

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

Thursday, 11 December 1958,
at 9.5 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 41:	
Question of the frontier between the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration and Ethiopia: reports of the Governments of Ethiopia and of Italy (continued)	537
Requests for hearings (continued)	
Requests concerning agenda item 13 (Report of the Trusteeship Council) (continued)	542

Chairman: Mr. Frederick H. BOLAND (Ireland).

AGENDA ITEM 41

Question of the frontier between the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration and Ethiopia: reports of the Governments of Ethiopia and of Italy (A/4030, A/4031 and Add.1; A/C.4/L.577) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, as informal conversations were still proceeding between certain delegations in an attempt to arrive at a draft resolution that might obtain wide support in the Committee, the meeting might be recessed for a short period.

2. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom), Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) and Mr. COHEN (Chile) supported that suggestion.

The meeting was suspended at 9.10 p.m. and resumed at 9.50 p.m.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Mohamed Hassan El Zayyat, representative of the United Nations Advisory Council for the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian Administration, took a place at the Committee table.

3. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti), speaking on behalf of the delegations that had participated in the conversations, expressed regret that no agreement had been reached on an acceptable text.

4. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) associated his delegation with the remarks made by the representative of Haiti.

5. In its desire to see an agreement reached, Ceylon was prepared to go to some length to accommodate the Italian delegation and, together with the other sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.577), was willing to accept the new paragraph proposed in the fourth Italian amendment (A/C.4/L.578, para. 4), if it were amended to read as follows:

"Expresses the hope that the parties will reach agreement within three months, if possible, on the choice of an independent person to assist them in the formulation of the compromis or, failing agreement between them, recommends that His Majesty the King of Norway appoint a jurist as such independent person".

6. Concerning the other Italian amendments (A/C.4/L.578, paras. 1-3), the first would appear to be superfluous, since the draft resolution already reaffirmed General Assembly resolution 1213 (XII), which recalled all the resolutions referred to in the amendment. Furthermore, if the draft resolution were adopted, the General Assembly would surely reaffirm its previous resolutions on the subject. The second amendment was of less importance and the third was no longer necessary. The question mainly centered round the appointment of the "independent person" mentioned in General Assembly 1213 (XII) and the delegation of Ceylon had accepted the three-months stipulation and added the words "if possible", in deference to the United Arab Republic. Concerning the use of the word "jurist", while the representative of Italy and the Minister of Economic Affairs of the Government of Somaliland preferred that the person in question should be chosen from a wider field, the sponsors had felt that, as the problem was a legal one, an eminent international jurist, to be chosen by His Majesty the King of Norway, would satisfy a majority in the Committee. They hoped that the representative of Italy and the Somali Minister would agree.

7. Mr. ALEMAYEHOU (Ethiopia), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that the mention of individual persons by name in draft resolutions was subject to certain preliminary formalities. He felt that courtesy required a blank space to be left pending the completion of the necessary formalities.

8. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) thanked the representative of Ethiopia for having raised the point and said that he had intended that the reference to His Majesty the King of Norway should be subject to the latter's acceptance and to the acceptance of the General Assembly.

9. Mr. RAVNE (Norway) expressed surprise that the name of His Majesty the King of Norway should have been mentioned in the text without previous consultation of his delegation.

10. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom), supported by Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium), suggested that the space for the name should be left blank until the matter was decided by the General Assembly.

11. The CHAIRMAN recalled that that procedure had been followed in the past.

12. Mr. ARAMBURU (Peru) said that his delegation agreed in principle with the text submitted by Ceylon but wished to know if the choice of the "independent person" would be binding on the two parties.

13. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that, since neither of the parties would agree to any other arrangement, the decision would be binding.

14. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) thanked the delegations which had joined in the informal meeting and in the endea-

vours to reach a solution. At the beginning of that meeting he had made his delegation's position clear concerning the choice of the "independent person" and had explained why it insisted that such a person should be independent of either side.

