

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



AD HOC POLITICAL COMMITTEE 69th

MEETING

Tuesday, 5 December 1950, at 10.45 a.m.

Lake Success, New York

CONTENTS

Page

Palestine: repatriation of Palestine refugees and payment of compensation due to them (A/1323, A/1324, A/1325, A/1326, A/1346, A/1349, A/1366, A/1367, A/1367/Corr.1, A/1367/Add.1, A/AC.38/L.30, A/AC.38/L.57, A/AC.38/L.60, A/AC.38/L.62) (<i>continued</i>).....	443
---	-----

Chairman: Mr. Víctor A. BELAÚNDE (Peru).

Palestine: repatriation of Palestine refugees and payment of compensation due to them (A/1323, A/1324, A/1325, A/1326, A/1346, A/1349, A/1366, A/1367, A/1367/Corr.1, A/1367/Add.1, A/AC.38/L.30, A/AC.38/L.57, A/AC.38/L.60, A/AC.38/L.62) (*continued*)

[Item 20 (c)]*

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the attempt made to bring about an agreement between the authors of the various draft resolutions had not been successful. In the circumstances, a vote would have to be taken.

2. Lord MACDONALD (United Kingdom) said that some of the speeches made in the Committee had been full of bitterness and injustice. It was for each representative to decide to what extent he could contribute to a solution of the problem and in what way he ought to speak in order to make that contribution, but the tone of certain speeches had not helped to make the Committee's discussions any easier and the United Kingdom delegation hoped that all members of the Committee who were anxious to solve the grave problem before it would avoid bringing into the Committee's discussions that note of bitterness which could only place further difficulties in the way of the solution for which all were hoping.

3. Several draft resolutions had been submitted to the Committee. As the United Kingdom delegation had already said, it would vote against the Egyptian draft resolution (A/AC.38/L.30); nor did it feel that it could accept the joint draft resolution of Ethiopia and Pakistan (A/AC.38/L.62). Although the representatives of those two countries had approached the problem in the right spirit, their proposal treated the refugee question as an entirely separate one with no relation to the other aspects of the more general question of Palestine. Yet the Committee's discussions had shown clearly that it was impossible to disassociate the refugee

problem in that way or to come to any satisfactory solution apart from a general settlement. The repatriation of the refugees was inseparable from the settlement of the other related questions which still remained outstanding. The draft resolution submitted by Israel (A/AC.38/L.60) had the merit of advocating certain measures which should be put into effect without delay in order to settle the fate of the refugees. However, the four-Power joint draft resolution still appeared the most satisfactory to the United Kingdom delegation. Having regard to the existing circumstances, the method which it proposed was the best. Moreover, the measures provided for in the four-Power draft resolution should be endorsed in any resolution which the General Assembly might adopt on that topic, rather than be left, as the Israel draft resolution proposed, to the discretion of the Conciliation Commission. He wished to make it clear that that point of view did not in any way imply a lack of confidence in the Conciliation Commission, but was rather an expression of the desire to find the solution which would receive the greatest support from the General Assembly. In point of fact, the urgency of the problem made it essential that the General Assembly should consider it in detail.

4. For all those reasons, the United Kingdom delegation would vote against the Egyptian draft resolution, the draft resolution of Pakistan and Ethiopia and the proposal of Israel. It would vote in favour of the four-Power draft resolution.

5. Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) asked to speak on a point of order. He drew the Committee's attention to the problem raised by some of the draft resolutions which had been submitted to it. Of the four draft resolutions before the Committee, two, i.e., that submitted by Egypt and that submitted jointly by the delegations of Ethiopia and Pakistan, came within the scope of the discussion that had taken place, since they were exclusively concerned with the question of the repatriation of the refugees. The other two proposals, and in particular the four-Power draft resolution, dealt

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

not only with the return of the refugees, but also with peace negotiations and all the questions which remained outstanding between the Arab States and Israel and which bore no relation to the special problem of the refugees. The question was, therefore, whether the Committee could vote on those two proposals, which went beyond the limits of the discussion which had taken place.

6. It was true that some delegations had not limited their speeches to the refugee problem. In order to reply to the representative of Israel, he himself had had to extend the field of debate as far as that representative had already done. Nevertheless, other delegations had expressed their views only on the refugee problem and had not indicated what position they intended to take on the questions raised by certain paragraphs of the four-Power draft resolution. He wondered whether a proposal which had not been discussed as a whole could be put to the vote.

