

being taken of the geographical situation of the countries represented with respect to the territory of the former Italian colonies. This sub-committee will study all drafts and suggestions which have been submitted . . ."

18. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) and Mr. ARCE (Argentina) considered the amendment proposed by the representative of Greece to be unnecessary since the composition of the sub-committee had already been decided upon. The former proposed that the Argentine draft resolution be amended by replacing the segment of phrase "of 15 members" up to the words "geographical position", by a simple enumeration of the delegations which had been elected.

19. Mr. de FREITAS-VALLE (Brazil) thought that since the composition of the sub-committee had been decided upon it had in effect been established.

20. Mr. PIPINELIS (Greece) withdrew his amendment but believed that a formal decision should be taken to create the sub-committee.

21. Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) proposed that the Argentine draft resolution be amended by enumerating the countries and then omitting the words "on which all the members of the Committee will be represented proportionally in accordance with their geographical position." The amended text would also contain an additional paragraph stating that the sub-committee would report to the First Committee by 15 October.

22. The CHAIRMAN asked Mr. Arce whether he accepted the amendment.

23. Mr. ARCE (Argentina) answered in the affirmative.

*The Argentine draft resolution as amended was adopted by 54 votes with one abstention.*

24. Mr. HOOD (Australia) assumed that it would be left to the discretion of the sub-committee to submit a single comprehensive draft resolution dealing with the whole question of the former Italian colonies or separate draft resolutions dealing individually with each of the territories concerned.

25. Sir Mohammad ZAFRULLA KHAN (Pakistan) pointed out that the resolution adopted by the Committee expressly provided that the sub-committee might submit either one or more draft resolutions.

26. He said that his delegation was preparing to submit a draft resolution which had been withheld in order that study might be given to the proposals from other delegations. Since the text of the draft resolution was not yet available he

deemed it advisable to explain its substance at the present time.<sup>1</sup>

27. In general the preamble of the draft resolution followed the same lines as that of the United States delegation with the exception of certain changes, in particular the incorporation of the directions contained in annex XI, paragraph 3 of the Peace Treaty with Italy.

28. As regards Libya the proposals were also similar to those of the United States with the following exceptions:

(a) stress was laid on the ultimate objective of a unified as well as an independent Libya; (b) it was proposed to add Pakistan to the membership of the Advisory Council and also to include a representative of the local population of the Fezzan; (c) it was stated that the Council in addition to advising the Administering Authorities how they should assist the inhabitants to form a Government for an independent Libya, should also advise the Administering Authorities regarding the functions set out in the first two sub-paragraphs of paragraph A 1.; (d) it was left to the Advisory Council to determine the location of its headquarters after consultation with the Secretary-General.

29. As regards Eritrea and Somaliland the proposals were different from those of the United States. For the former the Pakistan draft resolution recommended independence after three years as in the case of Libya. The process leading up to that independence would be the same as in the case of Libya, that is to say, there would be similar provisions relating to the duties of the Administering Authorities and to the creation of an advisory council.

30. As regards Somaliland it was proposed to institute an international trusteeship for a period of ten years. The territory would be administered by an administrator appointed by and responsible to the Trusteeship Council.

31. Finally, it was proposed to establish a separate boundary commission for each territory. In the case of Libya the commission would consist of Egypt, the United Kingdom and a third Member State to be nominated by the President of the General Assembly. In the case of Eritrea and Somaliland it was proposed that the membership of the commission should consist of Ethiopia, the United Kingdom and a Member State to be nominated by the President of the General Assembly.

*It was decided that the sub-committee should meet to discuss the order of its work immediately after the end of the present meeting of the First Committee.*

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.

<sup>1</sup> Later submitted as document A/C.1/499.

## TWO HUNDRED AND NINETY-SECOND MEETING

*Held at Lake Success, New York, on Saturday, 15 October 1949, at 10.45 a.m.*

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

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

1. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) requested the Chairman to read to the

Committee the letter addressed to him on 13 October 1949 by the representatives of the Somali Youth League. According to that letter, the inhabitants of Somaliland were demonstrating in protest against the proposed Italian trusteeship

over the territory, and the demonstrations were being suppressed by the British Authorities. Mr. Kiselev contended that the information supplied previously by the United Kingdom representative (289th meeting) was not in accordance with the truth, since subsequently tension and terror had increased in the territory. Moreover, the Somalis were being denied their freedom of expression and their elementary human rights. That was borne out by the fact that the headquarters of the Somali Youth League had been closed and their leaders had been either jailed or exiled. The First Committee should take action on the basis of that letter with a view to putting an end to British arbitrary actions in Somaliland. In conclusion, Mr. Kiselev asked the Chairman to have the letter read to the First Committee; to invite the representative of the United Kingdom to comment on the contents of the letter and to request the Administering Authority to put an end to the existing terror.