15. He wished, for the moment, to reserve his delegation's position concerning the amendment submitted by the delegation of Ceylon to the fourth Italian amendment. Concerning the other Italian amendments, he could not agree with the representative of Ceylon that a reference to previous General Assembly resolutions on the subject was superfluous. As a matter of respect for the General Assembly's earlier decisions and in order to reflect the spirit that had guided the debates on the question, the Italian delegation felt that it was both proper and customary to mention them. It might however, return to that point at a later stage. With regard to the second Italian amendment, he felt that there was justification for expressing the hope that a settlement of the problem would be a final, just and equitable one. He agreed with the representative of Ceylon that the third amendment was no longer necessary and could be deleted.

16. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that, having read the reports submitted by the Governments of Italy and Ethiopia (A/4030, A/4031 and Add.1), he felt that some progress had been made on the question since the previous session. In spite of the disagreements that still existed, both parties had made genuine efforts to reach an agreement and to contribute to a solution of the problem. An encouraging element was the fact that direct contact had been established during the previous year between the Ethiopian Government and the Somali authorities, since it was those two parties which would have to live together as neighbours in the future. Hence although no solution should be imposed on them from outside, every effort should be made to assist them in finding one.

17. From the informal discussions that had been held earlier, there seemed reason to believe that the area of disagreement between the parties was not very wide and it was to be hoped that the delegation of Italy would see its way to accepting the formula proposed by the sponsors of the draft resolution. It would seem appropriate to reaffirm General Assembly resolution 1213 (XII), since it had been adopted after many consultations and by a unanimous vote. The entire problem at issue could be solved if that resolution could be fully implemented; unfortunately the disagreements between the two parties concerning the choice of the "independent person" to assist them in formulating the compromis had prevented that.

18. A praiseworthy attempt to break the deadlock had been made by the delegation of Ceylon, which had submitted the first text on which maximum agreement could be reached. The Indian delegation would vote in favour of that text if it was included in the draft resolution; in fact, it doubted if any agreement could be reached unless that paragraph were incorporated. He would, however, suggest some minor drafting changes not because there was anything unacceptable in the wording proposed by Ceylon but because on such an important matter the General Assembly should not merely express a hope but make a recommendation. He would therefore suggest that the paragraph proposed by Ceylon should be amended to read:

"**Recommends** that the two parties reach agreement within three months if possible on the choice of an independent person to assist them in the formulation of the terms of reference or that, failing such agreement, appoint a jurist as such independent person."

19. With regard to the other amendments proposed by Italy, he agreed with the representative of Ceylon that the first amendment was superfluous. His delegation had no objection to the General Assembly resolutions in question being mentioned but it would perhaps be better to keep the draft resolution as brief as possible. The same consideration applied to the second amendment; if, however, such a reiteration was felt to be necessary, it would be preferable to reproduce the exact wording used in General Assembly resolution 1213 (XII). Moreover, since the draft resolution provided for the appointment of a jurist, it was hardly necessary to emphasize the equitable nature of the settlement. It was to be hoped that the representative of Italy would either withdraw his amendments or reword them so that they would meet with general acceptance.

20. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) said that as a gesture of compromise to Italy and Somaliland the sponsors of the draft resolution were prepared to accept the first Italian amendment although they considered it superfluous. They would even accept the third Italian amendment, although that too was unnecessary in view of the new paragraph he himself had suggested.

21. The sponsors apologized for their inadvertent discourtesy in mentioning the name of the Norwegian Sovereign without first consulting the Norwegian delegation. They regretted any embarrassment which their so doing might have caused the Norwegian representative and were prepared to replace the name of the Norwegian Sovereign by a blank space.

22. Mr. NIELSEN (Norway) said that the name of the Norwegian Sovereign could not be mentioned in any resolution without the Sovereign's permission. He considered it extremely doubtful that the Sovereign of Norway would accept the proposed role without previous assurance that both parties were in agreement.

23. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) said that the Italian delegation would not press its first amendment but was prepared to accept the view that it was sufficient to recall resolution 1213 (XII). Nor was it pressing for acceptance of the third amendment. He doubted, however, whether it could agree to the deletion of its second amendment, which embodied an idea that had been approved by the General Assembly. The fourth Italian amendment was the most important; with respect to the redrafted version proposed by the representative of Ceylon, if the sponsors would agree to the deletion of the words "a jurist as", the Italian delegation would support that version; if not, he would ask for a separate vote on those words and if they were retained the Italian delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

24. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that since Italy wished to retain its second amendment one solution might be to reproduce the text of the sixth preambulatory paragraph of resolution 1213 (XII) as a new paragraph in the draft resolution. Another possibility

would be to introduce the words: "having regard to the urgency of the matter in view of the fact that Somaliland will achieve independence on 2 December 1960".

25. With regard to the paragraph proposed by the Ceylonese representative, the words "in the formulation of the compromis" should be replaced by the words "in reaching agreement on the compromis," which would be in line with the previous year's text. With respect to the dispute over the word "jurist", since the tribunal's terms of reference would be essentially a legal document it would have to be worked out with the aid of a jurist and his delegation therefore felt that a jurist should be appointed.

26. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) emphasized that the present dispute was not between Ethiopia and Italy, which would relinquish its administration of Somaliland in two years, but between the Ethiopian people and the Somali people. Accordingly the matter should not be discussed within the context of former Italian-Ethiopian relations. As a member of the League of Nations, his country had actively supported the just cause of Ethiopia against Fascist aggression but it also had strong ties of sympathy with the Somali people and admired their efforts to attain independence. It was essential that the frontier question should be settled in such a manner as to preserve the rights of both the Ethiopian and the Somali peoples. It was the duty of the United Nations, which had fixed the date for Somali independence, to ensure that the new State would not be burdened with vexing problems vis-a-vis its neighbours.

27. The Iraqi delegation was not prepared to support any draft resolution which was not acceptable to both parties. It had been encouraged by the agreement to establish an arbitration tribunal, which had been a significant step forward. The two remaining problems, namely the terms of reference of the tribunal and the appointment of the "independent person", were relatively minor matters which could be solved given good will. Only the second of the two could be dealt with by the Committee.

28. Turning to the draft resolution before the Committee, he said that, in all fairness and courtesy, the third preambulatory paragraph should mention also the representative of the United Nations Advisory Council for the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian Administration among those who had made statements to the Committee.

29. The first Italian amendment was inconsequential and required no further comment. The second, however, was of great importance, since it stated an undisputed fact: namely, that a settlement should be reached before Somaliland attained independence. He would accept the recommendation concerning the use of the wording of resolution 1213 (XII) although he felt that the Italian version was more appropriate in view of the urgency of the matter.

30. The crux of the dispute was the reference to the word "jurist", a question which his delegation considered to be slightly academic since the person chosen would in any case have to deal with legal documents. It would help to have a jurist but that would not be enough: the person chosen would have to have extensive knowledge of international and public affairs in order to understand both the legal and the political

aspects of the frontier question. Although his delegation had no objection to Ceylon's proposal, it felt that in view of Italy's categorical rejection of the word "jurist" and Ethiopia's refusal to accept a text which excluded the word, the Fourth Committee had apparently reached an impasse and that it would be useless to approve any draft resolution on the subject. The position would be different the following year: it would be the last remaining year in which the General Assembly could reach a solution, in accordance with its responsibilities under article 1 of the Trusteeship Agreement. If no draft resolution was adopted at the present session, the Iraqi delegation would reserve the right to propose that the General Assembly should take drastic action the following year.

31. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that in view of the positions taken by Ethiopia and Italy the only course was to return to the original draft resolution. The sponsors would, however, accept the Yugoslav proposal that the sixth preambulatory paragraph of resolution 1213 (XII) should be reproduced between the present fifth and sixth preambulatory paragraphs of their draft resolution.

32. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that in a dispute like the present it was important to avoid taking sides and to reach conclusions that were fair to both parties. The Indian delegation would not wish to vote in favour of a draft resolution involving an august personage without previous agreement by both parties. Since Italy had rejected the Ceylonese proposal and Ethiopia had rejected the amendments proposed by Italy, the Committee was back in its original position. Nevertheless, it would still be desirable for the General Assembly to adopt a resolution on the subject, if only one reaffirming resolution 1213 (XII), some of whose recommendations had in fact been implemented.

33. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) agreed with the Yugoslav proposal that the words "in the formulation of the compromis" should be replaced by the words "in reaching agreement on the compromis." Ceylon and the other sponsors of the draft resolution had realized that the task of peacemakers was never rewarding but they had hoped to bring about an agreement between the two parties. Although a solution had appeared to be close, a wide gap still existed over the word "jurist". Speaking for Ceylon alone, he categorically rejected any suggestion that his country was promoting the views of either side. Ceylon, which looked forward to the attainment of independence by Somaliland, would not hesitate to dissociate itself from the draft resolution and, if the co-sponsors agreed, to withdraw the draft resolution and leave the matter to the collective wisdom of the Committee.

34. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) pointed out that it was only the last part of the paragraph proposed by Ceylon that used the word "jurist". The jurist was to be appointed by a personage, whom he would call Mr. X, only in the event of a failure in direct negotiations. In the informal discussions preceding the resumption of the present meeting the proposal had been made that Mr. X should appoint the "independent person" from a list of names submitted jointly by the Governments of Italy and Ethiopia. Such a list would include the names of persons meeting the requirements of the respective Governments. He suggested that that proposal should be explored further as offering a possible way out of the deadlock.

35. Mr. TURKSON (Ghana) said that his country had been accused by Somaliland of taking a partisan stand. The motives of his delegation were, however, quite clear: in the present dispute between two African States it had no desire to help one against the other but was rather seeking a basis for establishing friendly relations between those States. His delegation realized that acceptance of the resolution by both parties was important. In view of the dispute over the word "jurist" and the Norwegian statement that, in the absence of agreement between the two parties, the Norwegian Sovereign could play no part in the matter, the delegation of Ghana saw no point in maintaining the draft resolution and agreed with Ceylon that in the circumstances it might be withdrawn.

36. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) supported the proposal put forward by the representative of Haiti. He hoped that both parties would be able to accept the idea of a joint list which would include the names both of jurists and of other eminent persons.

37. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) withdrew her delegation's sponsorship of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.577).

38. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that his delegation would support the Haitian proposal if it was acceptable to both parties.

39. Mr. NIELSEN (Norway) said that he fully understood the reasons which had prompted the Ceylonese representative to include a specific reference to His Majesty the King of Norway in his oral proposal.

40. His delegation had no objections to the Haitian proposal in principle, so long as the blank space left in the text was not taken as referring to His Majesty the King of Norway. If, however, it was understood to designate His Majesty, the Norwegian delegation would have difficulty in accepting the proposal, for the reason he had previously given: namely, that His Majesty would probably be unwilling to accept such a task unless it was with the full consent of both parties.

41. The CHAIRMAN asked the Haitian representative whether the joint list of names he had proposed was intended to include some names proposed by Italy and some by Ethiopia or only names of persons agreed upon between those two countries.

42. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that each country should be left free to select what names it wished.

43. Mr. ALEMAYEHOU (Ethiopia) thanked the various delegations for the efforts they had made to solve a problem. In a conciliatory spirit, his delegation had been prepared to support the draft resolution although it had had some misgivings about the fifth paragraph of the preamble, which did not adequately reflect what had occurred during the past year and indeed appeared to imply a criticism of Ethiopia, which had done its best to meet the Italian point of view.

