

GENERAL
ASSEMBLYASSEMBLEE
GENERALEA/C.3/SC.2/SR 7
9 November 1948ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCHDual distribution

Third Session

THIRD COMMITTEE

SUB-COMMITTEE 2

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SEVENTH MEETING

Held at the Palais de Chaillot, Paris,
on Friday, 5 November 1948, at 10.45 a.m.

CONTENTS:

Palestinian refugees: Part III of the progress report of the United Nations Mediator on 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/W.1) (continued):

- a) Joint draft resolution submitted by Belgium, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (A/C.3/315) and draft resolution submitted by New Zealand and France A/C.3/SC.2/2) (continued);
- b) Amendment submitted by Poland (A/C.3/SC.2/3) to the joint draft resolution of the Four Powers; (continued)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. G. PEREZ CISNEROS	Cuba
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. F. DEHOUSSE	Belgium
	Mr. E. ANZE MATIENZO	Bolivia
	Mr. H. CHA	China
	A. ANDRAOS Bey	Egypt
	Mr. S. GRUMBACH, later	France
	Mr. de FOLIN	France
	Mrs. S.L. MENON	India
	Mr. OOSTERHUIS	Netherlands
	Mr. W.B. SUTCH	New Zealand
	Mrs. A. LIONAES	Norway
	Mr. H. ALTMAN	Poland
	Mr. BORISOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. DAVIES	United Kingdom
	Mr. WARREN	United States of America
	Mr. E. PLAZA	Venezuela
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. Martin HILL	

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 ON 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/W.1) (continued):

a) Joint draft resolution submitted by Belgium, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (A/C.3/315) and draft resolution submitted by New Zealand and France (A/C.3/SC.2/2)
(continued)

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), Rapporteur, informed the Sub-Committee that, owing to illness, Mr. de Beaumont would not be able to act as Chairman, and recalled that it was customary in such cases to call upon the Rapporteur to take the place of the Chairman. He would, however, request the Sub-Committee not to follow that practice and elect another Chairman.

Mr. DAVIES (United Kingdom) proposed that, in the interest of the Sub-Committee's work, the Rapporteur should accept the chairmanship.

ANDRAOS Bey (Egypt) said that he would willingly have supported the United Kingdom proposal were it not that he feared that the representative of Cuba, if he acted as Chairman, would no longer be able fully to participate in the discussion and would not feel himself entirely free to lend all his support to the cause of the Arab refugees.

Contrary to the rules of procedure usually followed, the Sub-Committee had decided at the beginning of its work to give the chairmanship not so much to a person as to a country. He would consequently propose that the chair be filled by a member of the French delegation.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), Rapporteur, having expressed his thanks to the representative of Egypt, concurred in his views and asked the representative of France if he were prepared temporarily to act as Chairman.

Mr. GRUMBACH (France) thanked the representative of Egypt for his proposal, but considered that there was no difficulty whatever in the Rapporteur replacing the Chairman during a brief absence, as was indeed customary.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba), Rapporteur, agreed to take the Chair. He pointed out that he might perhaps be obliged to speak in his capacity as representative of Cuba since his delegation was small

/and it

and it would be difficult to ask another of its members to sit in the Sub-Committee.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Sub-Committee had decided at the beginning of its last meeting to study simultaneously the joint draft resolution submitted by Belgium, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (A/C.3/315) and the draft resolution submitted by France and New Zealand (A/C.3/SC.2/2). It would, in his opinion, be preferable first to conclude the examination of the French and New Zealand draft resolution since, the two delegations having decided to retain only one point, paragraph 2 of the preamble of document A/C.3/SC.2/2, that examination could be completed rapidly. Furthermore, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had given its views on the subject at the previous meeting. Once that point had been dealt with the representative of Poland could submit his amendment and after a decision had been taken upon it, the Sub-Committee could return to the examination of the text which had served as the basic document for discussion (A/C.3/315).

Mr. de FOLIN (France) wished to make a slight drafting change in the second paragraph of the preamble of the French and New Zealand draft resolution in the hope that it might meet one of the objections raised by the representative of the USSR. He would propose to replace the future "will" by the conditional "might be". That tense would clearly indicate that the text was quoted from the report of the Acting Mediator; thus the General Assembly would not be bound in any way and the Fifth Committee would not have to give its opinion. The figure would therefore fall naturally into its place in the preamble and would not have to be inserted in the operative part of the resolution.

