

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



AD HOC POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 2nd

MEETING

Wednesday, 22 October 1952, at 10.30 a.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
Address by the Chairman	3
Election of the Vice-Chairman	3
Election of the Rapporteur	4
Order of discussion of agenda items (A/AC.61/1)	4

Chairman: Mr. Alexis KYROU (Greece).

Address by the Chairman

1. The CHAIRMAN thanked the members of the Committee for the great honour they had done him and his country in electing him Chairman. That distinction was a tribute to Greece, which had always been a loyal Member of the Organization, respecting its obligations and undertakings. He was particularly grateful to Mr. Gonzalez (Venezuela) and Mr. Sarper (Turkey) for the generous words they had used in nominating him.

2. Thanks to its former Chairmen, Mr. Sarper, Mr. Belaunde, Mr. Entezam and General Rómulo, the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee had always worked in an atmosphere of frank and sincere collaboration. The only desire that could be expressed at the beginning of the present session was that the same spirit should continue to prevail. For his part, he would like to assure all the members of the Committee of his absolute impartiality and complete devotion to the cause of the United Nations.

3. For the benefit of representatives who were not yet familiar with the Secretariat services, he introduced Mr. Protitch, Principal Director of the Department of Security Council Affairs, and Mr. Chai, the Committee's devoted Secretary.

Election of the Vice-Chairman

[Item 5]*

4. Mr. BORBERG (Denmark) said that the Committee's officials should be eminent diplomats with a profound knowledge of political and juridical matters. He therefore nominated for Vice-Chairman Mr. Simpson (Liberia), who fulfilled the necessary conditions.

* Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.

5. Mr. Simpson had acquired an excellent reputation as a jurist. A former Secretary of State and Vice-President of Liberia, he now occupied the important post of Liberian Ambassador to Washington. He had represented Liberia at the San Francisco Conference, and had taken the keenest interest in the cause of the United Nations from its very beginning.

6. Mr. ARDALAN (Iran) warmly supported the nomination of Mr. Simpson, who had acquired a rich experience in international affairs. Mr. Simpson had all the qualities needed to assist the Chairman of the Committee: impartiality, generosity, disinterestedness and devotion to the common cause. He had been one of the promoters of the Organization and one of its unfailing supporters. The Committee could rest assured that he would discharge the functions of Vice-Chairman most satisfactorily.

7. Mr. EBAN (Israel) said he was happy to support the nomination of Mr. Simpson, whose personal qualities and diplomatic skill were generally recognized. Mr. Simpson's assistance to the Committee would be appreciated by all.

Mr. Simpson (Liberia) was unanimously elected Vice-Chairman.

8. The CHAIRMAN congratulated Mr. Simpson and invited him to take his place as Vice-Chairman.

9. Mr. SIMPSON (Liberia), on his own behalf and on behalf of his country, thanked the representatives who had submitted and supported his nomination. He thanked all the members of the Committee for the honour that had been done to himself and, chiefly, to Liberia.

10. Liberia had always been and would remain faithful to the principles of the Charter; its representatives in the General Assembly would strive unremittingly to show themselves worthy of the responsibilities which rested upon them.

Election of the Rapporteur

[Item 5]*

11. Mr. FRAGOSO (Brazil) nominated Mr. Salazar (Dominican Republic) who was so well known and esteemed by his colleagues that it was practically unnecessary to introduce him. He had represented the Dominican Republic in the Organization since 1947; all who had had the pleasure of working with him would bear witness to his personal qualities, courtesy, culture and experience as a jurist.

12. Mr. PATIJN (Netherlands) supported the nomination. Mr. Salazar was well known to all representatives for his great knowledge of international affairs and for his competence in all matters with which the Committee had to deal. He would be an outstanding Rapporteur.

13. Mr. SEVILLA SACASA (Nicaragua) said he was very glad to support the nomination of Mr. Salazar, whom he knew and whose qualities as a diplomat and jurist he had been able fully to appreciate.

Mr. Salazar (Dominican Republic) was unanimously elected Rapporteur.

14. The CHAIRMAN congratulated Mr. Salazar and invited him to take his place as Rapporteur.

Order of discussion of agenda items (A/AC.61/1)

15. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the letter, dated 17 October 1952, addressed to him by the President of the General Assembly (A/AC.61/1), listing the items referred to the Committee. He recalled that under rule 98 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, each Main Committee, taking into account the target date for the closing of the session fixed by the General Assembly, was to adopt its own priorities. For the seventh session, the General Assembly had decided on 20 December 1952 as the target date.

