

GENERAL
ASSEMBLYASSEMBLEE
GENERALEA/AC.13/SR.28
15 July 1947

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

~~SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PALESTINE~~

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH MEETING (PRIVATE)

Held at the Y.M.C.A. Building, Jerusalem,
Sunday, 13 July 1947, at 12.15 p.m.*

Present:

Chairman: Mr. Sandstrom	(Sweden)
Mr. Hood	(Australia)
Mr. Rand	(Canada)
Mr. Lisicky	(Czechoslovakia)
Mr. Garcia Granados	(Guatemala)
Sir Abdur Rahman	(India)
Mr. Entazam	(Iran)
Mr. Blom	(Netherlands)
Mr. Garcia Salazar	(Peru)
Mr. Fabregat	(Uruguay)
Mr. Simic	(Yugoslavia)

Secretariat: Mr. Hoo (Assistant Secretary-General)
Mr. Garcia Robles (Secretary).

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 12.15 p.m.

Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Consideration of Third Report of Sub-Committee Two1. Applications for oral hearings from Organizations

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands), Chairman of Sub-committee Two, called the attention of members to the Third Report of Sub-committee Two** and informed members that the Subcommittee recommended that hearings should be granted to the Manufacturers' Association of Palestine, Tel-Aviv, and to Mr. Shertok, on behalf of the Jewish Agency. As regards the latter, he stated that the Sub-committee recommended the hearing of Mr. Shertok on the understanding that his statement would be limited to a continuation of the general case put forward by the Jewish Agency. The recommendation thus implied that if Mr. Shertok dealt with other evidence the Chairman would have discretion to limit his remarks.

SIR ABDUR RAHMAN (India) felt it would be wrong, in view of all
/that had

* The meeting was held later than indicated in the Provisional Agenda
(Document A/AC.13/43)

** Document A/AC.13/SC.2/9

that had been said on behalf of the Jewish Agency, to grant Mr. Shertok the opportunity of criticizing other testimony submitted before the Committee unless others were given a similar right. However he had no objections to Mr. Shertok's being given a further hearing provided he confined himself to the Jewish Agency's case.

DECISION:

The above recommendations by Subcommittee Two were adopted.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands) dealt with the applications for hearings from the Democratic Club, Tel-Aviv, and from the League for Peace with Justice in Palestine, and explained why the Subcommittee had recommended their rejection.

DECISION:

The above recommendation by Subcommittee Two was adopted.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands) referred to the Subcommittee's recommendation regarding the Alliance Israélite Universelle of Paris and the Anglo-Jewish Association of London.

DECISION:

The recommendation of Subcommittee Two that the Alliance Israélite Universelle of Paris and the Anglo-Jewish Association of London be informed that the Committee did not consider their testimony of sufficient urgency to justify a hearing in Palestine, but that the question of inviting them to testify in Geneva would be considered at a later date, was adopted.

II. Applications for oral hearings from individuals.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands) recapitulated the recommendations of the Subcommittee as set out in Document A/AC.13/SC.2/9, page 2, pointing out that Mr. Fabregat had disagreed with the decisions of the Subcommittee in three cases. Two of these cases dealt with the emergency regulations, and although the Committee earlier had taken a decision on the matter, Mr. Fabregat favoured granting a hearing to the three individuals concerned. As regards the emergency regulations the Subcommittee thought it advisable to ask the Palestine Government to provide general information, as, for instance, the number of people detained in Kenya, the number of people put on trial, the number of cases still under investigation, etc..

The Chairman asked members whether they approved the recommendation of the Subcommittee not to grant a hearing to the individuals listed

on pages 2 and 3 of the Subcommittee's Report, with the exception on those indicated on page 4.

DECISION:

The above recommendation of Subcommittee Two was adopted.

(a) Hearing of Carmela Shmidt

Mr. FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that in the Subcommittee he had expressed the opinion that the Committee was obtaining the views of almost all sections of the population with one exception, namely, those persons who had been sent to political prisons or to detention camps. These were the people who bore the brunt of the whole problem, and their hearing would be in accordance with the decision of the General Assembly. These people had valuable information to give to the Committee, particularly for the report to be submitted to the General Assembly.

Mr. GARCIA GRANADOS (Guatemala) and Mr. SIMIC (Yugoslavia) endorsed the view of Mr. Fabregat.

Mr. LISICKY (Czechoslovakia) enquired whether the twelve-year old Carmela Shmidt had been recommended for a hearing because of the contents of her petition or because of her age.

A vote was taken by a show of hands on Mr. Fabregat's proposal to grant a hearing to Carmela Shmidt.

DECISION:

The proposal was rejected: three votes in favour and eight against.