7. Moreover, assuming that the Committee voted on and adopted that draft resolution, its action would be tantamount to adopting a text which had not been previously discussed. Such a course would be most improper and the Lebanese delegation therefore regarded the problem of procedure as being of basic importance.

8. From the explanations of the French representative, recapitulated by the Turkish delegation (66th meeting), it appeared that the delegations of those two countries drew a distinction between the refugee problem, on the one hand, and those questions which remained outstanding between Israel and the Arab States on the other, but felt that neither problem could be studied in the abstract. The representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States had gone further and had not drawn any clear distinction between the two types of problem. It would therefore appear that the procedure which the Committee had previously decided to adopt on the subject had not been fully adhered to.

9. It seemed from the Committee's discussion that although a distinction in law was established between the refugee problem and the outstanding questions, a *de facto* link was nevertheless created between them. The Lebanese delegation felt that the Committee should make clear the distinction that existed in law in the legal text which it was to adopt, leaving it to the Conciliation Commission to establish, as it saw fit, the *de facto* connexion which might prove to be necessary. Thus, if the Conciliation Commission were presented with two separate resolutions, it would be able to apply them in conjunction, if, in its opinion, circumstances made it necessary.

10. The Lebanese delegation would be able to accept such a course. Moreover, that method had already been applied in the past, when the refugee problem and the territorial question had been examined together. It had been emphasized at that time that the refugees should return first to those territories which, according to the map attached to the Lausanne Protocol (A/1367, chapter I, para. 12), had been attributed to the Arabs. The refugees concerned had numbered 200,000 or 300,000 and the application of that method had made it possible virtually to solve the refugee problem. The

Lebanese delegation had admitted the logic of the argument and had accepted that mode of procedure.

11. The Lebanese delegation attached even more importance to its point since it had heard the representative of Israel refer to the Protocol of 12 May as the "so-called protocol". That text had been signed by the Arab delegations, the Israel delegation and the representatives of the three governments making up the Conciliation Commission, i.e., France, Turkey and the United States. Hence the existence of the text could not be denied and the Lebanese delegation therefore particularly requested that the summary record of the meeting in question should report the speech of the Israel representative in the precise terms in which it had been made, unless he decided to withdraw the expression. The detail had a certain importance, for it was characteristic of the general attitude of the Israel delegation, which had also denied that there had ever been any negotiations. Negotiations went through various stages: conciliation, mediation and finally direct negotiations. Thus, in replying to the Conciliation Commission's appeal and in going to Lausanne, the Arab States had entered into the first stage of negotiations. Contrary to the allegation of the representative of Israel, negotiations had taken place, as witness the various reports on that topic. The Arab States had subsequently requested mediation, which had been refused.

12. The Lebanese delegation felt that it was essential to make that point clear, in order to enlighten the Conciliation Commission which was shortly to resume its task and in order to facilitate the Commission's work.

13. It was important to establish an unequivocal distinction between the refugee problem and all other outstanding questions, and on the Committee's decision might perhaps depend the future of all its work on that point. All the members of the Committee should be conscious of the fact that it was by letting an ambiguity subsist that the Palestine problem had been allowed to take the turn it had taken.

14. Mr. SHARETT (Israel), intervening on a point of order, asked the Chairman to make it clear whether the general discussion was closed or not. If so, the speech of the Lebanese representative went beyond a point of order; if not, he would like to reply to some of the Lebanese representative's comments.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that the general discussion was closed and requested the Lebanese representative to confine himself to his point of order.

16. Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) bowed to the opinion of the Chair and urged the Committee to accord the problem to which he had drawn attention all the importance it deserved.

17. Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria) stated that the Chairman had frequently pointed out that the Committee was at present dealing only with sub-item 20 (c) of the General Assembly agenda, the sub-item relating to the repatriation of the refugees, payment of compensation due to them and implementation of General Assembly resolutions regarding that question. The general discussion on that part had been closed. The four-Power joint draft resolution (A/AC.38/L.57), however, dealt with both sub-item 20 (c) and

(d). Sub-item 20 (d) had not been considered by the Committee, which had been authorized to study the Conciliation Commission's report only in so far as it dealt with the refugee problem.

