

27. The CHAIRMAN noted that under that rule two speakers could oppose such a motion, after which the latter would immediately be put to the vote.

28. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the proposal for closure of the debate was not in accordance with the provisions of rule 106 since only the information contained in the letter from the representatives of the Somali Youth League addressed to the Chairman had been discussed. The draft resolution submitted by the Polish delegation had not been discussed at all, and it was not possible to close a debate that had not even started. The motion submitted by the United States representative was therefore not to close the debate but to prevent discussion of the draft resolution submitted by the Polish delegation. Such a proposal was illegal and incorrect.

29. Mr. BEBLER (Yugoslavia) agreed with the views expressed by the representative of the USSR. The question raised by the Polish delegation was not only urgent but was very important. Recalling that the representative of the United Kingdom, in reply to a question put by the representative of Liberia, had stated at a previous (289th) meeting that the slogans being carried by the Mogadiscio demonstrators had been anti-Italian. Pointing out that it had never been intimated that pro-Italian slogans were considered provocative, Mr. Bebler concluded that the United Kingdom Authorities in Somaliland took a specific position on the question of the disposal of that territory and that the administrative measures represented as being in the interests of law and order in the territory were in fact unilateral measures directed exclusively against the elements that did not want Italian trusteeship. That was just one piece of evidence militating against the motion for the closure of the debate, and it was indispensable that the Committee should allow at least a brief exchange of views, so that all the delegations might be permitted to adopt a clear position regarding the Polish proposal.

30. Mr. McNEIL (United Kingdom) said that he had handed to the Secretariat an amendment (A/C.1/502) to the Polish proposal just as the United States representative was moving closure

of the debate. He asked the Chairman whether the motion for closure precluded submission of the amendment.

31. There was some discussion of the procedural question involved in which emphasis was placed on the importance of the possible precedent which might be created. The representatives of IRAQ, IRAN and MEXICO generally considered that amendments could be submitted after closure of the debate. It was stated that the word "debate" mentioned in rule 106 referred to the general debate and did not cover the matter of submission of amendments.

32. The representatives of the UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS, POLAND, LEBANON, CHINA and the BYELORUSSIAN Soviet Socialist Republic generally considered that no amendments could be submitted after the closure of the debate had been decided upon.

33. The CHAIRMAN stated that, in conformity with rule 106 of the rules of procedure, his duty was to put to the vote immediately the motion for closure of the debate. As far as the amendment submitted by the representative of the United Kingdom was concerned, he stated that he had not received it before the motion for closure of the debate had been made. According to his interpretation of rule 106 of the rules of procedure, a vote must be taken on the "item under discussion" in the form in which the latter had been before the Committee at the time when closure of the debate had been moved. If, however, the motion for closure was not carried, no problem would arise. If the motion was carried, his interpretation of rule 106, which might be wrong, could be challenged, so that if a precedent was established, it would be based not on a ruling of the Chair but on the opinion of the majority of the Committee.

The closure motion was defeated by 32 votes to 8, with 8 abstentions.

34. Mr. ARCE (Argentina), invoking rule 107 of the rules of procedure, moved that the meeting adjourn.

The proposal for adjournment was adopted by 32 votes to 13, with 1 abstention.

The meeting rose at 1.50 p.m.

TWO HUNDRED AND NINETY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Tuesday, 18 October 1949, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).

Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece (continued)

REPORT OF THE CONCILIATION COMMITTEE (A/C.1/503)

1. The CHAIRMAN read a letter dated 18 October (A/C.1/503) from the President of the General Assembly constituting a report on the activities of the Conciliation Committee, and notifying the First Committee that it had been unable to develop a basis of conciliation on which an agreement could be reached between the Governments

of Albania, Bulgaria, Greece and Yugoslavia and that it had to suspend further activities.

2. Mr. PIPINELIS (Greece) remarked that the report dealt only briefly with the negotiations that had taken place in the Conciliation Committee and neither outlined the discussions nor indicated the reasons for their failure. He enquired whether the Conciliation Committee would present to the First Committee a fuller report giving a more complete picture.

3. The CHAIRMAN replied that in due course the Conciliation Committee would report in greater detail. However, their last meeting had

taken place only that morning and they had been unable to give a full report at once. As soon as possible, they would present a factual report outlining all points of view.

4. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) recalled that, when the creation of the Conciliation Committee had been discussed, his delegation had requested that it should seek to achieve a suspension of terrorism in Greece. He asked whether the Chairman could inform the Committee of what had been done in that respect, especially as recent news despatches stated that, on 14 October, Catherine Zevgos had again been sentenced to death by the unanimous vote of a court martial. In her second trial, new facts had emerged concerning the torture of witnesses with a view to extracting information from them, which had resulted in the death of one witness and another being driven to commit suicide. When the Zevgos case had first been discussed, general sympathy had been expressed and a promise to suspend the sentence had been given. That indicated the value of the promises of the Greek delegation. As the Conciliation Committee had apparently failed, it was the duty of the First Committee to take action in that respect. Mr. Katz-Suchy appealed to the Chairman for intervention also on behalf of Mr. Spyros Kritsikis who had been sentenced to death on 31 August and on whose behalf intercessions had already been made by the International Red Cross and a number of political and other associations in France and the United Kingdom. Mr. Katz-Suchy asked for information as to the action taken by the Conciliation Committee on these matters.

5. The CHAIRMAN stated that the detailed report of the Conciliation Committee would cover all aspects of their discussions. With regard to the situation referred to by the Polish representative, he would speak to the President of the General Assembly who was also Chairman of the Conciliation Committee. Their report would be made available as soon as possible.

6. Mr. MAKIN (Australia) noted that the Conciliation Committee had reported that no progress had been made. The detailed report should be examined in order that the discussion might be informed. He therefore moved that consideration of the report of the Conciliation Committee should be deferred until the following meeting of the First Committee.

7. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) said he appreciated the Chairman's reply to his question. He asked, however, what guarantee there was that Catherine Zevgos and Dr. Kritsikis would not both be executed in the meantime. There was too much experience of Greek promises in such matters and, in particular, there were the cases of the trade union leader, Georgi Demosthenes, and of four communist leaders who had been executed twelve hours after Mr. Pipinelis had given the promises of leniency.

8. Mr. J. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, before voting on the Australian motion, he wished to know how long the Conciliation Committee would need to prepare their report.

9. The CHAIRMAN observed that according to the Australian proposal the discussion would take place at their following meeting. That would possibly involve two difficulties. Firstly the de-

tailed report would take time to prepare since there were twenty-nine meetings to be covered; secondly, there was a possibility of confusion at the next meeting of the Committee since the report of Sub-Committee 17 might also be available. In reply to the question put by the Soviet Union representative, the Chairman stated that probably two or three days would be required to draft the report.

10. Mr. COUVE DE MURVILLE (France) said that the points raised by the representatives of Australia and the Soviet Union led to the question of the organization of the Committee's discussion. Apparently, neither the full report of the Conciliation Committee nor the report of Sub-Committee 17 could be expected for two or three days. There were therefore two alternatives: on the one hand the Committee could immediately proceed with the discussion of the Greek question; that would involve two disadvantages for the report of the Conciliation Committee was not yet available, and it would lead to the simultaneous discussion of two items; alternatively, the Committee could decide not to meet on the following day, but to convene on Friday to take up the report of Sub-Committee 17 which should then be ready; the Committee could then conclude its discussion on the question of the disposal of the former Italian colonies; the following week, the Committee could revert to the Greek question, after having studied the full report of the Conciliation Committee. The drawback to that procedure was the loss of time involved. However, that loss might not be quite so real, since an immediate discussion of the Greek question would not be fully informed. Mr. Couve de Murville accordingly moved an amendment to the Australian proposal in the sense of the second alternative.

11. Mr. McNEIL (United Kingdom) agreed with the representative of France. Moreover, according to the Journal, no meeting had been scheduled for the following day, so that their programmes would not be affected. For the current meeting, there was the question of the Polish draft resolution (A/C.1/501) concerning political activities in Somaliland, and the United Kingdom amendment thereto (A/C.1/502). He proposed that the Committee deal with those items and then proceed in accordance with the French proposal.

12. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) said that he appreciated the reasons for postponing the discussion of the Greek question since it would be difficult to discuss it in the absence of a full report. However, he was concerned over the possible loss of time which might result. The next item on the agenda was the Soviet Union proposal for a five Power pact. It had been evident from the beginning that some delegations wished to postpone the discussion of that item or even eliminate it from the agenda. Now there seemed to be an attempt to nullify the decision to place it third on the agenda. Mr. Katz-Suchy proposed that, if there were no meeting the following day either on the Greek question or on the question of the disposal of the Italian colonies, the First Committee should then begin discussion of the Soviet Union proposal. There had hardly been a time, at any session of the Assembly, when sub-committees had not been at work, and that was the first occasion when meetings of the First Committee had been cancelled because of those of a sub-committee. The target date for the end of the

Assembly was approaching and many items still remained unexamined. Indeed, the First Committee had not yet disposed of any. If the Committee decided not to deal with the Greek question the following day, Mr. Katz-Suchy wished to move that it proceed with the discussion of item 3 of the agenda and leave both the Greek question and the question of the disposal of the former Italian colonies until the appropriate reports were received.