The USSR representative had pointed out that the figure quoted by the Acting Mediator was \$29,500,000 and not \$30,000,000. Mr. de Folin stated that the French and New Zealand draft resolution quoted paragraphs 22 and 23 of the Acting Mediator's report (A/689) and that if to the figure of \$29,500,000 was added the sum of \$500,000 which represented administrative expenses, the total became \$30,000,000. If, however, the USSR representative objected to that figure, the French delegation was prepared to make use of the figure of \$29,500,000, provided that only paragraph 22 of the report was mentioned in the resolution.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN thanked the representative of France for his conciliatory attitude, but pointed out that the text had been submitted jointly by the French delegation and that of New Zealand. He must consequently consider the French proposal as an amendment unless the representative of New Zealand were prepared to agree with his French colleague.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) agreed to the French proposal in order, if possible, to obtain unanimity. If, however, the USSR was unable to accept that modification, the New Zealand delegation was willing to make others in order to prevent the rejection of paragraph 2 as a whole.

Since the two delegations were in agreement, it was unnecessary to consider the French proposal as an amendment which required a separate vote.

Mr. PLAZA (Venezuela) indicated that he was prepared to accept the French and New Zealand proposal on condition that it did not involve the deletion of paragraph 2 of the operative part of the resolution; it was absolutely essential that that paragraph should be retained since it alone imposed an obligation.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that paragraph 2 of the operative part of the resolution was before the Sub-Committee and would have to be voted upon. It was at that time that the representatives of France and New Zealand would be able to make statements, if they so desired.

ANDRAOS Bey (Egypt) said that the figure quoted in the preamble could be retained quite apart from the reasons which the representatives of France and New Zealand had had for indicating it. The figure had been given by the Acting Mediator and could serve as a basic estimate. Furthermore the Egyptian representative considered that, when the operative part of the resolution was discussed it would not be possible to go below that figure since it represented a minimum.

He was prepared to accept the French and New Zealand proposal and would vote for paragraph 2 of the operative part of the resolution.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that on the previous day his delegation had expressed the wish that the Fifth Committee should examine the second paragraph of the preamble of the draft resolution submitted by France and New Zealand. His

/delegation

delegation was particularly anxious to have data on the administrative expenses; it was necessary to effect economies under that heading in order that the great proportion of the funds available could be allotted to the refugees. As long as the Fifth Committee had not given its opinion on the subject, it would be difficult to come to a decision.

He thought the second paragraph of the preamble was superfluous since paragraph 2 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution (A/C.3/315) dealt with the same question.

His delegation was prepared to accept paragraph 2 of the operative part provided always that the Fifth Committee gave its opinion on the point.

The CHAIRMAN noted that the USSR representative had raised a question of procedure in his observations. For, whereas the Sub-Committee had decided to study the two draft resolutions together, the USSR representative proposed that their examination should be suspended and the Fifth Committee be asked to give an opinion on the second paragraph of the preamble of the draft resolution submitted by France and New Zealand.

The proposal of the USSR representative was rejected by 9 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium), though fully appreciative of the point of view of the USSR representative, had nevertheless not voted for the proposal which had just been put to the vote, since he did not consider it to be in accordance with the rules of procedure of the United Nations. In order to be able to give its opinion, the Fifth Committee must have a draft before it. The Sub-Committee must consequently prepare a draft without waiting to learn the opinion of the Fifth Committee.

Mr. FLAZA (Venezuela) stated that he had abstained from voting for the reasons given by the representative of Belgium.

His delegation considered, moreover, that it was unnecessary once more to submit the question to the Fifth Committee since paragraph 2 of the operative part of the joint resolution which dealt with the same question, had already been laid before it.

Mr. WARREN (United States of America) said that for practical reasons he was opposed to retaining, in the preamble of the resolution, the second paragraph proposed by the representatives of France and

/New Zealand,

New Zealand. To quote two possibly different figures, in the same resolution might mislead both Governments and public opinion. The figure laid down by the Fifth Committee might prove to be different from that indicated by the Acting Mediator, since the situation had changed considerably since the latter had drawn up his estimates; other measures had been taken, an agreement had been concluded with various voluntary relief agencies and it had been decided to reduce the staff of the Secretariat from fifty to twenty-five.

