

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PALESTINE

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FORTY-FOURTH MEETING (PRIVATE)

Held at the United Nations Building, Geneva,  
on Tuesday, 5 August 1947, at 4.00 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. Entezam	(Iran)
	Mr. Spits	(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 4.00 p.m.

Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Consideration of the First Report of Sub-Committee Three (Document A/AC.13/ - SC.3/3): Item 2 of the Agenda.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Delegate of Australia, in his capacity as Chairman of Sub-Committee Three, had circulated a letter containing the Sub-Committee's proposed terms of reference for the visit to displaced persons' assembly centres in Germany and Austria.

Mr. RAND (Canada) asked whether the terms of reference precluded numerical estimates of the displaced persons.

Mr. HOOD (Australia) explained that the Sub-Committee had considered it more convenient to have simple terms of reference, but it was understood that matters of the kind mentioned by the Delegate of Canada would be examined.

Mr. RAND (Canada) asked whether the mental and physical condition of the displaced persons would be noted.

48  
/Mr. HOOD

Mr. HOOD (Australia) said their condition would be noted in so far as it was relevant to the purpose of the Committee.

DECISION:

The terms of reference proposed by Sub-Committee Three were accepted.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that adoption of the Sub-Committee's report would not preclude adaptation of both the itinerary and the working plan to circumstances that could not be foreseen.

Mr. HOOD (Australia) agreed, and added that the proposed questionnaire also was not intended to be rigid. The Sub-Committee felt that the visit should be restricted to seven or eight days.

DECISION:

The first report of Sub-Committee Three was adopted.

The SECRETARY said the Sub-Committee had been offered a choice between two planes, costing respectively 900 pounds and 1200 pounds. An answer from the British authorities stated that the military authorities in the British occupation zones had been instructed to give all facilities to the members of the Sub-Committee, and the Government of the United States of America had sent instructions in the same sense to the American zones. It was expected that the Sub-Committee would be able to leave Geneva on the morning of Thursday, 8 August.

Letter from the United Kingdom Government Concerning the Attendance of a Minister or Senior Representative before the Committee

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to a letter of 30 July 1947 from Downing Street indicating the United Kingdom Government's attitude towards a possible request from the Committee for evidence from a Minister or senior Government representative. He felt that a request for the attendance of such a representative should not be made unless the Committee found it necessary.

Sir Abdur RAHMAN (India) agreed with the view expressed by the Chair, pointing out that if a representative were needed the Committee could call on the liaison officer.

DECISION:

It was agreed that no action should at present be taken on the letter from the Government of the United Kingdom.

Work Programme for Preparation of the Committee's Report: Item 3 of the Agenda

Sir Abdur RAHMAN (India) did not think the Committee had expected that anything in the nature of the Chairman's Memorandum on the Genesis of the Palestine Question and its Character would have been put before it at the present stage. He questioned the value of presenting a preliminary report before the Committee had discussed the fundamentals, and suggested that a decision be taken forthwith on who should be the reporter or reporting committee.

The CHAIRMAN explained that his Memorandum was intended only as a basis of discussion, and not as part of the report. He regretted that the second portion of the Memorandum had not been circulated earlier. Had it been studied beforehand, a discussion might have indicated whether or not the members of the Committee had the same general view as was expressed in the Memorandum.

Mr. RAND (Canada) wondered whether a question of that sort could be dealt with before controversial points had been thrashed out: he felt that the Committee should know the views of its members before taking any step to prepare a report.

The CHAIRMAN said his Memorandum should not be taken as preparation for a report: it showed how he saw the question to be solved.

Mr. RAND (Canada) considered the Committee ought to be round a table, getting to grips with the problem.

Sir Abdur RAHMAN (India) said he felt that the facts - as distinct from the opinions - in the Peel Commission's report would be more or less acceptable to the Committee, which might determine in the course of its discussions what other facts should be stated.

The CHAIRMAN was not convinced that it would be wise to refer only to the Peel Commission's report. The Committee should certainly give a short explanation of the facts on which its report would be based.

Mr. RAND (Canada) considered that if the Committee first explored the whole question it would be able to see it in better perspective: meanwhile nothing should be put on paper.

Sir Abdur RAHMAN (India) proposed that the Chairman's Memorandum remain in abeyance until a decision had been reached on certain fundamentals; the

/document might

document might then be taken into account by the reporting committee. Meanwhile he felt that the members of the Committee should meet privately and discuss the main points. When they began to make decisions, reporters could be called in.

The CHAIRMAN had no objection to the procedure indicated by the Delegate of India, but pointed out that acceptance of the working paper had been on another basis.

Mr. HOOD (Australia) supported the proposal of the Delegate of India to have an initial period of informal discussion.

Replying to Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran), the CHAIRMAN said he understood the idea to be that before proceeding according to the programme already drawn up, the members of the Committee would have an informal exchange of views.

Mr. RAND (Canada) considered that the entire discussion, pending the reaching of agreed views, should be on an informal basis.

Mr. SALAZAR (Peru) favoured a frank, private interchange of opinions.

Mr. HOOD (Australia) and Sir Abdur RAHMAN (India) felt that despite the informality of the discussions they should not be unplanned, but should proceed from point to point in a coherent and logical way.

DECISION:

It was agreed to adjourn and recommence forthwith on a basis of informal discussion among all members of the Committee, without records.

The meeting adjourned at 5.05 p.m.

---