13. Mr. J. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) believed that the Polish proposal would keep the Committee from wasting time. Some twenty days had been lost during the second part of the third session on the question of the disposal of the former Italian colonies, and it was to be feared that the Committee might repeat that performance. Since the reports of the Conciliation Committee and of Sub-Committee 17 were not expected for a few days, it would be reasonable to move on to item 3 of the agenda, either the following day or that afternoon. That procedure would lead to a more efficient use of the Committee's time.

14. Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) asked for information upon the possibilities of meeting the following day, and whether one of the meetings of the Committees at present scheduled could be cancelled.

15. The CHAIRMAN stated that he had been informed by the Secretariat that a meeting could not be arranged for that afternoon, but that one could be arranged for the following day.

16. Mr. McNEIL (United Kingdom) suggested that the Committee first decide whether they should meet the following day and then decide upon the subject for discussion. He thought it would be advantageous to separate the two questions.

17. Mr. PIPINELIS (Greece) said his delegation supported the French proposal, despite its desire to have the Greek question dealt with as soon as possible. However, it would accept the postponement in order to have the final report available. That report was essential to the Committee's discussion, and would show the opinion of eminent leaders in the United Nations, who would present facts. Those facts would be more pertinent and reliable than those given by some delegations. With regard to the remarks of the Polish representative, Mr. Pipinelis said that he would not deal at once with the substance of the insinuations, but would refer the matter at the proper time.

18. Mr. MAKIN (Australia) withdrew his motion in favour of the French proposal as amended by the United Kingdom representative.

19. After a procedural discussion upon the method of voting between the CHAIRMAN and Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland), the latter stated that he wished to re-submit his motion in the form of an amendment to the French proposal. Its purport would be that discussion of the Greek question should be deferred until the Conciliation Committee's report had been received, and that discussion of item 3 on the agenda be initiated the following day.

20. Mr. COUVE DE MURVILLE (France) could not accept the Polish amendment. He did not consider it advisable to discuss three items simultaneously. The Committee was already examining

two items and it was hard to avoid overlapping. The Committee was unlikely to gain time by holding one or two meetings on the Soviet proposal. If the United Kingdom proposal was intended as an amendment to the French motion, he would accept it, as it would not change the French proposal which dealt with the future organization of the Committee's work.

21. Summing up, the CHAIRMAN observed that the Committee had before it the French proposal as amended by the United Kingdom to the effect of postponing the discussion of the report of Sub-Committee 17 until the following Friday and, after its conclusion, to continue with the Greek question. At the current meeting, the Committee would deal with the Polish draft resolution with regard to political activities in Somaliland and the United Kingdom amendment thereto. Then there was also a Polish amendment to the French proposal that the discussion of the Soviet Union proposal be initiated on Wednesday, while reverting on Friday to the discussion of the report of Sub-Committee 17.

22. Mr. C. MALIK (Lebanon) suggested that the French proposal might be construed as a motion for adjournment of the debate under rule 105. The Committee might take a decision on that before considering what it should discuss immediately or on the following day. Secondly, it might deal with the United Kingdom proposal and thirdly with the Polish proposal. The three ideas seemed to be quite distinct.

23. The CHAIRMAN stated that he did not feel that the suggested procedure would bring about any different result from the procedure he had proposed, namely to vote first on the Polish amendment, and then on the French proposal as amended by the United Kingdom.

24. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) expressed the hope that adoption of the French proposal would not prevent the representative of Greece from replying to the points he had raised.

25. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Polish amendment to the effect that discussion on item 3 of the agenda should be initiated on Wednesday and that the Committee would revert to the report of Sub-Committee 17 on Friday.

The amendment was rejected by 32 votes to 6, with 8 abstentions.

26. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the French proposal, as amended by the United Kingdom, to the effect that the Committee should discuss the Polish draft resolution (A/C.1/501) at the current meeting and then adjourn until Friday when the report of Sub-Committee 17 would be discussed, after which the Committee would pass on to the Greek question.