18. The question was of great importance. The Syrian delegation had stated several times that it reserved the right to make all the observations it considered necessary on the problem of peace and negotiations—sub-item 20 (d)—when that problem was raised. It had confined its statement to the refugee problem with that reservation. In operative paragraph 1, however, the four-Power draft resolution spoke of the peaceful settlement of all questions outstanding between Israel and the Arab States. The refugee problem was not the only problem outstanding between the parties concerned; there were quite a number of such problems. But even if it were admitted that the refugee problem and the problem of peace were connected, it would be impossible to take a decision on the matter without preliminary discussion, and in so general and vague a form as appeared in the joint draft resolution. The Syrian Government for its part was quite prepared to negotiate, provided that all the parties were given the opportunity to express their points of view on the matters still outstanding between Israel and the Arab States which had not been considered at all during the debate in the Committee. If that condition was not fulfilled, negotiations would be impossible.

19. Delegations must therefore be given an opportunity of stating their attitude on the subject and submitting proposals likely to produce fruitful results.

20. Furthermore, when the General Assembly had transmitted to the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee the Conciliation Commission's report dated 2 September (A/1367, A/1367/Corr.1), it had sent with it the supplementary report dated 23 October 1950 (A/1367/Add.1); in accordance with paragraphs 13 and 5 of resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948, the Security Council was the competent body to consider the Conciliation Commission's reports concerning negotiations. That was also confirmed by the fact that the Conciliation Commission's reports, and especially the supplementary report, had been submitted to the Security Council. It was known further that, according to Article 12 of the Charter, the General Assembly could not discuss a question which was before the Security Council unless the Council informed it that the Council was no longer seized of the question.

21. It appeared therefore that sub-item 20 (d) had not been considered by the Committee and that it covered a considerable number of problems quite unrelated to the refugee problem. Those problems had not been discussed, and a discussion lasting for at least one meeting would be necessary to enable the Committee to ascertain the position of the various delegations with regard to them. For the time being, the Committee had decided to consider only sub-item 20 (c), namely, the refugee problem. Its decision could be changed only by a vote showing a two-thirds majority in favour of such a change. For all those reasons the four-Power draft resolution, which referred to a number of problems that had not yet been considered, was not admissible unless the Committee arranged for a debate.

22. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) said that the discussion, which had been closed at the 68th meeting, related to

sub-item 20 (c). If the representative of the United Kingdom wished to link that question with other problems covered by sub-item 20 (d), so as to connect the two, the discussion would have to be reopened. The Iraq delegation had not had an opportunity to express its point of view on the report and work of the Conciliation Commission, and had confined itself to a consideration of sub-item 20 (c).

23. In the opinion of the Iraq delegation, the refugee question related exclusively to the right of the Arabs of Palestine to repatriation; and the question whether or not the Arab States desired to negotiate did not arise. His government's attitude would depend on the manner in which the Arabs of Palestine were treated. If the Iraq Government found that the Arabs of Palestine were treated fairly, it would agree to enter into peace negotiations. For the time being, he thought it preferable, in the interests of peace in the Middle East, to distinguish between the two questions.

24. Mr. DEJANY (Saudi Arabia) recalled that the Chairman had already intervened three or four times at previous meetings to explain that the discussion was on sub-item 20 (c). He (Mr. Dejany) had wished to make the conciliatory gesture of providing some delegations with an opportunity of dealing with certain aspects of the problem which they felt might be connected with the refugee problem. It was, however, to be understood that sub-item 20 (d) was to be considered separately.

25. He was therefore surprised at the attitude adopted by some of his colleagues. If the Committee voted for the four-Power draft resolution, it would by doing so adopt a resolution relating to sub-item 20 (d) before there had been any discussion of that subject, and prejudice the debate on that sub-item.

26. He therefore asked the Chairman to make it clear whether the Committee was going to consider sub-item 20 (d) or whether the vote on the draft resolution would preclude consideration of that sub-item. He would also like to know what effect the vote on the draft resolution might have on the subsequent consideration of the questions covered by sub-item 20 (d).