16. Mr. SHAW (Australia) remarked that the items referred to the Committee were not all of the same kind. Some were of primarily humanitarian interest and should be dealt with first. That applied particularly to the items concerning the Palestine refugees and the repatriation of Greek children.

17. The documentation on the Palestine refugees was complete and that item could therefore be considered immediately. On the repatriation of Greek children, the documents were not yet quite ready. An item of another kind, but of great international importance—the question of the admission of new Members—might therefore be considered first.

18. He therefore proposed that the items listed in the letter from the President of the General Assembly should be considered in the following order: items 7, 2, 8, 5, 6, 1, 3 and 4.

19. Mr. CASTILLO ARRIOLA (Guatemala) said that he would prefer that the question of the admission of new Members should not be considered second, as the Australian representative had suggested, but should be placed, say, in sixth place on the Committee's agenda.

20. The question had been included in the sixth session's agenda at the request of the Central American

Republics, which had at that time submitted a draft resolution (A/C.1/708) suggesting that the International Court of Justice should be asked for an advisory opinion. The authors of the draft resolution had withdrawn it and wished to submit a modified version. The problem was of the greatest importance not only to the Organization but to all States in the world, and should be discussed thoroughly and in detail. It would therefore be better to give the authors of the draft resolution some time to prepare it.

21. He suggested that the question of the admission of new Members should be entered on the Committee's agenda as item 6.

22. Mrs. PANDIT (India) said that she had no fixed opinion as to the order in which the items referred to the Committee should be placed on the agenda, except that she thought the items on "Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa" and "The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of the Union of South Africa" should be entered as items 3 and 4.

23. At its sixth session, the General Assembly, by resolution 511 (VI), had already stated that the policy of the Government of the Union of South Africa was based on doctrines of racial discrimination, and it had called upon that Government to suspend the execution of the racial legislation passed by the Parliament of the Union.

24. Disregarding the General Assembly's wishes, the Government of the Union of South Africa had enforced the racial legislation, thus provoking legitimate resistance from the sections of the population penalized. The Government had persisted in its attitude; it had done all in its power to break the resistance and had sent many persons to prison. The situation had become so serious that the States which had asked for the inclusion of the two items in the General Assembly's agenda had been obliged to declare that there was a threat to the maintenance of peace.

25. Obviously, therefore, the two questions should be considered without delay and should be the subject of a definite decision by the General Assembly. Though undoubtedly of great interest, the other items referred to the Committee were not of the same urgent character, for in most cases—as in the case of the Eritrean question, for example—the General Assembly's action would not appreciably affect the situation. Mrs. Pandit said, however, that she would have no objection if the question of the Palestine refugees, a question of great humanitarian importance, were considered first by the Committee.

26. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) heartily supported the Indian representative's proposal. If the Committee decided to make the question of the admission of new Members one of the last items on its agenda, as the Guatemalan representative had proposed, the two questions on the treatment of persons of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa and the racial conflicts in that country should become items 2 and 3 of the agenda, respectively. The same considerations which had induced the Australian delegation to propose that the Committee should first examine problems of a humanitarian nature, such as those of the Palestine refugees

and the repatriation of Greek children, required that the problem of the treatment of persons of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa should be considered at a very early date. Important as the question of the admission of new Members was, it should be emphasized that in view of the threat of racial conflict in the Union of South Africa to world peace and of the unprecedented interest the problem had aroused among both the Members of the United Nations and the public at large, the two questions relating to the conflict should be given priority. It would be most unfortunate if the Committee were to give the impression that it was trying to postpone discussion of the subject.

27. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) also supported the Indian representative's proposal. The Committee was primarily a political body and it should therefore deal without delay with a situation that was contributing to world tension and to creating disturbances involving loss of human life. An early appeal to the Government of the Union of South Africa might help to reduce the tension.

28. While fully conscious of the urgency and importance of the problem of the Palestine refugees, the Iraqi delegation still thought a settlement would not be reached unless the refugees took part in it. Representatives of the refugees must take part in the Committee's discussions of the problem; they were human beings and their desires should be fully respected. While gratified, therefore, that it had been proposed that the problem of the Palestine refugees should be given priority, the Iraqi delegation urged that it should not be considered until the representatives of the refugees could come to New York.

29. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that no representatives of the Palestine refugees had yet asked to be heard by the Committee.

30. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) replied that he would have expected the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East to suggest to the refugees that they should ask for a hearing.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that he would ask the Director of the Relief and Works Agency for enlightenment on that aspect of the problem when the question of the Palestine refugees was considered.

