



**CONTENTS**

	Page
Statement by the Chairman.....	3
Election of the Vice-Chairman.....	3
Election of the Rapporteur.....	3
Organization of work.....	4

*Chairman:* Mr. Jiří NOSEK (Czechoslovakia).

**STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN**

1. The CHAIRMAN thanked those delegations, and in particular the Ecuadorian delegation, which had proposed him for the office, and the USSR delegation, which had seconded his nomination. He greatly appreciated the honour conferred on his country and himself by the nomination and assured the Committee that he would do his best to show himself worthy of the confidence placed in him.
2. He was convinced that the Committee would complete its task in good time, thanks to the co-operation of the representatives. The Third Committee was the first of the Main Committees of the General Assembly to meet and should also be the first to complete its work.
3. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) expressed his pleasure at the Chairman's nomination. He had known Mr. Nosek for a very long time and was in a position to appreciate his well balanced mind and energetic qualities and his deep understanding of the problems that concerned the United Nations. Apart from his personal merits, Mr. Nosek represented a country which had often distinguished itself in cultural, social and humanitarian affairs.
4. He therefore felt sure that he was expressing the feeling of all his colleagues when he welcomed the opportunity of working that year, under the chairmanship of Mr. Nosek, towards the achievement of the humanitarian work entrusted to the Third Committee, in that co-operative spirit which enabled men to cross political and religious frontiers and join in work for a common ideal.

**ELECTION OF THE VICE-CHAIRMAN**

5. Mr. PEREZ DE ARCE (Chile) nominated the Reverend Benjamín Núñez, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and Permanent Representative of Costa Rica to the United Nations. Mr. Núñez brought with him not only outstanding personal qualities, but also very great knowledge and practical experience of the matters with which the Third Committee was concerned. Both as a minister of religion and as a professor

in the Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences at the National University of Costa Rica, Mr. Núñez had devoted himself to raising the standard of living of the least favoured strata of society. He had also taken an active part in the International Labour Conferences held since 1944 at Philadelphia, Mexico, Montreal and Montevideo. He had represented his country in 1948 at Medellín, Colombia, in connexion with the seminar on social service organized under the auspices of the United Nations.

6. As a priest, Mr. Núñez was held in the highest esteem by his superiors and by his flock; as a trade-union and political leader, he had earned the respect of both friends and enemies. The Chilean delegation therefore proposed, both on personal grounds and as a tribute to the country which Mr. Núñez represented, that he should be elected Vice-Chairman of the Third Committee by acclamation.

7. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that he was happy to support Mr. Núñez's candidature. As theologian and as a sociologist, and because of his qualifications and his interest in humanitarian, cultural and social matters, Mr. Núñez was eminently fitted for the Vice-Chairmanship of the Third Committee.

8. Mrs. MONTGOMERY (Canada), Mr. CONCHA (Ecuador), Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq), Mr. DE BARROS (Brazil), Mr. GONZALES (Philippines), Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) and Mr. ROY (Haiti) supported Mr. Núñez's candidature.

*Mr. Núñez (Costa Rica) was elected Vice-Chairman by acclamation.*

9. Mr. NÚÑEZ (Costa Rica), Vice-Chairman, thanked the Committee for the honour it had done him and especially for the tribute it had paid to his country. He was particularly grateful to the Chilean representative and to all those who had been kind enough to support his candidature.

10. He had been particularly affected by the observations made about his priestly vocation. However, he had come to serve on the Third Committee not for religious but for humanitarian purposes. Religion had nothing to fear from social reforms nor had social reforms anything to fear from religion. That was the spirit in which he intended to approach his task.

**ELECTION OF THE RAPPOREUR**

11. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic) nominated Mrs. Tsaldaris, the representative of Greece, for the office of Rapporteur. Since the establishment of the United Nations at San Francisco, Greece had been among the countries that had most actively contributed to the solution of the many complicated problems exercising the world of today. Mrs. Tsaldaris had brilliantly fulfilled important duties in her own country and

abroad. She had been a member of several international women's organizations whose work was related to that of the United Nations. She had played an outstanding part in the Third Committee and had distinguished herself by her fairness and efficiency. Finally, there was another important reason in favour of electing Mrs. Tsaldaris as Rapporteur: the custom that the Third Committee should have a woman among its officers.

12. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) shared the Dominican representative's opinion as to the competence and merits of Mrs. Tsaldaris and did not wish to minimize the importance of the principle that women should serve among the officers of the Third Committee. Nevertheless he wished to nominate Mr. Pazhwak. Apart from the notable way in which the representative of Afghanistan had performed his duties as Rapporteur the previous year, there was another weighty consideration, geographical distribution, which had prompted his nomination. Mr. Pazhwak represented a country in the very heart of Asia. There were in all fifteen Asian countries in the United Nations. If Mr. Pazhwak was not elected, there would not be any representative of that important group among the officers of the Committee.

13. Mrs. LORD (United States of America) supported the nomination of Mrs. Tsaldaris.

14. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) fully agreed with the sentiments expressed by the Saudi Arabian representative in congratulating Mr. Nosek on his nomination as Chairman of the Third Committee.

15. He also wished to thank Mr. Baroody for having nominated him as Rapporteur. Having had for so long the honour of representing his country in the Third Committee, he was conversant not only with the opinions expressed in the conference room, but also with those expressed outside it. He had known what the Saudi Arabian representative intended as soon as he began to speak, for it had been suggested to him a week previously that he should again undertake the duties of Rapporteur of the Committee, at a time when no other candidate had yet been put forward and he himself had anticipated that the vice-chairmanship would, as usual, be held by a woman. He had therefore replied that, if it was the Committee's wish that he should accept those duties, he would not refuse the responsibility, as the honour attached to the office would belong to his country first of all and only secondly to himself.

16. However, the nomination of Mrs. Tsaldaris raised another question of principle, for it was traditional for a woman to sit among the Committee's officers. The Committee was aware of the Afghan delegation's views on the rights of women, their place in society and the role that should be accorded to them in general. He therefore had the feeling that, if he now accepted the honour which had been done him, he would be neglecting another important principle. He accordingly wished to withdraw his candidature in favour of the representative of Greece.

17. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) supported the nomination of Mrs. Tsaldaris.

18. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that he had been especially pleased and affected to hear the Afghan representative, whose devotion to the United Nations was known to the Committee, explaining why he had withdrawn his candidature in favour of the rep-

resentative of Greece. Like Mr. Baroody, he realized the importance of equitable geographical distribution, but other factors should also be taken into consideration, and especially the rights of women. The Committee had to deal with matters relating to the status of women, and some of its members, especially the Dominican representative, had devoted their lives to the defence of women's rights. The Uruguayan delegation therefore considered it important that there should be a woman among the Committee's officers.

*Mrs. Tsaldaris (Greece) was elected Rapporteur by acclamation.*

19. Mrs. TSALDARIS (Greece) thanked the members of the Committee for the honour they had conferred upon her country and herself by electing her Rapporteur. She especially thanked the Dominican representative, who had nominated her in consequence of their long-standing friendship and the close co-operation they had enjoyed in recent years, and the United States and Iraqi representatives who had so warmly supported the nomination. She also thanked the Uruguayan representative, who had emphasized the importance of active participation by women in the work of the Third Committee, and the other representatives who had spoken in support of her candidature. She would like to assure the Afghan representative that, in recognition of the co-operative attitude he had displayed on the occasion of their work together at the preceding session and because of the ties of friendship by which Greece was bound to Afghanistan, she would have been honoured and glad to support his nomination if Mr. Baroody's proposal had been accepted.

20. She greatly appreciated the honour which her nomination meant for women, who, in their ceaseless efforts to improve their status throughout the world, found valuable support in the Third Committee; and she was particularly honoured to have the opportunity to participate still more closely in that work, as an officer of the Committee. She would strive to prove worthy of the confidence which the members of the Committee had shown in her.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK (A/C.3/571, A/C.3/L.400)

21. The CHAIRMAN observed that two corrections should be made to the note by the Chairman (A/C.3/L.400). In paragraph 2, the words "Committee item 4—see chapter V, section VI, paragraphs 766-769, 'Encouragement and development of independent domestic information enterprises'" and in paragraph 7, subparagraph 4, the words "Report of the Economic and Social Council, A/2686, chapter V, section VI, paragraphs 766-769", should be deleted.

22. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) thought that a change should be made in the order of the items on the Committee's agenda as given in the letter from the President of the General Assembly to the Chairman of the Third Committee (A/C.3/571). At previous sessions, there had always been a general debate on the Economic and Social Council's report. According to the letter from the President of the Assembly, however, it would appear that the Committee was to study each agenda item without delegations' having first expressed their views on the Council's report as a whole.

23. He therefore asked that the report should be one of the first items to be considered by the Committee.

24. With regard to agenda item 1 [27]\*, he realized that the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees was pressed for time and that the item should be considered before any other. On the other hand, item 2 [30]\* would certainly cause controversy, as it had done at the preceding session. Furthermore, the Committee on Forced Labour had ended its work. It would therefore be better to deal with that item last, in order to avoid having the Committee's discussions begin in a tense atmosphere.

25. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) also thought agenda item 1 [27]\* should be considered first. Item 2 [30]\* could, he thought, be dealt with fairly quickly. There would be a procedural discussion in connexion with item 5 [58]\*: the question to be decided was whether the Committee itself, a sub-committee, or some other body should be given the task of examining the draft international covenants on human rights. He therefore proposed that that item should be placed third on the agenda, so that the Committee would know in good time where it stood with regard to the procedure to be followed.

26. Mr. ROY (Haiti) observed that all the agenda items except item 4 [29]\* were dealt with in the various sections of chapters IV and V of the Council's report (A/2686). He therefore proposed that the questions should be considered in the order in which they came in the report.

27. Mr. HOOD (Australia) thought it would be better to leave agenda item 7 [12]\* to the last, so as to avoid duplication of discussion.

28. Mr. EPINAT (France) agreed. Furthermore, the French text of the Council's report had not yet been circulated. He thought it would be better to adopt the Chairman's suggestions and to work consistently through the agenda, leaving the discussion on the report as a whole till the end.

29. Mr. ASHA (Syria), supported by Mrs. LORD (United States of America), proposed that agenda item 1 [27]\*, "Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees", should be considered first.

*It was so decided.*

30. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) recalled that since the second session of the General Assembly it had been customary to hold a general debate on the Council's report before considering the various questions dealt with therein. A general debate was necessary because it enabled delegations to express their views on the report, so that each delegation knew at the very beginning of the session what the views of the others were on any particular question, and the Committee's work was thus made easier.

31. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) was pleased that the Committee had decided to give priority to the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. That was indeed an urgent question and consideration of it should not be delayed.

32. With regard to item 5 [58]\*, he supported the United Kingdom representative's proposal. People everywhere were keenly interested in the draft covenants on human rights. Several texts had been prepared and had to be examined. To show that it was fully aware of the importance of the work, the Third

Committee should decide on the procedure to be followed at the very beginning of the session.

33. With regard to item 7 [12]\*, he was of the opinion not only that there should be a general debate on the Council's report, but also that the report should be given priority and considered before most of the other items on the agenda.

34. Lastly, he thought item 6 [59]\* was of great importance and should be studied with particular care.

35. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) stressed the need for an immediate decision on the procedure to be followed in considering agenda item 5 [58]\*. If it were decided to establish a sub-committee, the sub-committee would have to start work immediately. It was therefore essential for the Committee to have a procedural discussion on the item at the beginning of its work, before it considered other items which would certainly give rise to protracted discussion.

36. Mr. ASHA (Syria) agreed with the United Kingdom representative.

37. With regard to agenda item 7 [12]\*, he hoped delegations would be authorized to express their views on that subject when they thought fit.