27. Lord MACDONALD (United Kingdom) said that if delegations thought they could not vote on the four-Power draft resolution because some of its clauses had not been discussed, his delegation would have no objection to an extension of the discussion, provided, however, that the purpose of the argument advanced in favour of the reopening of the discussion was not to evade the difficulty. They should avoid a situation in which the Committee would decide not to vote on the draft resolution under consideration and subsequently find it impossible to vote on it on the pretext that part of the problem had already been settled by the vote on the Egyptian draft resolution or the joint draft submitted by Ethiopia and Pakistan. The delegation of the United Kingdom would not lend itself to a manoeuvre of that kind.

28. He recalled that at its 24th meeting, the Committee had decided to consider sub-items 20 (b) and (c) after dealing with the question of the relation of the Member States with Spain. At its 31st meeting, the Committee had decided that if the chapter on refugees in the report of the Conciliation Commission was discussed in the debate on sub-items 20 (b) and (c),

the refugee question should not be discussed when sub-item 20 (d) was dealt with. At the same meeting, the Cuban representative had proposed that sub-items 20 (c) and (d) should be considered together, but had then withdrawn his proposal. There had therefore been no decision whether sub-items 20 (c) and (d) should be considered together or separately. A decision could be reached on that point so as to give satisfaction to the delegations of Syria, Iraq and Saudi Arabia. The delegation of the United Kingdom would therefore agree to an extension of the discussion on sub-item 20 (c) before the draft resolution was put to the vote. It would be for the Chairman to decide.

29. MUSTAFA Bey (Egypt) did not share the point of view of the representative of the United Kingdom on the discussion of sub-item 20 (d). He considered that the matter under consideration related to sub-item 20 (c). The Committee had before it the refugee question, which had been included in the Assembly's agenda at the request of four Arab States. The Committee had before it four draft resolutions, two of which dealt only with sub-item 20 (c), whereas the other two were of more general reference and deal with sub-items 20 (c) and (d). It was for the Chairman to decide whether the Committee should deal with sub-item 20 (c) when it voted on the draft resolutions under consideration. In his opinion, the Committee was dealing only with sub-item 20 (c). The question of the Conciliation Commission's report (A/1367) to which sub-item 20 (d) referred, had not yet been considered.

30. Moreover, he would like to point out to the Committee that his delegation had just submitted a revised draft resolution bearing the document number A/AC.38/L.30/Rev.1. The original draft resolution submitted by Egypt (A/AC.38/L.30) had proposed, in operative paragraph 1, the establishment of a United Nations agency for the repatriation and compensation of Palestine refugees. The revision consisted in adding, after word "Resolves" in operative paragraph 1, the words "to request the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine".

31. Mr. COOPER (United States of America) referred to the point of procedure raised by the representative of Lebanon. First he would like to make it clear that in the opinion of the United States delegation the operative paragraph 1 of the four-Power draft resolution related to sub-item 20 (c). It did not affect the subsequent consideration of sub-item 20 (d) by the Committee. The United States delegation reserved its position with regard to the discussion of that sub-item and was of the opinion that operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution under consideration would simply provide a satisfactory solution of the question referred to in sub-item 20 (c). Generally speaking, he considered that when matters might be dealt with in connexion with different items on the agenda, the Committee should not refrain from dealing with them on the grounds that they were already covered by another item of the agenda. He therefore thought that the draft resolution submitted by the four Powers should be voted on because operative paragraph 1 related to sub-item 20 (c). The United States delegation asked that a vote should be taken on the draft resolutions that had been submitted.

32. Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria) said he did not altogether share the point of view of the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States.

33. The representative of the United Kingdom had said that sub-item 20 (d) had not been fully discussed and that therefore he would not object to a discussion. He had suggested that the Committee should consider sub-items 20 (c) and (d) at the same time. Moreover, the representative of the United Kingdom had stated that the four-Power draft resolution related to sub-items 20 (c) and (d). He (Mr. Zeineddine) shared the view that, on the one hand, sub-item 20 (d) had not yet been considered and, that on the other hand, the four-Power draft resolution related to sub-items 20 (c) and (d).