32. Mr. CASTILLO ARRIOLA (Guatemala) supported the Indian representative's proposal. Items 3 and 4 on the list of questions referred to the Committee should be given priority because very important humanitarian problems were involved. He would not object if item 2 on the list—which dealt with the admission of new Members—were entered at the end of the agenda, as the seventh or even the eighth item.

33. Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa) stated that the representatives of India and Pakistan were pushing at an open door. The position of the delegation of the Union of South Africa was well known. The Government of the Union of South Africa was of the opinion that neither item 3 nor item 4 on the list of questions referred to the Committee should be considered by the Organization since they related to matters exclusively within the Union's domestic jurisdiction and that, if it were true that a problem had arisen

in the Union of South Africa, any discussion by the Organization could only aggravate the situation. Provided that the questions were not placed at the head of the agenda—and to place them there would raise a number of difficulties since the General Assembly had not settled the question of competence—the delegation of the Union of South Africa would not object to their being considered in the near future.

34. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom) said that, as he understood it, the Indian representative wanted items 3 and 4 on the list of questions referred to the Committee retained in the order in which they stood, but had not expressed any preference with regard to the order of the other items. Items 5 and 6, however, related to one and the same problem, that of the relations between Israel and the Arab States, and might therefore be taken together. The United Kingdom delegation accordingly considered that the Committee might take them as item 2 of its agenda and follow with the items at present numbered 3 and 4.

35. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, while the Indian representative had not specified which item should be taken second, the Pakistani representative, supported by the Guatemalan representative, had proposed that items 3 and 4 on the list should be entered as items 2 and 3 of the agenda.

36. Mr. MOSTAFA (Egypt) considered that for practical reasons the question of the Palestine refugees should be the first item on the Committee's agenda. The report of the Director of the Relief and Works Agency¹ covered the period ending 30 June 1952 and a new financial year had therefore begun. Contributions had to be collected, aid given to the refugees and the various proposed programmes carried out. The time factor was therefore very important.

37. He supported the Indian representative's proposal that items 3 and 4 on the list should figure in that order in the Committee's agenda. The Committee should deal with those questions without delay as the situation in the Union of South Africa and, judging by the reports of certain news agencies, in Kenya, constituted a threat to world peace.

38. Mr. PATIJN (Netherlands) shared the anxiety underlying the Australian representative's proposal and agreed with him that it would be prudent to place the most controversial items at the end of the agenda. If the Committee began with the less political items, it would be able to deal with them quickly and in a calm atmosphere. Otherwise, they might not receive the attention they deserved.

39. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) supported the arguments advanced by the Guatemalan representative when he had asked that the question of the admission of new Members should be placed on the Committee's agenda as item 7 or 8. He also associated himself with the remarks made by the Indian representative when submitting her proposal, and supported the proposal itself. The discussion had shown that it would be judicious to take items 3 and 4 on the list as items 2 and 3 of the agenda, as the Pakistani representative had proposed. In reply to the comments of

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, Supplement No. 13* (document A/2171).

the Australian and Netherlands representatives, the Uruguayan representative emphasized the fact that the Committee was primarily a political body and that it was therefore inevitable that it should deal with highly controversial items.

40. Mr. QUINTANILLA (Mexico) agreed with the representative of Uruguay. Thorny questions would not be any less so in two or three weeks' time, so that there was no reason for deferring consideration of them. He supported the Indian representative's proposal.

41. The CHAIRMAN noted that there seemed to be general agreement to take the question of the Palestine refugees as item 1 of the agenda, on the understanding that the Chairman would get in touch with the Director of the Relief and Works Agency on the question of representation of the refugees at the Committee's meetings. He invited the Committee to decide that question before proceeding further.

It was so decided.

42. Mr. JESSUP (United States of America) noted that different views had been expressed regarding the most rational and advantageous way in which the Committee could deal with the other items on its agenda. The United States delegation wished to propose a formula which might reconcile the differences of opinion.

43. In the first place, certain items were clearly not as urgent as others. In that connexion there was a great deal of force in the arguments advanced by the Indian representative with regard to the Eritrean question and by the Guatemalan representative with regard to the desirability of making the question of the admission of new Members one of the last items on the agenda.