38. Mr. ROY (Haiti) proposed that the Committee should consider the various items on the agenda in the order in which they appeared in the letter from the President of the Assembly (A/C.3/571), with only one change—item 2 [30]\* and 5 [58]\* should be transposed so as to restore the order followed in the Council's report (A/2686).

39. Mr. MEADE (United Kingdom) supported that proposal. The purpose of the procedural discussion on item 5 [58]\* would be to decide whether the Committee should study the substance of the item or refer it to some other body.

40. Miss BERNARDINO (Dominican Republic), speaking on a point of order, asked when the Spanish text of the Council's report would be circulated.

41. The CHAIRMAN replied that the Spanish and French texts would be circulated to delegations not later than 4 October.

42. Mr. CHENG (China) thought, like the Australian representative, that it would be better to follow the order in document A/C.3/571, ending with agenda item 7 [12]\*. The third item to be considered would be item 5 [58]\*, on which there would be a purely procedural discussion, as the United Kingdom representative proposed.

43. Mr. DUNLOP (New Zealand) recalled that at the preceding session the various agenda items and relevant sections of the Council's report had been considered before the general debate on the sections of chapters IV and V not related to other items. That procedure had proved satisfactory, and he thought the Committee might adhere to it. A general debate at the very beginning of the session would be unwieldy and would confuse the documentation as important statements would become separated from the other papers on the item to which they referred.

44. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Haitian representative, supported by the United Kingdom representative, proposed that items 2 [30]\* and 5 [58]\* in document (A/C.3/571) should be transposed, but that otherwise the order indicated in that document should be followed.

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

45. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said he would willingly accept the Haitian proposal with regard to items 2 [30]\* and 5 [58]\*. He insisted, however, that the Economic and Social Council's report as a whole should be considered as soon as possible.

46. Contrary to what the New Zealand representative believed, at the preceding session the Third Committee had held a general debate on the Council's report before taking up specific questions. Moreover, that procedure had been followed since the first sessions of the General Assembly and as it had given good results, he could see no good reason for abandoning it.

47. A general debate would enable delegations to make their positions clear. Every member of the Committee would thus know exactly what the others were thinking. When differences of opinion arose, it was possible to begin immediately to seek agreement in principle and, if necessary, to consult governments. In that way the need to repeat sometimes lengthy preliminaries on each specific question was avoided, the later work was made easier and in the long run there was a real saving of time. If the general debate were not to take place until the end of the session, it would relate only to secondary items and in practice would be devoid of interest; in fact the Committee would never consider chapters IV and V of the Economic and Social Council's report as a whole. The Committee was, however, concerned with the whole of those chapters and they should therefore not be broken unduly.

48. He therefore suggested that chapters IV and V of the report should be given at least third place on the agenda.

49. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the Saudi Arabian representative.

50. He also wished to stress a point that was not without importance. In connexion with chapters IV and V of the Economic and Social Council's report, the Committee might be called upon to consider questions which related more or less directly to the matter under discussion, but which were dealt with in other chapters of the report and were not expressly referred to in the agenda. For example, that was the case with the question of the organization and operation of the Council and its commissions and the activities of non-governmental organizations. It should be clearly understood that any representative would be free to speak on those problems in so far as they related to social matters or to human rights.

51. Mr. ASHA (Syria) thought that, in order to reach the widest possible agreement, it would be enough to decide that any representative who wished to do so could, at any time, make a general statement on the Economic and Social Council's report as a whole, irrespective of the specific question under discussion.

52. Mr. MOREAU DE MELEN (Belgium) regretted that he could not agree with the Saudi Arabian representative's conclusions, in spite of the weighty reasons given. There was a very important point to consider and that was that the Spanish and French texts of the Economic and Social Council's report had not yet been distributed. He suggested that the Committee should wait until the delegations concerned had been able to study the report before taking a decision on the place it should be given in the agenda.

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

53. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) said that all the questions before the Third Committee were of equal importance. The order in which they should be discussed depended only on logic. On the one hand, the Committee's work should be made easier and, on the other hand, the special circumstances of each case should be taken into account.