44. He regretted that the text was unacceptable to the Italian delegation because of the word "jurist". The Italian objection was difficult to understand in view of the fact that the "independent person" was intended to assist in the formulation of a legal document and should therefore be a trained lawyer with wide experience. His delegation therefore felt obliged to insist on the inclusion of the word "jurist". At the opening of the negotiations between Ethiopia and Italy, the Ethiopian Government had offered the Italian Government a

choice between political and legal means of settlement. When the Italian Government had opted for legal means, negotiations had been started at that level. Italy had agreed that an independent person should be appointed to assist in the negotiations but it had now apparently changed its mind. What it now wished was that the choice of the "independent person" should be left to an august personage, whose decision would be binding on both parties. On the understanding that the august personage would be His Majesty the King of Norway and that he would appoint a jurist, the Ethiopian delegation had been prepared to support the draft resolution. It was discouraging that Italy found it impossible to meet the Ethiopian point of view. The Ethiopian Government had made every effort to achieve a final settlement but its efforts had not been appreciated. It could do no more.

45. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that the Ethiopian and Italian points of view were not very far apart. Although Italy insisted that the "independent person" should have wide political experience, that did not exclude the possibility of his being a jurist, which would be acceptable to the Ethiopian delegation. International jurists must have experience of international affairs. He urged the Ethiopian and Italian delegations to reconsider their position. The joint list proposed by Haiti might provide an acceptable solution for both parties. There was nothing to prevent either Government from including jurists in that list.

46. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon), speaking on behalf of the two remaining sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.4/L.577), withdrew the draft resolution because it had proved unacceptable to the Ethiopian and Italian delegation.

47. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland) said that the Committee should not give up without making one last effort. The area of disagreement between Ethiopia and Italy was really very small. In order to meet the views of both parties, he proposed that the word "jurist" in the draft resolution should be replaced by the words "a prominent person with wide experience of juridical and public affairs", which would leave the august personage complete freedom to select the appropriate person. He urged the Ethiopian and Italian delegations to give his proposal serious consideration.

48. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) said that his delegation accepted the Irish proposal.

49. Mr. ALEMAYEHOU (Ethiopia) said that, although he was grateful to the Irish representative for his initiative, he could not accept his proposal; the "independent person" must be a jurist.

50. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) moved the suspension of the meeting in order to allow delegations to discuss the Irish proposal.

51. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) and Mr. RASGOTRA (India) supported the motion for suspension.

The meeting was suspended at 12.20 a.m. and resumed at 1.20 a.m.

52. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) said that the words "a prominent international attorney" had been suggested as a compromise on which the Italian and Ethiopian representatives might agree.

53. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) said he wished to make a statement on the situation that would arise if neither

of the parties felt able to accept the compromise text. The divergence of views on the qualifications of the "independent person" was indeed great, since one side insisted that that person should be a jurist and the other was anxious not to place any undue restriction on the choice. After eight years of discussion, a decision had been taken on the membership of the arbitration tribunal, but even if the parties could now agree on the "independent person" a decision would still have to be taken on that person's authority. The United Nations had little over a year left in which to formulate a satisfactory procedure that it might suggest to the parties. There seemed to be three possible solutions: the matter might be raised at the resumed thirteenth session of the General Assembly in February, after the question of the Cameroons had been dealt with; the case might be referred to the Trusteeship Council; or the Secretary-General or the Chairman of the Fourth Committee might be authorized to intercede between the two parties, in order that agreement on the "independent person" might be reached within three months. Failing all those, the United Nations should consider any further steps that might be taken to avoid saddling the independent State that would emerge in 1960 with an outstanding frontier problem.

54. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) said that the Ethiopian representative had told him that the words "a person prominent as an international lawyer" would be acceptable to his delegation.

55. Mr. ASHA (United Arab Republic) suggested that, if no agreement were reached at the current meeting, the Committee should express the hope that the Secretary-General would discuss the question with the parties at his convenience.

56. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) said that his delegation would be prepared to accept the phrase "a person prominent as an international lawyer and of acknowledged experience in public affairs".

57. Mr. ALEMAYEHOU (Ethiopia) said that he had been given to understand that the Italian delegation might be willing to accept the last part of the paragraph proposed by the Ceylonese representative, amended to read as follows:

"...reaching agreement on the terms of reference and, failing agreement between them within that period, will appoint a person prominent as an international lawyer as such independent person".

58. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) observed that the wording proposed by his delegation did not introduce a substantive change. Considering the nature of the questions which the "independent person" would be called upon to deal with, experience in public affairs seemed to be essential. The additional phrase might seem redundant to those who held that all international lawyers had experience in public affairs, but his delegation thought it necessary to include that provision, which, moreover, in no way altered the legal qualifications of the person concerned.

59. The CHAIRMAN noted that the difference of views between the Ethiopian and Italian delegations was obviously very wide. He paid a tribute to the delegations which had made painstaking attempts to bridge the gap and regretted that their efforts had been unsuccessful. The Committee now had no text and no formal proposal on which to vote. Accordingly, its only course was to report to the General Assembly that the matter had

been discussed, that statements had been made by the representatives of Ethiopia, Italy, the Government of Somalia and the United Nations Advisory Council for Somaliland and that progress had been made to the extent of establishing an arbitration tribunal, but that no agreement had been reached on the appointment or terms of reference of the "independent person". The report might also state that delegations had expressed the earnest desire that the parties should intensify their efforts to implement General Assembly resolution 1213 (XII), but that no resolution on the matter had been approved at the present session. Reference might also be made to the suggestion made by the representative of the United Arab Republic.

60. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) said that his delegation was prepared to introduce a short, uncontroversial draft resolution, but would only submit it formally if the Ethiopian and Italian delegations would accept it. It would read as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Recalling its resolution 1213 (XII) of 14 December 1957,

"Urges the parties once again to intensify their efforts to implement the terms of resolution 1213 (XII);

"Requests the Governments of Ethiopia and of Italy to report to the General Assembly at its fourteenth session on the measures taken by them to give effect to the present resolution."

61. The proposed text in fact consisted of the first preambulatory paragraph and the last two operative paragraphs of the three-Power draft resolution that had been withdrawn (A/C.4/L.577).

62. Mr. ALEMAYEHOU (Ethiopia) thanked the representative of the United Arab Republic for his suggestion, but as it seemed to imply a return to proposals of mediation it was unacceptable.

63. His delegation was, however, prepared to accept the short draft resolution suggested by the Ceylonese representative.

64. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) asked the Ceylonese representative why he had withdrawn the three-Power resolution, which his delegation had co-sponsored, if he had intended to reintroduce it in a shorter form.

65. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) said that many delegations had worked hard to bring about agreement, feeling that it would be lamentable to betray the trust of the Somali people in the United Nations simply because the parties were unable to agree on one point, and three of them had submitted a draft resolution to serve as a point of departure for further negotiation. His delegation's new proposal would leave the door open for the Ethiopian and Italian Governments to pursue negotiations by the best possible means, of which they alone could be the judges. If they thought they could reach agreement among themselves, that would certainly be the best way out; if they felt that they should enlist the assistance of the Secretary-General, that was for them to decide. In any case, a restatement of the Assembly's earlier resolution was the least that the Committee could put forward as an alternative to admitting complete failure.

66. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) thanked the Ceylonese representative for his indefatigable efforts to bring about

agreement. However, in the light of the statement made at the previous meeting by the Minister of Economic Affairs of the Government of Somalia, the Italian delegation could not accept the Ceylonese suggestion in its present form.

67. The SECRETARY-GENERAL stated that, if the Committee were to fail to reach an agreement, it would be his intention to make contact with the Government of Ethiopia and the Government of Italy to see in what way he could be of assistance. It was of course for the Governments to accept or reject such an initiative on his part, but he would certainly feel it to be his duty to do his best in such direction. The Secretary-General pointed out that he was saying this only with the hope that it might be helpful for the consideration of the Committee and the writing of the report. He did not want in any way to intervene in the affair, but this intention of his was after all a fact, which he was quite willing to put on record.