44. As regards item 4 on the list, the Committee should take into consideration the important fact that while items 3 and 4 undoubtedly had certain aspects in common, item 3 had already been considered at previous sessions, whereas item 4 was a completely new item; it was generally recognized as an item which presented considerable difficulties. Moreover, as it was a completely new item and as the Committee had just begun its work, delegations had not yet had the opportunity to hold any of the informal discussions which, experience in the United Nations had shown, facilitated the solution of difficult problems, especially in the case of items considered for the first time. The Australian delegation had probably been inspired by similar considerations when submitting its proposal and it would be most unfortunate if the impression were to be given that that proposal did not attach due importance to the question of the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa and the racial conflict in that country.

45. Since the Committee had decided to take the Palestine refugee question as item 1 of its agenda and since items 5 and 6 on the list concerned the general question of relations between Israel and the Arab States—of which the question of the Palestine refugees was one aspect—it would be useful to take the two latter items as items 2 and 3 of the agenda and in that way consider the three aspects of the same problem *seriatim*, as had been the case at previous

sessions. Furthermore, as the United Kingdom representative had indicated, items 5 and 6 on the list dealt with a single subject so that the formula suggested by the United States delegation would make it possible to meet the Indian representative's wish to have items 3 and 4 on the list taken as items 3 and 4 of the agenda.

46. The United States delegation was convinced that, if agreement were reached on the lines it had proposed, the Committee would have no difficulty over the order of the other items on the agenda.

47. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) supported the Indian representative's proposal. He considered that items 3 and 4 should be dealt with before items 5 and 6.

48. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom) associated himself with the United States representative's second proposal. He doubted whether it was advisable to begin by discussing the most explosive questions; it was wiser to deal with them only after mature reflection.

49. Mr. SEVILLA SACASA (Nicaragua) also supported the United States representative's proposal.

50. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) drew the United Kingdom representative's attention to the fact that item 3 on the list, while undoubtedly of an explosive nature, had been on the General Assembly's agenda for several years. There was therefore no disadvantage in dealing with it at the beginning of the session.

51. The CHAIRMAN expressed the hope that the Committee would reach as wide a measure of agreement as possible on the order of the items to be considered and that it would not be necessary to take a vote on the matter.

52. Mr. JESSUP (United States of America) asked whether the proposals concerning the priority of items constituted independent proposals or should be regarded as amendments to the Australian representative's proposal.

53. Mr. SHAW (Australia) explained that he had merely submitted his proposal as a basis of discussion in order to facilitate proceedings. His proposal did not imply that special importance should be given to certain items. The Committee had, of course, to give the same attention to all the items on its agenda.

54. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that it would be logical to take each item in whatever order best suited the delegations most concerned. He therefore supported the proposal submitted by the representatives of India and Pakistan.

55. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) asked whether the United States representative had any particular reason for proposing that items 5 and 6 on the list should be considered before items 3 and 4.

56. Mr. JESSUP (United States of America) replied that he had advanced all the arguments which seemed to him to justify his proposal.

57. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) said that in that case he would support the Pakistani representative's proposal to take item 3 on the list, which had already been on the General Assembly's agenda for several years, as item 2 of the agenda, and to take item 4 on

the list as item 3 of the agenda. The Committee could then take up item 5 on the list.

58. The CHAIRMAN thought that there appeared to be agreement to take item 3 on the list as item 2 of the agenda.

59. Mr. JESSUP (United States of America) pointed out that he had made a contrary suggestion and wished to stand by it.

60. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom) recalled that he had supported the United States proposal and suggested that the Committee should vote on it.

61. The CHAIRMAN proposed as a compromise to take item 3 of the list as item 2, item 8 of the list as item 3, and item 4 of the list as item 4 of the agenda.

62. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) said that he would prefer items 3 and 4 to be dealt with together, before the items relating to Palestine.

63. Mr. ALGHOUSSEIN (Yemen) asked that the votes on items 3 and 4 be taken together.

By 30 votes to 12, with 14 abstentions, the Commit-

tee decided to take as items 2 and 3 of its agenda items 3 and 4 on the list of items referred to the Committee in document A/AC.61/1.

64. The CHAIRMAN proposed that item 8 on the list should be taken as item 4 of the agenda.

It was so decided.

65. Mr. ORDONNEAU (France) pointed out that, as far as the other items were concerned, the Committee had before it only the Australian representative's proposal, as amended by the representative of Guatemala. The proposal seemed sensible and the Committee might adopt it.

66. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections to the Australian representative's proposal, as amended by the Guatemalan representative, whereby items 5, 6, 2 and 1 on the list of items transmitted to the Committee would be taken as items 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the agenda, he would consider that proposal adopted.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.