The proposal was adopted by 42 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Question of the disposal of the former Italian colonies (continued)

27. The CHAIRMAN declared that the Committee would proceed to discuss the Polish draft resolution (A/C.1/501), the text of which read as follows:

"The First Committee,

"Taking into consideration the fact that the future of Somaliland is being discussed by the General Assembly,

"Appeals to the Administering Authorities of Somaliland to permit free expression of opinion and to prevent victimization of persons and political organizations."

28. Two amendments had been submitted to the draft resolution, one by the representative of the United Kingdom and another by the representative of Yugoslavia. The United Kingdom amendment (A/C.1/502) read as follows:

"The First Committee,

"Taking into consideration the fact that the future of Somaliland is being discussed by the General Assembly,

"Appeals to the Administering Authorities of Somaliland to maintain their present policy of permitting free expression of opinion and of preventing victimization of persons and political organizations."

29. The Yugoslav amendment (A/C.1/504) consisted in replacing in the second paragraph the words 'to prevent victimization of persons and' by the words 'and the free activity of'. That paragraph would therefore read as follows:

"Appeals to the Administering Authorities of Somaliland to permit free expression of opinion and the free activity of political organizations."

30. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) said that the United Kingdom amendment was presented in an unusual form and amounted to a complete change of the substance of his draft resolution. The United Kingdom amendment, if adopted, would amount to an approval by the First Committee of the present policy pursued by the Administering Authorities in Somaliland. He said that his delegation had intended to submit its own amendment to the United Kingdom amendment but hesitated to do so in order not to engage the Committee in endless discussion. Moreover, should Mr. McNeil insist that a vote be taken on his amendment, the Polish representative suggested that the First Committee call upon the representative of the Somali Youth League to appear before the Committee with a view to ascertaining their opinion on the policy of the Administering Authorities. The United Kingdom representative had previously admitted the existence of disturbances in Somaliland. However, additional information had been received to the effect that various Somali leaders had been sentenced to periods of imprisonment ranging from 8 to 12 months. The United Kingdom representative was, therefore, asking the First Committee to approve of the actions of the Administering Authorities. In conclusion Mr. Katz-Suchy said that the United Kingdom amendment was irrelevant, since the Polish draft resolution requested the Administering Authorities to permit freedom of expression and to prevent victimization without reference to any political organization, whereas the United Kingdom amendment requested the maintenance of the present policy of the Administering Authority.

31. Mr. LÓPEZ (Philippines) said that his delegation felt unable to support either the Polish draft resolution or the United Kingdom amendment to it. With regard to the Polish draft resolution, his delegation thought that the First Committee did not possess sufficient factual information to warrant a judgment of that kind, the nature of which would be prejudicial to the

matter under discussion. On the other hand, the United Kingdom Government did not require an appeal from the Committee to maintain the good policy which it claimed to be sustaining in Somaliland. His delegation was therefore ready to support any resolution which would neither prejudge the issue nor reduce it to an absurdity. Accordingly, he submitted the following amendment (A/C.1/505) to the second paragraph of the Polish draft resolution:

"The First Committee,

"Taking into consideration the fact that the future of Somaliland is being discussed by the General Assembly,

"Requests the Administering Authorities of Somaliland to ensure free and peaceful expression of opinion among the inhabitants of the territory regarding its future."

32. Mr. MARTÍNEZ MORENO (El Salvador) said that since the United Kingdom amendment constituted a negation of the Polish draft resolution, his delegation would formally move that the Committee consider them as separate proposals and vote on them separately. His delegation would vote against the Polish draft resolution since it implied a criticism of the policy of the Administering Authorities in Somaliland and since his delegation had no information leading to believe that the disorders in Somaliland were the result of the policy pursued by the Administering Authorities. He would equally vote against the United Kingdom proposal, since it implied an approval of the policy which it was following in Somaliland, in which case, he saw no reason for the First Committee to approve of that policy. As for the Philippine proposal, his delegation would also vote against it, since its adoption would amount to a partial decision on a matter which was still under consideration by Sub-Committee 17.

33. Mr. GONZÁLEZ ALLENDES (Chile) agreed with the views expressed by the representative of El Salvador.

34. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the United Kingdom amendment should be regarded as a separate draft resolution since it requested the First Committee to approve of the policy of the Administering Authorities in Somaliland. That policy consisted in the denial of freedom of expression and in the banning of demonstrations and political organizations, especially the Somali Youth League. Moreover, the United Kingdom proposal implied that the present policy of the Administering Authorities in Somaliland permitted the free expression of opinion and prevented victimization of persons and political organizations. If a change had occurred in that policy, the First Committee should have been informed to that effect and an opportunity should be given to the representative of the Somali Youth League to confirm that information.