68. Mr. VITELLI (Italy) expressed his delegation's gratitude to the Secretary-General for his statement. He recalled that his Government had suggested in its report (A/4030) that the Secretary-General might be requested to play a part in the negotiations; it was to be hoped that such intervention would indeed take place.

69. Mr. ALEMAYEHOU (Ethiopia) observed that his understanding of the Secretary-General's statement differed somewhat from that of the Italian representative. The Ethiopian delegation had carefully avoided involving the Secretary-General in the question throughout the debate but it now felt obliged to refer to the Secretary-General's participation, in the light of the Italian representative's remarks.

70. It was true that the Italian Government had proposed that the Secretary-General or his representative should be appointed as the "independent person" referred to in resolution 1213 (XII), but the Ethiopian delegation had thought that the task was not one with which the Secretary-General should be burdened. For that reason, it had not accepted at the previous session a Philippine amendment proposing that the Secretary-General should appoint an umpire for the arbitration tribunal (A/C.4/L.530, para. 3). The Ethiopian delegation had always assumed that the Secretary-General would not like to be implicated in the question, particularly as the matter concerned the United Nations so closely and the General Assembly must have meant the "independent person" not to be associated with the Organization. He therefore hoped that the Secretary-General's offer—for which his delegation was none the less grateful—did not mean that he himself would participate in the negotiations between the Ethiopian and Italian Governments.

71. The SECRETARY-GENERAL stated that the representative of Ethiopia was correct. He did not claim to be the "independent person" in the very special sense of the resolution, but he might perhaps be of some assistance to the Governments, if they so wished, in finding a solution to the problem of an "independent person".

72. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) hoped that the Rapporteur's report on the question would describe in detail the many attempts that had been made to bring about an agreement between the two parties.

73. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) expressed the hope that

the report would reflect the fact that Liberia had withdrawn its sponsorship of the draft resolution because the Ethiopian and Italian delegations had been unable to accept it.

74. Mr. EL ZAYYAT (United Nations Advisory Council for the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian Administration) thanked the Committee for allowing him to state the Advisory Council's views on the matter. It should be borne in mind that after the General Assembly's deliberations had been concluded, the Advisory Council would still live with the problems concerned and that it shared the hopes and fears of the Somali people. He had described those fears to the Committee at the 839th meeting; now he hoped to be able to convey to the Somali people that the United Nations had not deserted them and was still willing to extend to them the support to which they were entitled as inhabitants of a Trust Territory.

75. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Rapporteur should present a draft report setting forth the proposals that had at one time been before the Committee, indicating that the Committee was unable to recommend a draft resolution on the question and noting the statements by the Secretary-General.

It was so decided.

Requests for hearings (continued)

REQUESTS CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 13 (REPORT OF THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL) (continued)

76. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the four petitioners who had appeared before it in connexion with the future of the Trust Territories of the Cameroons under British administration and the Cameroons under French administration had requested that arrangements should be made to hear them during the resumed part of the General Assembly's thirteenth session. He asked the Committee whether it would be willing to consider the decision to accord them a hearing during the first part of the session as valid for the resumed session.

77. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that he could not accept that suggestion. The requests for hearings should be considered at the resumed session, when a decision would be taken.

78. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) suggested that, as a compromise, petitioners who had already been granted hearings should be allowed to make statements at the resumed session while new requests for hearings should be considered at that time.

79. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that he could not accept that solution, which was not a genuine compromise.

80. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) proposed that the petitioners should be informed that they might have a fifteen-minute hearing at the resumed session and that they might present written statements without restriction.

81. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) and Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) supported that proposal.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose on Friday, 12 December 1958 at 2.25 a.m.