

UNITED NATIONS  
TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL



Distr.  
GENERAL

T/C.2/SR.148  
30 March 1954  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS  
SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND FORTY-EIGHTH MEETING

DOCUMENTS INDEX UNIT MASTER  
APR 4 1954

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Friday, 12 March 1954, at 2.45 p.m.

CONTENTS

Organization of the Committee's work  
Petitions concerning the Trust Territory of Somaliland under  
Italian Administration (T/C.2/L.69, T/C.2/L.70, T/C.2/L.70/Add.1)  
(continued)

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. QUIROS	El Salvador
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. PETHERBRIDGE	Australia
	Mr. SCHEYVEN	Belgium
	Mr. GIDDEN	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. TARAZI	Syria
	Mr. SUMSKOI	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
<u>Also present:</u>	Mr. ROBERTI	Representative of Italy as the Administering Authority for Somaliland
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. ALEKSANDER	Division of Trusteeship
	Mr. RANKIN	Secretary of the Committee

## ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

Mr. ALEKSANDER (Secretariat) said that the President of the Trusteeship Council had instructed him to ask whether the Committee could examine all the petitions on its agenda and submit a report to the Council on procedural matters, or whether it intended to make a formal proposal that consideration of certain petitions and of procedural matters should be postponed.

Mr. RANKIN (Secretary of the Committee) thought that the Committee could conclude its study of the draft resolutions on nine petitions in time for the Council to adopt them before the end of its session. Its agenda would then still contain petitions concerning Togoland under French Administration, and certain procedural matters.

Mr. SCHEYVEN (Belgium) did not think that the Committee had time to consider both the petitions concerning Togoland under French Administration and the procedural matters. He hoped that, in the petitioners' interest, the Committee would make every effort to consider the Togoland petitions as it had considered those concerning other territories. Some of the petitions were more than a year old. Procedural matters were not of immediate importance to the peoples of the Trust Territories and could easily be postponed to the following session.

Mr. SUMSKOI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the Committee could have completed its agenda if it had allowed itself more than a bare fortnight before the Council's session. That lesson should be borne in mind for the next session.

Mr. PETHERBRIDGE (Australia) stated that the Committee must finish its work by the following Wednesday if it wished the Council to consider its reports. It could not therefore consider procedural matters. As the Belgian representative had said, the Committee should try to consider all the petitions concerning

Togoland under French Administration; but it could make a selection and consider, for example, the oldest petitions or those for which the Special Representative's presence was desirable.

Mr. RANKIN (Secretary of the Committee) explained that there were eighteen petitions concerning Togoland under French Administration. Nine were in the nature of commentaries on political happenings in the Territory while nine concerned personal grievances.

The CHAIRMAN considered that, although all the petitions might be of equal importance, those of a personal nature were probably more urgent. He proposed that the Committee should begin its next meeting by considering petitions concerning Togoland under French Administration which dealt with personal matters; they were summarized in document T/C.2/L.58/Add.1. At the same time the Secretariat could submit as a working paper a draft of the Committee's report to the Council containing its suggested decisions on the final items of its agenda.

It was so decided.

PETITIONS CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY OF SOMALILAND UNDER ITALIAN ADMINISTRATION  
(T/C.2/L.69, T/C.2/L.70, T/C.2/L.70/Add.1) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to conclude its examination of the draft resolution in document T/C.2/L.69.

V. Petition from the Somali Youth League, Oddur Branch (T/PET.11/364)

Mr. SUMSKOI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that once again the draft resolution reflected only the Administering Authority's views. The facts of which the petitioners complained constituted a violation of Article 87 (b) of the Charter and therefore deserved the Council's particular attention. Consequently, he proposed that the operative part of the draft resolution should be replaced by the following text: "Instructs the Visiting Mission of the United Nations to East Africa, 1954, to investigate the question of

the violation of the right to submit petitions in Oddur and the persecution of members of the Somali Youth League in Oddur for having addressed petitions to the United Nations".