(b) Hearing of Captain Helpern

Mr. GARCIA GRANADOS (Guatemala) said that Captain Helpern had been described as a vice-chairman of an organisation to arm the Jews and as one who maintained that the Jewish Agency did not represent the whole Hebrew population of Palestine. Although he disagreed with this view, it would be interesting to hear him. For these reasons, he supported Mr. Fabregat's proposal to grant Captain Helpern a hearing.

At the CHAIRMAN's request, Mr. Stavropoulos (Assistant Secretary) gave a brief outline of the memorandum sent by Captain Helpern.

A vote was taken by a show of hands on Mr. Fabregat's proposal to grant a hearing to Captain Helpern.

DECISION:

DECISION:

The proposal was rejected: three votes in favour and eight against.

(c) Hearing of Dr. Heppner

A vote was taken by a show of hands on Mr. Fabregat's proposal to grant a hearing to Dr. Heppner.

DECISION:

The proposal was rejected: two votes in favour and nine against.

(d) Hearing of Captain Lifshitz

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands) suggested that Captain Lifshitz, who wished to make a statement regarding the war record of Jewish soldiers, might be given a hearing before a subcommittee. As an alternative, he suggested to let him appear as a witness of Mr. Shertok.

Mr. GARCIA SALAZAR (Peru) proposed that no hearing should be given to the applicant.

A vote was taken on Mr. Garcia Salazar's proposal that no hearing be given to Captain Lifshitz either before a subcommittee or at a public meeting of the Committee.

DECISION:

The proposal was adopted: six votes in favour.

Information on the enforcement of security measures in Palestine

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands) stated that Subcommittee Two had suggested to invite the Government of Palestine to submit a written statement on the enforcement of security measures in Palestine.

The CHAIRMAN requested that if the proposal were adopted, members should then communicate to him or to the Secretariat any question they would like to put in this respect in addition to the request for general information.

DECISION:

After discussion the proposal of Subcommittee Two was adopted.

Memorandum submitted by Captain Kotz and Mr. Rost

Mr. HOOD (Australia) pointed out that the memorandum by Captain Kotz was available to members. As he considered the proposal neither practical nor acceptable, a false impression might be given if it were singled out and distributed,

tributed, as proposed in the Subcommittee's report.

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands) stated that the Subcommittee had suggested distribution of this proposal because it was of quite a different character from the others.

DECISION:

The proposal by Subcommittee Two that the memoranda submitted by Captain Kotz and Mr. Rost be distributed to the Committee was adopted.

III. Question of obtaining further information from the Government of Palestine

Mr. BLOM (Netherlands) stated that Subcommittee Two wished to draw the attention of the Committee to the question as to whether the Government of Palestine should be invited to furnish further information either in written or oral form. Furthermore, the Committee should decide whether questions should be addressed to the Government based on the testimony of other witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN declared that he must first ask the Government what their attitude was. He understood that the Government was considering answering certain points raised by the Jewish Agency and other witnesses and as to whether such reply should be in writing or by oral testimony.

DECISION:

The Committee agreed that before deciding this question the Chairman should seek the advice of the Government as to what they desired to do.

Request by the Representative of Guatemala for a Legal Adviser to answer questions on the Emergency Regulations.

The CHAIRMAN referred to a letter from Mr. Horowitz, who said that, in accordance with a request by Mr. Garcia Granados, a Legal Adviser was now ready to appear before the Committee to answer questions on the Emergency Regulations.

Mr. GARCIA GRANADOS (Guatemala) said that, after the questions he had put to Mr. Eliash^x, that was now unnecessary.

Telegram from Mr. Friedman^{xx} from Cyprus.

The CHAIRMAN referred to a telegram from Dr. Friedman from Cyprus urging the Committee to reconsider its decision on the visit to the Cyprus Camp. He explained that he had met Dr. Friedman and found that the latter was going to
/investigate

x Document A/AC.13/P.V.24, pages 64 ff.
xx Document A/AC.13/NC/53.

investigate the situation in the Cyprus Camp. He had requested a summary of Dr. Friedman's report and he saw no reason why the Committee should take up the matter again.

Mr. GARCIA GRANADOS (Guatemala) suggested that the Committee should make contact with the representatives of the Hashomer Hatzair and the Ahdut Avoda, which, according to Mr. Vilner of the Communist Party of Palestine, had been forbidden by the Jewish Agency to give evidence before the Committee, in order to obtain their points of view.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Secretary) pointed out that the Committee would hear the League for Arab-Jewish Rapprochement, which included the Hashomer Hatzair.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that Subcommittee Two should enquire into the Ahdut Avoda and report back to the Committee on whether a hearing should be given to that party.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:05 p.m.