He certainly agreed with the representatives of Venezuela and the USSR that the figure fixed by the Fifth Committee and accepted by the General Assembly should be mentioned in paragraph 2 of the operative part in order that Governments might have a basis upon which to determine their contributions.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) having asked what figure was quoted in the new text proposed by France and New Zealand, the CHAIRMAN replied that it was \$30,000,000. The new text read as follows:

"WHEREAS, according to the report of the Acting Mediator, a sum equivalent to 30 million dollars might be required between 1 December 1948 and 31 August 1949 (A/689 -- paragraphs 22 and 23)".
The above text was rejected by 7 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

Amendment submitted by Poland (A/C.3/SC.2/3) to the Joint Draft Resolution
of the Four Powers (continued)

Mr. ALTMAN (Poland) stated that he would not repeat all the arguments he had previously brought forward in support of his amendment, but that he wished merely to make a few remarks concerning the political aspects of the problem of the Palestinian refugees. It was a well-known fact that the progress report of the United Nations Mediator on Palestine, and particularly its third part, formed the basis of all the proposals before the Sub-Committee. He was therefore surprised that certain delegations had not taken into consideration the references made by that report to the close relationship between the political aspects of the Palestine problem and the position of the refugees. He quoted certain passages in support of his statement. The first paragraph of the third part of the report (A/648) read as follows: "As a result of the conflict in Palestine, almost the whole of the Arab population fled..." The fourth paragraph of that same document contained the following sentence: "Moreover, the refugee problem is intimately related to the problem of the Palestine settlement." In the tenth paragraph of the Supplement to the Progress Report (A/689), the Mediator asserted: "The period for which international relief for the refugees will be required, and the number of refugees to be cared for throughout that period will depend upon... the prospects of repatriation... etc". Regarding prospects of repatriation, the Mediator indicated in the seventh paragraph of the third part of the report (A/648): "The Provisional Government of Israel... replied... that, as long as a state of war existed, it was not in a position to re-admit on any substantial scale the Arabs who fled".

Thus no one could deny that, if the problem of Palestinian refugees existed, it was because of the political situation in Palestine, and that a solution of that problem could not be separated from a settlement of the Palestine question as a whole.

Accusations that certain delegations were attempting to obscure the problem of assistance to refugees behind ideological disputes were both unjust and unfounded. The urgency of the Palestine problem could not be ignored, and he would not conceal his opinion that the so-called humanitarian stand taken by certain delegations was really only a political stand which did nothing to help the cause of the refugees.

The Polish amendment aimed at emphasizing, on the one hand, that the refugee problem was the direct result of the existing conflict in Palestine, and, on the other hand, that a settlement of the Palestine problem as a whole at the earliest possible date was in the interests of the refugees themselves.

The measures provided for in the joint draft resolution and in the draft resolution submitted by France and New Zealand would only serve, even if they were applied, to render the situation less acute. They could not make for a permanent solution, which depended on a general settlement of the conflict in Palestine.

Mr. DAVIES (United Kingdom) stated that all delegations shared the concern expressed by the Polish representative with regard to the existing situation in Palestine. However, the draft resolution under consideration had as its sole aim the taking of the necessary measures to aid the refugees. It was not intended to study the primary causes of the present situation, and still less to find a solution. The Polish amendment, however, opened the way to a political discussion which would inevitably divert attention from the principal aim in view.

The Third Committee was not in a position to foresee how the Palestine problem would be settled, a matter with which only the Security Council and the First Committee were competent to deal.

The Polish amendment did not appear useful, therefore, as it diverted attention from the Sub-Committee's main and immediate concern. The problem it raised, moreover, did not come under the competence of the Third Committee. That amendment would only serve to open political controversies, whereas there had been unanimous agreement on the urgency of the humanitarian measures provided for under the original draft resolution.

ANDRAOS Bey (Egypt) expressed his complete agreement with the Polish representative when he had said that the refugee problem involved more than the question of immediate aid to the refugees. He himself had already stated that, though the immediate aim was to assist the refugees, it was nevertheless essential to examine later the possibilities of their economic rehabilitation and their return to their homes. It was not therefore from any lack of logic but on the basis of very real considerations that he had separated the humanitarian problem of immediate aid from the political problem of economic rehabilitation. The latter problem continued to exist. The preamble of the joint draft resolution stated that aid to refugees was "one of the minimum conditions for the success of the efforts of the United Nations to bring peace to that land..." The Mediator's report also stressed that the problem of economic rehabilitation was closely related to the solution of the Palestine problem as a whole. The Third Committee was not, however, competent to deal with the political aspects of the problem. He recalled that it had just been pointed out that the Third Committee was encroaching on the powers of the Fifth Committee which, it was asserted, was alone competent to

examine the financial implications of the resolution. Why was an attempt now being made to assign to the Third Committee the consideration of a question which did not come within its scope?