Mr. ROBERTI (Special Representative for Somaliland under Italian Administration) recalled that the Administering Authority had made a complete reply to the petition in document T/OBS.11/20. Mr. Pastrana, Philippine representative on the Consultative Council, had visited Oddur in March 1953 and had spoken at a public meeting. One of the speakers, the head of the Somali Youth League, had paid a tribute to the local administration. Following the meeting, a member of the League had informed Mr. Pastrana that he wished to submit a petition, which had in fact been submitted on the following day. The people were free to submit petitions whenever they wished, even on matters of minor importance. The number of petitions from the Territory testified to the truth of that statement.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of El Salvador, stated that he had no fundamental objection to the Soviet representative's proposal, but wondered whether the Visiting Mission should make an investigation in that particular case. The previous year, the representative of the Somali Youth League had stated in the Council that relations between the Administration and the League had much improved. That had been confirmed by the impartial statement of Mr. Deeb, a member of the Secretariat. An investigation by the Visiting Mission might merely aggravate the situation and he would therefore abstain in the vote.

Mr. SUMSKOI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had no reason to doubt the statements of the Administering Authority or of Mr. Deeb. Nevertheless, the petitioners complained that the police had prevented them from talking to Mr. Pastrana. Mr. Deeb's statement was of no value as evidence; the police might have acted before Mr. Pastrana arrived. It was the Council's duty to ascertain whether the petitioners' allegations were justified.

Mr. PETHERBRIDGE (Australia) did not object in principle to the Visiting Mission being asked to make an investigation. The Mission would in any case consider the matter of relations between the Administration and the Somali Youth League. As those relations had improved, he considered that an investigation would only cause further tension.

Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) stated that the Council should endeavour to reconcile the various points of view which had emerged in the Territory. If the draft resolution proposed by the Soviet representative were adopted, fresh dissension might arise between the Administering Authority and the Somali Youth League.

The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the vote.

The draft resolution was rejected by 3 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) asked for a separate vote on paragraph 5.  
Paragraph 5 was adopted unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution as a whole to the vote.  
The resolution was adopted by 3 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

VI. Petition from the Hizbia Dighil and Mirifle, Oddur Branch (T/PET.11/358)

The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution to the vote.  
The resolution was adopted by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. RANKIN (Secretary of the Committee) recalled that the Administering Authority had been requested to state what action had been taken in pursuance of resolution III. The resolution was therefore not included in those listed in paragraph 3, page 2, of document T/C.2/L.69.

The CHAIRMAN put the draft report as a whole to the vote.  
The report was adopted by 4 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to study the draft resolution in document T/C.2/L.70.

I. Petition from Messrs. Scide Mohamed Dore, Dahir Sciacul and Abdullahi Hassan  
(T/PET.11/356)

Mr. SUMSKOI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to make three amendments to the draft resolution.

In the first place, in order to bring paragraph 2 of the draft resolution into line with paragraph 4 of the summary of the petition and observations (T/C.2/L.54/Add.1), he proposed that a text should be substituted for it in which the Council reminded the Administering Authority that the Resident had not yet discovered the camel thieves.

Next, he proposed the addition to paragraph 3 of a phrase expressing the Council's hope that the Administering Authority would give the chiefs of the tribe all the assistance necessary to avoid internecine strife.

Finally, he proposed that paragraph 5 should be deleted. It did not appear that the Administration had made any great efforts or that there was any reason to congratulate it.

Mr. PETHERBRIDGE (Australia) saw no advantage to the petitioners in the paragraph 2 proposed by the Soviet Union. Consideration of the petition and the Administering Authority's observations showed that, although the Administration wished to discover the thieves, the petitioners did not desire a thorough investigation because the thieves belonged to their own tribe.

Mr. SUMSKOI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that his amendment merely recorded a fact.