34. Nevertheless, his opinion differed from those of the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States in that, in his view, the Committee, after completing the discussion of sub-item 20 (c), should vote on that sub-item, and then devote at least one meeting to the consideration of sub-item 20 (d), on which it should then vote. The fact was that operative paragraph 1 of the four-Power joint resolution went beyond the limits of sub-item 20 (c), although it had been claimed that the refugee question was connected with the question of the attainment of peace.

35. In conclusion, he remarked that any proposal suggesting the modification of the procedure followed by the Committee should be made the subject of a motion to be submitted for the Committee's consideration.

36. Lord MACDONALD (United Kingdom) pointed out that the revised draft resolution submitted by Egypt (A/AC.38/L.30/Rev.1) raised a difficulty.

37. Paragraph 1 of that draft resolution had been modified and the new text provided that the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine should be requested to establish an agency for the repatriation and compensation of the refugees. He thought that paragraph should be considered before they voted on the draft resolution, and that it should be considered for the same reasons as those which the Syrian representative had advanced when he stated that the Committee could not vote on sub-item 20 (d) before it had been discussed.

38. The CHAIRMAN said that he would try to make the situation clear and asked the Secretary to read first an account of the decisions which had been taken at previous meetings.

39. Mr. CHAI (Secretary of the Committee) recalled first of all that at its 24th meeting held on 28 October, the Committee had decided to examine sub-items (b) and (c) of item 20, concerning the question of Palestine. He also recalled the proposal submitted by the Cuban delegation at the 31st meeting, suggesting that sub-item 20 (d) should be considered at the same time as sub-items 20 (b) and (c). The representatives of Syria and Greece had opposed that procedure and had suggested that the Committee should decide that if chapter III of the Conciliation Commission's report (A/1367) dealing with refugees was examined when sub-items 20 (b) and (c) were studied, the refugee question should not be examined again when sub-paragraph 20 (d) came up for discussion. The matter had been raised again at the 61st meeting. The Chairman had

then proposed that the Committee should adopt the course suggested by the representative of Saudi Arabia and should limit the discussion to sub-item 20 (c) and chapter III of the Conciliation Commission's report, regarding refugees.

40. The CHAIRMAN stated that he had decided not to combine sub-items 20 (c) and (d) because the Lebanese representative had pointed out that the Conciliation Commission's report dealt not only with refugees but also with other important matters such as the territorial question. He had also agreed with the Lebanese representative when the latter had shown that a report was an indivisible whole and that it was difficult to deal with one part separately. In practice, it was not possible to isolate sub-item 20 (d) completely. It was, however, possible as far as sub-item 20 (c) was concerned, to take from the Conciliation Commission's report all matters connected with refugees and certain other related points which could be dealt with at the same time. The Committee could discuss the draft resolutions which referred to the refugees and which considered certain aspects of the problem as they were presented in the Conciliation Commission's report. It was on the basis of those considerations that the Committee had continued its discussion.

41. In fact, the discussion had ranged over a large number of questions, including the territorial question and the question of the origin of the State of Israel. In order to place all representatives on an equal footing, the Chair had been forced to allow replies to certain allusions.

42. He recalled that the four-Power draft resolution and the Israel draft resolution referred to sub-item 20 (d) because that sub-item also dealt with the problem of refugees, as was shown in chapter III of the Conciliation Commission's report. The four-Power draft resolution was concerned mainly with the refugee problem. Not only the preamble but also paragraphs 2 and 3 made specific reference to that problem. The only point which was open to question was operative paragraph 1. He felt that that paragraph contained a general statement which was simply the expression of a desire for peace and which did not prejudice the problems which would be discussed in detail by the Committee when it studied sub-item 20 (d). If the authors of the four-Power draft resolution thought that the statement referred simply to the desire for peace expressed in resolution 194 (III) and did not constitute a judgment on the other problems which the Committee had not yet discussed, the Committee could not refuse on procedural grounds to vote on it.

43. If, on the other hand, paragraph 1 meant the discussion of problems which were still to be considered in greater detail, it would be necessary to open the discussion on the Commission's report and not to vote on the draft resolutions until the discussion on sub-item 20 (d) had been completed.

44. He himself felt that the Committee had before it some draft resolutions which concerned only sub-item 20 (c). He therefore asked the members of the Committee not to show an excessive regard for form. Polemics should give way to the interests of the refugees. It might almost be said that the Committee's prestige was at stake.

