



---

UNITED NATIONS CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE  
SUMMARY RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIFTH MEETING  
Held in New York on 22 November 1950, at 11 a.m.

Present

Mr. ARAS	(Turkey)	Chairman
Mr. BOISANGER	(France)	
Mr. PALMER	(United States)	
Mr. de AZCARATE		Principal Secretary

Exchange of views on the [draft resolution](#) sponsored by the delegations of France, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States; memorandum prepared by the Secretariat.

Mr. PALMER (United States) informed the Commission of some changes which had been made in the draft [resolution](#) as a result of further discussions between the sponsoring delegations and the delegations of some of the governments concerned.

Although he would have preferred to see the resolution presented earlier, Mr. Palmer thought that the procedure which had been followed would have the advantage of securing for the Commission the full co-operation of the Governments concerned whose views had been incorporated in the draft [resolution](#).

The PRINCIPAL SECRETARY stated that the memorandum which was before the Commission had been prepared by the Secretariat as a preliminary list of points which would, require action or decision by the Commission if the draft [resolution](#) were adopted.

With regard to the first point mentioned — an approach to the parties in connection with direct negotiations — the CHAIRMAN felt that the Committee of Experts on Compensation and the new committee to be formed under the terms of the [resolution](#) should be set in operation as soon as possible. It would be desirable for the Commission to receive a preliminary report from the Committee on Compensation, and some indications from the new committee, before deciding on its approach to the Governments. A point which might be stressed by the Commission in its discussions with the Governments concerned was that the [resolution](#) should be carried out as a whole.

Concerning the second paragraph of the memorandum, which referred to the directive given to the Commission by the draft [resolution](#) “to make administrative arrangements for the assessment and payment of compensation,” the Commission agreed that it would be necessary to await a preliminary report of the Committee of Experts on Compensation before deciding what administrative arrangements would be necessary. It was decided that the Committee should be instructed to present to the Commission at the earliest possible moment its preliminary suggestions as to the administrative arrangements which might be envisaged for the assessment and payment of compensation.

With regard to the third paragraph of the Secretariat memorandum, concerning the committee to be established to work out “practical arrangements for the implementation of the other objectives of paragraph 11” of the [11 December resolution](#), the PRINCIPAL SECRETARY stated that he had communicated unofficially to the Executive Assistant to the Secretary-General the views expressed by the members of the Commission regarding the nationality of the members to be appointed to the proposed committee, and the desirability of taking immediate action to set up the committee if the [resolution](#) were adopted. The Principal Secretary asked whether it was desired that he should make immediate tentative inquiries of delegations with a view to finding suitable candidates for the new committee.

After some discussion it was *decided* that the Principal Secretary should consult the delegations concerned at once, but that his approaches should remain on a confidential and informal basis until the draft [resolution](#) had been tabled.

The PRINCIPAL SECRETARY requested the Commission’s views regarding the relationship of the proposed committee to the Commission itself. The sentence in the draft [resolution](#) which referred to the committee’s relations with the Commission required interpretation by the Commission. Between the two extremes of having a committee which would work only on the specific instructions of the Commission and one which would be more or less independent, while remaining “under the direction of the Commission”, there were many shades of interpretation. As the administrative organization of the proposed committee was to a certain extent dependent on the Commission’s decision, he felt it would be useful for the members to give early consideration to the question of the relationship of the new committee to the Commission.

A preliminary exchange of views on this matter then took place.

Mr. ARAS (Turkey - Chairman) expressed the opinion that the new committee should be given a large measure of autonomy to work on the basis of the [resolution](#) , while keeping the Commission fully informed of all its activities.

Mr. PALMER (United States) felt that if the committee were to work “under the direction of the Commission” it could not be considered as an independent body. He envisaged it as being more than a committee of experts and thought that its members should be men with a broad approach who would take into account the situation as a whole as well as the technical questions to be studied. The committee would refer to the Commission for guidance on political matters, and it was possible that the Commission might sometimes step in and assist the committee by negotiating with the governments concerned on political questions which had arisen in the committee’s work.

Mr. de BOISANGER (France) ‘thought .that the committee should remain in the Palestine area for the entire duration of its work. If the Commission itself found it necessary, for the purpose of holding negotiations with the parties, to leave the area for a time, the committee could represent the Commission in the area for the carrying out of the objectives of paragraph 11 of the [11 December resolution](#) . The members of the committee should therefore be of a sufficiently high calibre to undertake that task.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that during the debate which would take place in the Ad Hoc Committee on the draft [resolution](#) , some explanation and interpretations of the wording of the [resolution](#) might emerge which would be helpful to the Commission.

It was pointed out that UNRWA was the executive body for the reintegration of refugees — whether in Israel or in the Arab countries. The Commission considered it very important that the closest co-operation and liaison be maintained between the Commission and its committee on the one hand, and UNRWA on the other. The advice of the Agency would be of great value to the committee when it came to formulating its practical recommendations concerning repatriation, resettlement etc.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Commission should await the adoption of the [resolution](#) by the Ad Hoc Committee before crystallizing its views on the role of the new committee and the other points covered by the resolution.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*

[Document in PDF format](#)

[Français](#)