

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

**EIGHTH SESSION**  
*Official Records*



**AD HOC POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 2nd**

**MEETING**

*Wednesday, 30 September 1953,  
at 10.30 a.m.*

*New York*

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Statement by the Chairman.....	3
Election of the Vice-Chairman.....	3
Election of the Rapporteur.....	3
Order of discussion of agenda items.....	3

**Chairman: Mr. Miguel Rafael URQUIA (El Salvador).**

**Statement by the Chairman**

1. The CHAIRMAN thanked representatives for having unanimously elected the leader of the delegation of El Salvador to the chairmanship of the Committee during the eighth session of the General Assembly. He felt sure that their main desire in doing so had been to show honour to his country, in recognition of its constant and enthusiastic co-operation in the work of the United Nations, not only since the San Francisco Conference but even earlier, El Salvador having been one of the States which had signed the Washington Declaration of 1 January 1942.
2. He particularly wished to thank the Greek and Norwegian representatives for their kind appreciation of his work in the United Nations when proposing and seconding his nomination.
3. It was a matter of pride, though most difficult, to follow such a distinguished chairman as Mr. Kyrour, but he hoped to be able to carry out his task to the general satisfaction and to that end he counted chiefly on the wisdom, understanding and tact of all representatives.

**Election of the Vice-Chairman**

4. Mr. RIBAS (Cuba) nominated Mr. López, representative of the Philippines, who had vast experience of United Nations work and whose long and brilliant diplomatic career was known to all. Among the offices held by Mr. López were those of Rapporteur of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee at the fifth session and Vice-Chairman of the Special Committee on Admission of New Members appointed at the seventh session. In view of his experience of the United Nations and personal qualifications, Mr. López was thoroughly qualified to act as Vice-Chairman.
5. Mr. SULTAN (Egypt), Mr. PARIS (Colombia), Mr. DAOUDY (Syria) and Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) seconded the nomination.

*Mr. López (Philippines) was unanimously elected Vice-Chairman.*

**Election of the Rapporteur**

6. Mr. DERINSU (Turkey) proposed Mr. Forsyth, representative of Australia, whose connexion with the

United Nations went back to the San Francisco Conference; since then he had represented his country with distinction on a number of United Nations organs. He had also served on different international commissions, such as the South Pacific Commission, of which he had been Secretary-General.

7. Mr. FERREIRA DE SOUZA (Brazil), Mr. NISOT (Belgium) and Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa) supported the nomination of Mr. Forsyth.

*Mr. Forsyth (Australia) was unanimously elected Rapporteur.*

**Order of discussion of agenda items (A/AC.72/1)**

8. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to decide upon the order of discussion of the four items assigned to it by the General Assembly.
9. The report of the United Nations Good Offices Commission concerning the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa, and the report of the Special Committee on Admission of New Members had already been distributed to delegations. The documents on the other two items were not quite ready. The report of the Advisory Committee of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East would not be available in the various languages until the end of October; the report of the Commission appointed to study the racial situation in the Union of South Africa would not be issued until the end of October or early in November.
10. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) considered, in view of that information, that the Committee might start with the report of the Special Committee on Admission of New Members, which had already appeared in all the official languages and which all delegations had probably had time to study.
11. The CHAIRMAN believed that that suggestion would meet with general approval. He therefore proposed that the Committee first examine the item "Admission of new Members: report of the Special Committee on Admission of New Members", followed by the item "Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa".

*It was so agreed.*

12. The CHAIRMAN suggested, in view of the information given him by the Secretariat, that the Committee might examine next the subject of Palestine refugees in the Near East, and, last, the question of race conflict in South Africa.

13. Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa) reminded the Committee of his delegation's position on the questions of the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa and race conflict in South Africa. In his Government's view, which was supported by several other delegations, neither item should appear on the agenda of the General Assembly since any discussion of those matters constituted interven-

tion in the domestic affairs of South Africa and conflicted with the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

14. Since, however, the General Assembly had decided to place those items on its agenda, the South African delegation did not object to stating its case at any time. The leader of the delegation proposed to deal with the two items personally; he would also have to deal personally with the question of South West Africa, which was item 4 on the agenda of the Fourth Committee. It was hoped that the two committees would not examine questions that concerned South Africa at the same time.

15. Mr. CROSTHWAITE (United Kingdom) observed that it was impossible to be quite certain which of the outstanding reports would be ready first. Therefore, the Committee should decide forthwith on the order in which the last two items were to be taken. It was to be hoped that the Committee would allow itself enough flexibility to be able to adjust its work in the event of the report on the racial situation in South Africa being ready first.

16. The CHAIRMAN considered that suggestion sound. The Committee might accept the order announced by the Chair, subject to a possible change in the order of the last two items on the agenda according to circumstances.

17. Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa) pointed out that the Committee was likely, for various reasons, to change the order of the agenda. It would be wise to agree that the two-thirds majority rule would not apply to a change in the order of discussion, it being understood that the present decision was not final but could be applied with some elasticity, according to the wishes of the majority.

18. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) stated that some delegations, including his own, would not be prepared to discuss an item if the relevant documents had not been translated into all the working languages as required by the rules of procedure. He reminded the Committee in that connexion that when the representative of Honduras had suggested, at the last plenary meeting of the seventh session, that the eighth session should start work a week or two later, a representative of the Secretariat had stated that all the documents would be distributed in time. After such assurances it was surprising to learn that the documentation on some of the items was not yet complete.

19. Referring to the point raised by the South African representative he said that the Fourth Committee had already decided not to examine matters of concern to

the Union of South Africa at the same time as the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. Hence a resolution did not seem necessary, especially as the Chairman had full discretion to organize the Committee's work so as to safeguard the South African delegation's prerogatives, as well as those of the Uruguayan delegation, which would have to take part in the debates in both committees on those matters.

20. Mr. NISOT (Belgium) agreed. The decision reached about the order in which the items would be examined by the Committee was a conditional one; it had been reached subject to modification in the light of circumstances. As already suggested by the South African representative the Committee might allow that the two-thirds majority rule should not apply in the event of a change in the order of the items on the Committee's agenda.

21. Mr. DAYAL (India) thought it would be premature at that stage for the Committee to commit itself in advance on the point raised by the South African representative concerning the simultaneous examination by two committees of questions affecting his country. Nobody wished to create difficulties for the South African delegation, but it must be realized that the Committee had to take into account not merely the convenience of a single representative but that of the sixty delegations represented on it.

22. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) thought it would be possible to satisfy all delegations. He proposed that the order of items suggested by the Chairman be approved, it being left to him to take the initiative of suggesting any changes he might deem necessary in the light of the position with regard to the distribution of documents and, if necessary, the Fourth Committee's work.

23. Mr. ORTEGA MASSON (Chile) proposed that the Committee refrain from taking any final decision on the order of discussion of the last two items on its agenda. It might also postpone any decision on the South African proposal since it was not yet in possession of the necessary documents.

24. Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa) and Mr. NISOT (Belgium) supported the Peruvian proposal.

25. After a brief discussion Mr. ORTEGA MASSON (Chile) also agreed to that proposal, which hardly differed from his own.

*The Peruvian proposal was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.