The CHAIRMAN put the text of paragraph 2 proposed by the Soviet representative to the vote.

There were 3 votes in favour and 3 against.

In accordance with rule 38 of the rules of procedure, a second vote was taken.

There were 3 votes in favour and 3 against. The proposal was not adopted.

The CHAIRMAN explained that he had voted for the Soviet proposal because it simply stated a fact of no great importance.

Mr. SCHEYVEN (Belgium) said that he had voted against the proposal because it did not recommend that the petitioners should assist the Administration in finding the thieves, although they knew them very well.

The CHAIRMAN put the amendment to paragraph 3 proposed by the Soviet Union to the vote.

The amendment was adopted by 3 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) explained that he had voted for the amendment for reasons similar to those which had prompted the Belgian representative to vote against the Soviet representative's first amendment.

Mr. GIDDEN (United Kingdom) said that he had voted against the amendment because it seemed to imply that the Administering Authority was not giving the tribal chiefs all the assistance they required and there was no proof of that.

Mr. SCHEYVEN (Belgium) said that he had voted against the amendment for the same reasons as the United Kingdom representative.

With regard to the third Soviet Union's amendment, the CHAIRMAN observed that congratulations added nothing to the draft resolution, that the



Administering Powers themselves had often said that they attached no importance to them and that the Trusteeship Council had adopted a resolution recommending that such phrases should be avoided. He therefore thought that the first part of the paragraph should be deleted. The second part should, however, be retained because the Administration's efforts to increase the number of wells were of vital interest to the country: indeed, inter-tribal warfare was often caused by lack of them.

Mr. SCHEYVEN (Belgium) felt that the Administering Authority should be congratulated on the admirable task it had accomplished in a particularly wild and barbarous country.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) protested strongly against the terms the Belgian representative had used. He thought that they showed a certain racial discrimination.

On the request of Mr. SCHEYVEN (Belgium), the CHAIRMAN took a separate vote on paragraph 5.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The resolution as a whole was adopted by 2 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

## II. Petition from Messrs. Barle Ker, Osman Hire and Others (T/PET.11/362)

The CHAIRMAN proposed that paragraphs 3 and 5 of the draft resolution should be amended in the same way as the corresponding paragraphs of the previous resolution.

Mr. SUMSKOI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Chairman's proposal. In addition, he drew the Committee's attention to the reference to the petitioners' "audacity" in paragraph 3 of document T/C.2/L.54/Add.1 (page 3). Words of that kind should not be used in United Nations documents. He further proposed that the first paragraph of the draft resolution should be

amended as follows: "Notes the Administering Authority's assurances that appropriate action has been taken in an affair which involved the death of two persons".

Mr. RANKIN (Secretary of the Committee) said that in its observations the Administering Authority had used the word "cheek", which could hardly be used in a United Nations document. The Secretariat had therefore decided to replace it by the word "audacity". If the Committee so desired, the Secretariat would redraft the text so as to avoid using that word.

The CHAIRMAN said that the text would be corrected as indicated.

Mr. SCHEYVEN (Belgium) asked for separate votes on paragraphs 3 and 5. Paragraph 3, as amended, was adopted by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions. Paragraph 5, as amended, was adopted by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution as a whole, with the amendments to the first paragraph proposed by the USSR representative, to the vote.

The resolution, as amended, was adopted by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

III. Petition from Capi Soffe Abdulle, Aden Uarsama and Others (T/PET.11/371)

The resolution was adopted by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

IV. Petition from Scek Abdul Rezah Scek Abdio and Others (T/PET.11/360)

The CHAIRMAN observed that draft B was not an alternative to draft A, but constituted paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

Mr. SUMSKOI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he wished to withdraw paragraph 4. Petitions IV, V and VI were all concerned with the Bardera District and called for recommendations of a more general nature. He had therefore drafted a resolution (T/C.2/L.70/Add.1) covering all the points

raised in those petitions, and he asked the Committee to consider it before discussing the resolution in document T/C.2/L.70.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) objected to the use of the word "farce" in the USSR draft resolution and proposed that it should be replaced by the word "plaisanterie" in the French text.