The causes underlying the present situation in Palestine were clearly political in nature. Palestine Jews and Arabs had lived together for centuries. It would have been possible at the present time to have directed military operations in such a way as to have spared half a million refugees their present fate. The responsibility for that state of affairs rested not with the Arabs or the Palestine Jews, but with extremist elements who had come from different countries and had adopted terrorism as a weapon for political expansion.

According to information he had received, whole villages, which had been evacuated by troops as well as by the civilian population, were at the present time being systematically destroyed by dynamite. On the one hand, systematic destruction making any economic rehabilitation or return home impossible was being carried out, and, on the other hand, it was being categorically stated that the question of aid to refugees was related to the problem of a rehabilitation which had been made impossible. In such circumstances, one might well ask if a deliberate attempt was not being made to delay the implementation of the measures contained in the draft resolution.

For those reasons, he stated that he would vote against the amendment submitted by the Polish delegation.

Mrs. MENON (India) said that her delegation supported the Polish amendment for the reasons put forward by the Polish representative. Her delegation had always been of the opinion that the problem of aid to refugees was closely related to a permanent settlement of the Palestine problem.

Although the draft resolution was not intended to be a study of the causes of the present conflict, it nevertheless foresaw certain practical results. The Polish amendment too, as her delegation understood it, dealt only with results, and amounted to a recommendation drawing attention to the urgency of the Palestine problem. She asked the United Kingdom representative what would happen to those 500,000 refugees after 31 August 1949. Beyond any doubt those refugees could not forever remain the responsibility of the United Nations. They would necessarily have to be given a permanent home which would probably not be in Palestine for, according to information received, there was little chance of those refugees being able to return to their homes.

By adopting the Polish amendment, the Third Committee would not in any way be encroaching upon the competence of the First Committee.

- For those reasons, her delegation supported the Polish amendment, for it considered that it fell within the duties of the Third Committee for it to make suggestions regarding the settlement of that problem. A humanitarian settlement of the refugee problem could not be envisaged separately from measures providing for their resettlement in the shortest possible time.

Mr. PLAZA (Venezuela) said that he would not repeat the arguments advanced by other delegations against the Polish amendment, which came within the competence of the First Committee. He would vote against that amendment for a simpler reason, namely, that the Sub-Committee had decided to exclude all considerations of a political nature from its deliberations. He understood the Indian delegation's concern over the urgency of the problem of rehabilitation, but that came solely within the scope of the First Committee.

Mr. BORISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that the USSR delegation supported the Polish amendment which aimed at mobilizing the efforts of the United Nations in order to put an end to the sufferings of the population in Palestine. It was useless to separate, as some did, the humanitarian from the political aspects of the problem. Clearly, by adopting that amendment, the Third Committee would not have solved the Palestine problem, but it would at least have accomplished something towards a final solution of that problem. The Polish amendment served to draw attention to the fact that humanitarian measures alone would not solve the refugee problem. Certain circles which doubtless wished the war to continue in order to satisfy their material interests, were attempting to sabotage the implementation of the draft resolution. It should not be forgotten, however, that the people of Palestine longed for peace, and that its own interests were very different.

In his opinion, the Egyptian representative had spoken in rather an aggressive spirit. In any case, his observations had only the value of a unilateral statement. Those who supported the Polish amendment were not defending any interests, in oil or in anything else. They were trying to find a radical solution of the problem. The present state of affairs was perhaps of importance to certain reactionary elements, to some limited liability companies or to certain general-staffs. It was certainly not, however, in the interests of the people of Palestine. That was why the USSR delegation supported the Polish amendment.

/Mr. DEHOUSSE

Mr. DEHOUSSE (Belgium) proposed that the Sub-Committee should hold a night session at 9 p.m.

Mr. SUTCH (New Zealand) was opposed to a night session being held without previous notice.

The Sub-Committee decided to meet at 9 p.m. as well as at 3 p.m. by 8 votes to 6, without any abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.