45. In consequence, he felt that it would be preferable to vote on the draft resolutions now before the Committee. The Committee could then deal with sub-item 20 (d), which would give an opportunity for general discussion.

46. Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) thanked the Chairman for his statement of the position. He had remarked that the United States delegation had said that the four-Power draft resolution came within the scope of the question appearing under sub-item 20 (c) of the General Assembly agenda. If so, and if paragraph 1 of the draft resolution also came within the scope of that sub-item, it would be necessary, when the Committee came to study sub-item 20 (d), for the four Powers, or other delegations, to submit another draft resolution. On the other hand, if paragraph 1 of the draft resolution included sub-item 20 (d), it would not be possible to submit a new text when the Committee came to study that point. In his opinion, that was undoubtedly what would happen. He would have liked the Committee to draw a clear distinction between the paragraphs on the refugee problem and the other paragraphs. Another solution would have been to ask the four Powers themselves to submit two draft resolutions, one concerning refugees and the second the other aspects of the problem. If the representatives of the four Powers were willing to proceed thus, the Lebanese delegation would be able to vote in favour of the paragraphs which would constitute the resolution concerning refugees only. Otherwise, he would probably have to return to the solution envisaged by the Syrian representative.

47. Mr. SHARETT (Israel) thought that the procedural debate which had just taken place clearly showed how utterly artificial and impracticable it was to separate the two aspects of the problem. The delegation of Israel had always affirmed that the urgent problem of the refugees could be fully solved only within the framework of a comprehensive and lasting peace settlement. Other representatives had claimed during the meeting that the refugee question should be solved separately first, before any negotiations for a peace settlement were embarked upon.

48. The Committee had thus been dragged into a vicious circle. In order to escape from the situation, the Committee must adopt only texts drafted with the greatest care, for, if two distinct resolutions were adopted by the same organ—the General Assembly—each party would be able to insist that the resolution which better answered his requirements had priority over the other. Confusion would thus be complete.

49. The interests of the refugees made it essential that the two aspects of the problem should not be separated. The delegation of Israel had no intention of appealing against the Chairman's decision with regard to the Committee's order of work; however, since it had been agreed to examine also within the general scope of sub-item 20 (c), that part of the Conciliation Commission's report dealing with the refugee question, the delegation of Israel felt that it was authorized to refer to the intervention of the Conciliation Commission in that matter. He quoted paragraph 11 of the supplementary report of the Conciliation Commission (A/1367/Add.1) which said, *inter alia*, that the General Assembly should urge the parties to engage without delay in direct negotia-

tions and that in those negotiations priority should be given to a consideration of the refugee question.

50. Since the discussion had ranged over the widest aspects of the question, if not the entire field, the Committee was now in a position to vote on the four draft resolutions that had been submitted to it.

51. In reply to a question from Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon), the CHAIRMAN recalled that during the exchanges of views in the working party which had unofficially undertaken to seek possibilities of amalgamating the draft resolutions, the United States representative had said that operative paragraph 1 of the four-Power draft resolution did not in any way constitute a condition to which the settlement of the refugee question or the working of the organ it was proposed to create would be subject. The provision simply stressed the atmosphere in which, in practice, a solution of the problem should be sought.

52. It followed from that that paragraph 1 of the joint draft resolution was not connected with the topic of sub-item 20 (d) of the agenda, which would be examined at a later date.

53. Mr. COOPER (United States of America) explained that in his delegation's opinion, paragraph 1 of the four-Power draft resolution was in no way intended to deny refugees the right to return to their homes or to make the settlement of the refugee question subordinate to the settlement of other problems. However, the United States delegation felt that progress could be achieved simultaneously. In other words, the paragraph came wholly and solely under sub-item 20 (c) of the agenda.

54. Like other delegations, the four Powers had submitted a draft resolution which they regarded as being the best means of reaching a solution of the refugee problem and the payment of the compensation due to the refugees; they felt for their part that the provisions of paragraph 1 of their draft resolution would help to solve the question contained in sub-item 20 (c).

55. Those delegations which did not agree with the authors of the four-Power draft resolution, moreover, were at liberty to vote against paragraph 1 or against the proposal as a whole when the draft resolution was put to the vote.