2. The CHAIRMAN said that, among the many letters he received daily, he might have received the one referred to but that it was not before him at that time. It was, however, obvious that any member of the Committee had the right to read such a communication. As to the second question, he inquired whether the United Kingdom representative wished to make any statement in that respect.

3. Mr. McNEIL (United Kingdom) objected to Mr. Kiselev's contention that his delegation's earlier statement was not in accordance with the truth. As to the situation in Somaliland, he reaffirmed that, since his last statement on the matter, no further disorder or casualties had been reported. Moreover, the restrictions, imposed with regret by the Administering Authorities, had almost all been removed. The curfew had been modified; the political clubs, including those of the Somali Youth League except for those of Mogadiscio, had all been reopened; those of Mogadiscio had been partially reopened.

4. Finally, Mr. McNeil noted that the temporary restrictions had been imposed on all political organizations and not on the Somali Youth League exclusively.

5. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) said that in its earlier statement the United Kingdom delegation had tried to minimize the gravity of the situation existing in Somaliland. The First Committee could not overlook the fact that demonstrations had occurred in at least fifteen places and that in some of those places several persons had been killed or injured, and that several leaders of the Somali Youth League had been sentenced to terms of imprisonment, ranging from eight to twelve months. In view of those facts, he deemed it useless for the First Committee to discuss the problem of the Italian colonies, if in the meantime the basic human rights of the inhabitants could not be safeguarded. The First Committee should make a firm recommendation to the Administering Authority to remove the ban on all political organizations and to release the arrested leaders.

6. Mr. McNEIL (United Kingdom) replied that the casualties referred to by the representative of Poland had already been mentioned in the earlier statement made by his delegation and that no further casualties had been reported subsequently. As to the sentences imposed on the ar-

rested leaders, those sentences had been suspended as a result of their appeal.

7. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) recalled that he had previously requested the Chairman to direct the Secretariat to read the letter received from the Somali Youth League.

8. The CHAIRMAN explained that it had not been the practice of the Chairman of the First Committee to have communications received from private individuals and non-governmental organizations read to the Committee. However, it was perfectly in order for the representative of the Byelorussian SSR to read the letter to the Committee himself if he so wished.

9. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) questioned the statement made by the Chairman, in view of the particular importance of the letter under discussion.

10. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) read the text of the letter dated 13 October 1949 sent by the Somali Youth League to the Chairman of the First Committee, in which it was alleged that the British Military Authorities were still continuing to massacre the Somalis, to arrest and deport their leaders and to ban the branches of the Somali Youth League situated in the interior of the country. The Somali Youth League had been unable to submit to the First Committee full information concerning the disturbances in Somaliland due to the arrest and deportation of their leaders. The latter, after stating that a number of high officials of the Somali Youth League had been sentenced to various terms of imprisonment, referred to excerpts from reports published in *The New York Times* to the effect that a British frigate had been dispatched to Mogadiscio and that R.A.F. aircraft had been reconnoitering. Finally, the letter quoted a telegram received from Mogadiscio requesting that the Chief Administrator and some of his subordinates be brought before the International Court of Justice on account of massacring the people of Somaliland and of violating human rights and freedom of expression in the territory, as well as imposing arbitrary and excessive penalties on the leaders of the Somali Youth League.

11. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) proposed that the Committee recommend to Sub-Committee 17 that a hearing be given to the representative of the Somali Youth League on the questions contained in the letter of the League, at the first meeting of the Sub-Committee or at its earliest possible opportunity, and that the Sub-Committee should recommend to the First Committee the steps which could be taken in connexion with the situation in Somaliland.

*The Polish proposal was rejected by 21 votes to 11, with 16 abstentions.*

12. Mr. McNEIL (United Kingdom) said that he could understand the feeling of the officials of the Somali Youth League. The latter were passionately anti-Italian and had protested each time the United Nations had appeared to be associating Italy with the administration of the former Italian Somaliland. However, he assured Mr. Manuisky and the Committee that the administration had taken no measures to act exclusively against the Somali Youth League. Following the action on which details had been given, it had

been considered necessary to impose some temporary restrictive measures not directed, as had been said, exclusively against the Somali Youth League, but intended to maintain order and not to prevent an expression of political opinion. There had been no ban of the Somali Youth League, and demonstrations had been taking place within the last forty-eight hours, and no doubt were still taking place in all parts of the territory except in Mogadiscio. Such demonstrations would continue to take place as long as they did not constitute a threat to the general population and were in conformity with the local laws on the subject. The curfew had been raised progressively, and he thought that at the present time it was only partially in existence at Mogadiscio. In all places except Mogadiscio, the clubs had been re-opened to all parties, and even at Mogadiscio the clubs of the Somali Youth League had again been made available to the officers of that organization.