54. There was sufficient reason to consider the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. first. The High Commissioner's presence in New York and the importance of the work awaiting him elsewhere made it essential to give priority to that item. Moreover, no one had expressed any objections to such a procedure.

55. The Economic and Social Council's report dealt with several questions which related to as many specific agenda items. A preliminary general debate should be held on the matter. That method, which the Third Committee had always followed, had proved to be extremely useful in practice and could not fail to facilitate the Committee's work at the current session. During the general debate representatives would certainly make observations on various specific questions, which the Committee would then consider separately. A real general debate would probably result in the submission of draft resolutions, which would then be considered usefully when the time came to study the specific questions to which they related. He therefore supported the Saudi Arabian representative's suggestion.

56. With regard to the draft international covenants on human rights, his delegation was interested in the considerations advanced by the United Kingdom representative, but did not think that it would be advisable to deal exclusively with procedure, without taking the substance of the question into account. In any case, the usual practice was to give some priority to questions with which other organs of the United Nations had had to deal; that was the case in the present instance. He therefore suggested that the draft covenants should be considered immediately after the general debate on the Economic and Social Council's report. Anyone who wished to submit a procedural proposal could easily do so at that time.

57. The atmosphere of the major part of the session would be more propitious, as the Saudi Arabian representative had rightly pointed out, if the consideration of the question of forced labour were dealt with as late as possible.

58. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the draft covenants on human rights had been referred to the General Assembly by the Economic and Social Council; the procedural decision required of the Committee consisted in determining the method of considering the draft covenants.

59. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) emphasized that it was in principle unwise to take a procedural decision on a question which was not to be considered substantively.

60. Mr. CHENG (China) formally protested against the attitude of the Chairman, who had twice addressed him by name when calling upon him. The members of the Chinese delegation were the official representatives of China, and the Chairman had no power to modify their status in the slightest degree by refusing to address them as such, just as he was unable to modify the legal status of any delegation. In any case, his

attitude was liable to harm the prestige of the office of Chairman of the Third Committee and the prestige of the Organization as a whole. In that connexion, he drew attention to the resolution adopted by the Sixth Committee (391st meeting) at the eighth session of the General Assembly, which stated that, when official business was being conducted, it was the duty of the Chairman and all other officers of the Committee to address all members of the Committee as representatives of their respective countries and not as private persons. On behalf of his delegation, he registered his protest in the strongest terms against the Chairman's conduct, which he considered to be prejudicial to the dignity of the United Nations.

61. With regard to the organization of the Committee's work, it would be useful to combine consideration of each item with that part of the Council's report to which it was related. Anyone who wished to make a general statement could do so at any time; the report as a whole could then be dealt with at the end of the session.

62. Mr. ROY (Haiti) said that he could not recall that any delegation to an organ of the United Nations had been refused satisfaction in the matter of postponement of a decision because a document had not been distributed in one of the working languages. He therefore considered that the Belgian representative's request should be met and that the Committee should wait until the delegations concerned had the French and Spanish texts of the Council's report before deciding what place that question should be given in the programme of work.

63. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should decide, for the time being, to consider first the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for

Refugees, and then the draft international covenants on human rights, on which a procedural decision had to be taken. It could then decide what place should be given to the consideration of chapters IV and V of the Economic and Social Council's report as a whole. The French and Spanish texts would certainly have been distributed by that time.

64. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) supported that suggestion.

*It was so decided.*

65. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee might, if it so wished, meet on the morning of Wednesday, 29 September.

66. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that a general debate was being conducted in plenary meeting of the General Assembly and that many representatives wished to listen to the discussions, which related to highly important political questions.

67. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) stressed the fact that small delegations found it difficult to follow the work of several organs at the same time. It would be better for the Main Committees not to meet until the General Assembly had finished its general debate in plenary meeting. Complications had always arisen when attempts had been made to depart from that principle. He therefore suggested that the Chairman should be left to choose, after consultation with delegations, an appropriate date, other than Wednesday, 29 September, for the Committee's next meeting. The Chairman's decision would be announced in the *Journal of the United Nations*.

*It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.