35. With regard to the earlier suggestion to the effect that discussion be postponed until the consideration of the report of Sub-Committee 17, that suggestion was intended to hamper the progress of the work of the Committee since Sub-Committee 17 was dealing with another aspect of the problem. The Polish draft resolution was an objective and correct proposal and his delegation would, accordingly, vote in favour of it.

36. Mr. McNEIL (United Kingdom) said that Mr. Katz-Suchy should not object to the application by the First Committee of correct parliamentary procedures in amending a resolution in conformity with the direction of the Chair. He could not understand the attitude of the representative of the Byelorussian SSR with regard to the Somali Youth League, since on page 21 of the Report of the Four-Power Commission of Investigation the delegation of the Soviet Union accused the Somali Youth League of terrorism and other methods having nothing in common with democratic principles. The Committee would certainly be interested in ascertaining the reasons for that sudden change of mind. The representative of the Somali Youth League had submitted material alleging the mistreatment of their leaders, whereas other organizations had refuted those allegations; the United Kingdom delegation was not in a position to judge as to the veracity of either contention.

37. Various allegations had been made to the effect that the Administering Authorities were denying the Somalis their freedom of expression. Those allegations could be sustained if it were proven that the military authorities were permitting freedom of expression only to such political organizations holding views similar to those of the Administering Authorities. If the Administering Authorities were practising a terroristic policy in Somaliland, it should be assumed that they would endeavour to prevent any such information from reaching the First Committee, but that was not the case. Moreover, the Administering Authorities had always allowed peaceful demonstrations and had only attempted to prevent those intended against the Italian minority. The Administering Authorities had been forced to adopt their present policy as a result of similar unfortunate experience in January 1948. Moreover, the curfew had already been completely lifted and all political clubs, except those of Mogadiscio, had been reopened. In conclusion, the representative of the United Kingdom offered to withdraw his amendment with a view to facilitating the work of the First Committee and said he would do so if the representatives of El Salvador and the Philippines found it acceptable.

38. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) said that, in submitting its draft resolution, his delegation had

not intended to question the policy of the Administering Authorities in Somaliland. That draft resolution had been submitted as a result of recent events in that territory. His delegation would withdraw its draft resolution in favour of the Philippine proposal.

39. Mr. CASTRO (El Salvador) thanked the United Kingdom representative for withdrawing his amendment and hoped that the Philippine representative would do the same.

40. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that during the previous session, his delegation had condemned the terroristic activities by the Somali Youth League against the Italian minority but had found later that the charges made against the League had been exaggerated. His delegation considered terroristic actions on the part of any organization or any group of the population against any other group of the population to be reprehensible and that there was therefore no contradiction between his delegation's position then and the position it was adopting at present, believing that there could, should and must be no prohibition of the expression of the will of any group of the population of Somaliland.

41. Mr. BEBLER (Yugoslavia) also withdrew his amendment.

42. The CHAIRMAN put the Philippine draft resolution (A/C.1/505) to the vote.

The draft resolution was rejected by 23 votes to 18 with 9 abstentions.

43. Mr. McNEIL (United Kingdom) and Mr. GONZÁLES (Chile) explained that they had voted against the Philippine draft resolution because of its implied criticism of the policy of the Administering Authorities in Somaliland.

44. The representatives of INDIA and of PAKISTAN remarked that their delegations had voted in favour of the Philippine draft resolution on the understanding that it did not imply any criticism of the Administering Authorities in Somaliland.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

TWO HUNDRED AND NINETY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Monday, 24 October 1949, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Selim SARDER (Turkey).

1. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, as Subcommittee 17 had not yet concluded its work, it would not be possible to finish the consideration of the question of the disposal of the former Italian colonies before returning to the Greek question, as had been decided previously. He proposed that, as the Conciliation Committee had submitted its report (A/C.1/506) to the First Committee, the Committee should resume the general debate on the Greek question.

It was so decided.

Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece (continued)

DEATH SENTENCES PASSED BY GREEK MILITARY COURTS

2. Mr. VYSHINSKI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the Polish representative had made a statement on 18 October (293rd meeting) concerning death sentences in Greece and that the Chairman of the First Committee