentence "this amendment was not accepted" should be put at the end of the sub-paragraph.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, on the basis of two and a half year's experience a large number of meetings, he understood that the expository part of a report consisted of an account of the views of the delegations; it was designed to show how work had progressed. The USSR delegation, therefore, had a right to remind the Rapporteur of its views and thus help him to refresh his memory. Since the report recorded the position of the United Kingdom, it should record that of the USSR delegation just as accurately. There had been no vote on that additional part.

The CHAIRMAN said that the information supplied by the USSR representative would be inserted into the report.

It was so decided.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS, (Cuba), Rapporteur, agreed with the representative of the USSR. In his capacity of Rapporteur, he had always thought it most important that the Sub-Committee's report should take into account a minority opinion whenever there was a difference of opinion between a majority and a minority.

Undoubtedly, that point should have been expressly mentioned in the rules of procedure. In any case, he wished to emphasize that he fully agreed with the USSR representative on that point.

Part V of the report.

Sir Hugh DOW (United Kingdom) pointed out that on page 17, seventh paragraph, line 2 the words "the United Kingdom delegation" should be substituted for the words "the Norwegian delegation." It had been the United Kingdom delegation which had proposed that the International Children's Emergency Fund should be mentioned in the resolution.

The correction was adopted.

The report as a whole was adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 2 p.m.