13. Mr. McNeil pointed out that his delegation had already apologised for the most unfortunate deaths that had occurred. While seven deaths and twelve people wounded represented a very serious situation, the latter scarcely merited the description of a massacre. Six persons had been arrested, of which two had been found not guilty and had been acquitted. Four had been found guilty of inciting a mob to violence and had been sentenced, as the Committee had been informed by the Polish representative. He reiterated, however, that appeals had immediately been made against those sentences and that they had been suspended. The appeals would be heard by the Appeals Court very shortly.

14. Mr. McNeil hoped that the representative of the Ukrainian SSR would agree that the British Authorities had acted as promptly as they could to restore normal conditions, whether or not Mr. Manuisky approved of the initial conduct of those authorities. In conclusion he said that one frigate and six fighter aircraft were normally stationed in the territory.

15. Mr. HOOD (Rapporteur of Sub-Committee 17) said that in spite of the fact that Sub-Committee 17 had been sitting almost constantly it had not yet entirely completed discussion of the first item which it had taken up, the question of Libya. The opinion of most of the members of the Sub-Committee and of its officers was that at least another five days and possibly six, would be necessary to complete the work properly.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that, assuming that prophecy to be correct and that the Sub-Committee's report would not be received for another five or six days, the Committee would have to decide what to do in the meantime. Pointing out that the Conciliation Committee dealing with the Greek problem hoped to report to the Committee on 17 or 18 October, he said that the Committee could, of course, begin discussion of that report and of the Greek question while the Sub-Committee was dealing still with the former Italian colonies. Another alternative would be for the Committee to discuss the next item of the agenda, the USSR proposal, throughout the following week while Sub-Committee 17 was at work. Still another course would be to have the full Committee meet in the mornings dealing with the next item on the agenda while the Sub-Committee met in the afternoons.

17. Mr. C. MALIK (Lebanon) proposed that the Committee meet on Tuesday morning to consider

the report of the Conciliation Committee on the Greek question and then decide what to do next.

18. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, if the Committee did not meet while the Sub-Committee was meeting, the possibility of a complete consideration of all items on the agenda during the present session would be gravely jeopardized. He therefore favoured the proposal that the Committee should meet in the morning and the Sub-Committee in the afternoon, and supported the Chairman's suggestion that the morning meetings be devoted to the third item on the agenda, namely the USSR proposal.

19. Mr. McNEIL (United Kingdom), pointing out that alternation of the meetings of the Committee and of the Sub-Committee might well involve loss of time, especially if the two were discussing different items, supported the proposal of the Lebanese representatives.

20. Mr. MANUILSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) considered the fears expressed by the United Kingdom representative to be unwarranted. It would be another matter if political interests were involved and it was desired to delay the discussion of some item. However, that question had not been raised. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR therefore supported the proposal made by the representative of the Soviet Union, which was most calculated to further the work of the Committee. Moreover, the other items on the agenda could be discussed with calm and serenity once a proper exchange of views had taken place on the third item.

21. The CHAIRMAN stated that he would submit to the Committee the two proposals, namely that of Lebanon and that of the Soviet Union, in the order in which they had been submitted. Therefore, a vote would be taken first on the Lebanese proposal that the Committee adjourn until Tuesday morning, when it would discuss the report of the Greek Conciliation Committee.

*The Lebanese proposal was adopted by 45 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.*

22. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) stated that he had just submitted a draft resolution (A/C.1/501) appealing to the Administering Authorities in Somaliland to permit free expression of opinion.

23. Mr. DE HOLTE CASTELLO (Colombia), pointing out that the Committee had had no time to consider the draft resolution submitted by the Polish representative, moved that the meeting be adjourned.

24. Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) stated that in view of the importance of the question and of the fact that the matter had been discussed sufficiently to permit an immediate decision, he would vote against the motion for adjournment.

25. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), supporting the views expressed by the Mexican representative, said that he would also vote against the motion.

*The motion to adjourn was rejected by 28 votes to 13, with 8 abstentions.*

26. Mr. JESSUP (United States of America) thought that the subject of the Polish draft resolution ought to be disposed of immediately. He therefore moved the closure of the debate under rule 106 of the rules of procedure.

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