56. Moreover, the fact of adopting, within the scope of sub-item 20 (c), the provisions of the joint draft resolution, would simply be an indication of the steps to be taken when sub-item 20 (d) came up for consideration.

57. Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa) noted that in the view of some delegations, the four-Power draft resolution and that of Israel contained provisions which had not yet been discussed. Although the South African delegation thought that the various aspects of the problem had been touched upon during the discussions, he feared that if the draft resolutions before the Committee were put to the vote forthwith, the delegations from the Arab States might feel that they were being unjustly treated.

58. In those circumstances, he returned to the suggestion of the Syrian and United Kingdom representatives and proposed that the vote on the four draft resolutions before the Committee should be postponed;

and that the Committee should give one meeting to those parts of the Conciliation Commission's report which had not yet been discussed in detail. Following that discussion, the Committee could take a decision on the draft resolutions which were already before it and on any new proposals.

59. Mr. DEJANY (Saudi Arabia) said that if the South African proposal were adopted, the agreement made at the beginning of the discussion of that question would be violated. That agreement was particularly intended to separate sub-items 20 (c) and (d) on the agenda and to consider separate resolutions on those points. To adopt the procedure now suggested meant treating unjustly the delegations which had proposed that the two questions should be dealt with separately.

60. Mr. AMMOUN (Lebanon) thought that the formalities of procedure could not be ignored as they were the guardians of the law. He insisted that the return of the refugees was a principle which admitted of no dispute and could not be subject to any negotiation. The direct discussions referred to in the draft resolution of the four Powers obviously related to other problems. Consequently, that provision went beyond sub-item 20 (c) of the agenda.

61. Moreover, the discussions would be lengthy even if they took place in a favourable atmosphere. If the solution of the refugee problem depended upon the result of those discussions, the least that could be said was that the interests of the refugees would be completely disregarded. For those reasons, he supported the suggestion of the Syrian representative.

62. Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria) thought that although operative paragraph 1 of the four-Power draft resolution did not, as the United States representative had stated, deal with sub-item 20 (d), there was no need to mention in the heading of the draft that it related to sub-items 20 (c) and (d), as all the other provisions of that draft concerned sub-item 20 (c).

63. Furthermore, if the Committee considered the various questions together, it should also begin the consideration of the question of the internationalization of Jerusalem which was, in some respects, equally related to the refugee problem.

64. Consequently the choice was as follows: either the Committee must note that draft resolutions which related to both sub-items 20 (c) and (d) of the agenda were unacceptable because only sub-item 20 (c) was at present under discussion, or it should undertake a more thorough study of the various aspects of sub-item 20 (d), in regard to which some delegations had not yet stated their views.

65. The CHAIRMAN thought that operative paragraph 1 of the four-Power draft resolution particularly concerned sub-item 20 (c) of the agenda, and was intended merely to suggest the atmosphere in which the problems should be solved.

66. Delegations which could not agree to the provisions of that paragraph could vote against it and explain their respective positions. They also had the right to submit amendments which they deemed necessary.

67. That being understood, the Committee could consequently take decisions without further delay on the various proposals which were before it.

68. Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria) thought that it would be difficult to submit amendments to a proposal related to a question which had not yet been discussed. It would be equally difficult to vote on such a proposal. Delegations should therefore be given the opportunity to state their opinions on all the questions dealt with in certain draft resolutions. In that connexion, he shared the views of the United Kingdom and South African representatives.

69. The CHAIRMAN observed that he had not yet put to the vote the formal proposal of the South African representative, in view of the objection of the Saudi Arabian representative, apparently raised on behalf of the Arab States.

70. Mr. CHENG (China) suggested a means of overcoming the procedural difficulties. As the Committee

had previously decided to limit the discussion to sub-item 20 (c) and to chapter III of the Conciliation Commission's report, it could decide whether the four-Power draft resolution (A/AC.38/L.57) and the Israel draft resolution (A/AC.38/L.60) were acceptable. If it decided that those drafts were acceptable, the discussion of sub-item 20 (d) would automatically be open. If it decided to the contrary, the Committee would be seized only of the draft resolution of Ethiopia and Pakistan (A/AC.38/L.62) and the revised Egyptian draft (A/AC.38/L.30/Rev.1).

71. Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria) suggested that the meeting should be adjourned.

That proposal was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.