

RESTRICTED
SR/64
28 May 1949
Original: English

19 DEC 1950

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SIXTY-FOURTH MEETING

held in Lausanne on Saturday,
28 May 1949, at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. de Boisanger (France) - Chairman
x) Mr. Yenisey (Turkey)
Mr. Ethridge (U S A.)
Dr. Azcarate - Principal Secretary

Report of the General Committee

Mr. de la TOUR DU PIN (Chairman, General Committee) reported that at the Committee's meeting the preceding day (see Com.Gen./SR.9), the Arab delegations had completed their formal statements with regard to the nine-point memorandum, except for the last point, which dealt with guarantees to the returning refugees and which would be taken up at a later moment since it was treated in more detail in the memorandum of 21 May.

In the course of an informal meeting in the afternoon with Mr. Sasson, he had conveyed the Commission's request that the proposals concerning the eastern frontier should be re-phrased taking as a basis the Partition boundaries rather than the armistice lines. It had been agreed that the Israeli delegation would make a new statement at the following meeting with the Committee, basing itself on the Protocol, and that the proposed frontier would be defined in detail point by point and village by village. As regards that part of the frontier where the lines were at present double, the suggested boundary would cut through the present no-man's land, Mr. Sasson had remarked that although the proposals regarding the frontiers with Lebanon and Egypt had envisaged permanent boundaries, the present proposal was not for a permanent frontier, since it was not as yet known who the authority in control of the "Triangle" would be.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that as soon as the Committee

x) Alternate

was in possession of the new and firm proposal from the Israeli delegation, it should communicate it to the Arab delegations.

Letter from the Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem (NC/21)

Mr. ETHRIDGE suggested that the Principal Secretary should acknowledge the letter with the Commission's thanks, stating that the views expressed therein had been brought to the attention of the Jerusalem Committee. He did not consider it necessary that an interview should be arranged at the present time.

The Commission agreed to Mr. Ethridge's suggestion.

List of questions to be handed to the Arab Higher Committee

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the representative of the Arab Higher Committee had declared himself at the disposal of the Commission to state the Committee's views on any question. The Secretariat had now drafted a list of possible questions which might be put to the Committee, but desired to know whether the Commission wished the questions to be general in character or specific and detailed.

Mr. ETHRIDGE recalled that at the meeting with the representative of the Arab Higher Committee, he had taken the position that the Commission could not accord the same treatment to that Committee which it gave to representatives of Governments, and that if the Committee had any observations it wished to make in writing, the Commission would be glad to read them. He still maintained the same position, and felt that the Commission should consider seriously whether it desired to put any questions to the Arab Higher Committee, particularly in view of the fact that that Committee had made no attempt to contact the Commission since the initial meeting. He still held the view that the Committee was chiefly interested in establishing its own status with the Commission. He suggested postponement of the question until the Commission could study it further.

Mr. YENISEY thought it would serve no useful purpose to put questions to the Committee, and that both Israeli and Arab delegations would object.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that consideration of the question should be suspended indefinitely.

The Commission agreed to the Chairman's suggestion.