Mr. RANKIN (Secretary of the Committee) explained that "farce" was a literal translation of the Italian word used by the petitioner. It had been placed between inverted commas in the draft resolution in order to show that it was a quotation.

Mr. ROBERTI (Representative of Italy as the Administering Authority for Somaliland) thought that the USSR draft resolution was not justified. Elections to the municipal councils were shortly to take place and the indigenous inhabitants were to elect a Territorial Council in 1955. It could therefore be said that the Administration was taking the measures necessary to convert the Territory into a modern democratic State. Moreover, there was no racial discrimination in the Territory, in hospitals, hotels, schools, prisons, etc. There were far more Somalis in the administrative services than Italians; about half the police posts were entrusted to Somalis and most customs and postal employees were Somalis. It was the Administration's intention to turn over the entire administration of one of the Territory's six Regions to indigenous officials in a few years, before 1960. With regard to education, the Administration had drawn up a detailed plan of development, which had been submitted to the Trusteeship Council and also to UNESCO and had earned the Administering Authority's praise.

Mr. SUMSKOI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that his resolution first summarized all the complaints received from the Bardera District, using the petitioners' own words, and then made certain recommendations. If the Administering Authority had already adopted all those measures, the next Visiting Mission could note the fact and the Administering Authority would mention it in its next report. Then everyone would be satisfied.

The CHAIRMAN observed that paragraph 4 instructed the Visiting Mission to investigate all the problems raised by the petitioners. They would include political, economic, social and cultural questions, all of which the Mission would naturally investigate when it visited the Territory. He therefore thought the paragraph superfluous.

Mr. SUMSKOI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that paragraph 4 like the rest of the resolution, had particular reference to the Bardera District, and there was some justification for asking the Visiting Mission to consider the questions raised by petitioners from that district.

Mr. TARAIZI (Syria) thought that the Committee should adopt the paragraph so that the Council could take account of the suggestion in formulating the Mission's terms of reference and give it that specific task.

The CHAIRMAN took a separate vote on paragraph 2.

Paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was rejected by 3 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Mr. TARAIZI (Syria) said that he had voted in favour of the paragraph because it took account of the petitioners' complaints; his vote was not to be interpreted as a reproach to the Administering Authority.

The CHAIRMAN put the USSR resolution as a whole, with paragraph 2 deleted, to the vote.

There were 3 votes in favour and 3 against.

In accordance with rule 38 of the rules of procedure, a second vote was taken.

There were 3 votes in favour and 3 against. The proposal was not adopted.

The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution in document T/C.2/L.70, with paragraph 4 deleted, to the vote.

The resolution was adopted by 3 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

V. Petitions from Chief Hussen Mohamud Dini (T/PET.11/366 and Add.1), from Haji Abdalla Hussen and Others (T/PET.11/367) and from Chief Cahir Sciacul (T/PET.11/L.5)

The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution to the vote.

The resolution was adopted by 3 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

VI. Petition from Haj Abdullah Hassein (T/PET.11/372 and Add.1)

The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution to the vote.

The resolution was adopted by 3 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

VII. Petition from Haji Abdullahi Hussein (T/PET.11/374)

The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution to the vote.

The resolution was adopted by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

VIII. Petition from Mr. Mohi Edden Abo Bakre Othman Herset (T/PET.11/359)

The CHAIRMAN asked that a separate vote should be taken on paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 4 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution was adopted by 4 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Administering Authority was required to submit information on the effect given to resolution VIII and that all the other resolutions in the draft report would therefore be mentioned in paragraph 3 of document T/C.2/L.70 (page 2).

The Chairman then put the draft report to the vote.

The report was adopted by 4 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.