

UNITED NATIONS  
TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL

DOCUMENTS  
INDEX UNIT MASTER



10 1955

Distr.  
GENERAL

T/C.2/SR.228  
1 March 1955

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Friday, 11 February 1955, at 10.35 a.m.

CONTENTS

Petitions concerning the Trust Territory of Togoland under French  
Administration: draft reports (T/C.2/L.119/Add.1, T/C.2/L.133,  
T/C.2/L.134) (continued)

PRESIDENT:

Chairman:

Mr. TARAZI Syria

Members:

Mr. SCHEYVEN Belgium

Mr. de CAMERET )  
Mr. MAX ) France

Mr. BHANDARI India

Mr. KARTSEV Union of Soviet Socialist  
Republics

Mr. CRAMER United States of America

Secretariat:

Mr. RANKIN Secretary of the Committee

PETITIONS CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY OF TOGOLAND UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION:  
DRAFT REPORTS (T/C.2/L.119/Add.1, T/C.2/L.133, T/C.2/L.134) (continued)

Document T/C.2/L.119/Add.1

I. Petition from Mr. Koumavoh Agboyi (T/PET.7/403)

Draft resolution I was approved by 4 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

II. Petition from Mr. Andréas Dagadon (T/PET.7/422)

Draft resolution II was approved by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

III. Petitions concerning certain incidents at Sanghana Mango, from the Mango Branch of the Comité de l'Union togolaise (CUT) (T/PET.7/409), the General Chairman of the CUT (T/PET.7/410) and Mr. Ndjambara Ntchaba (T/PET.7/413)

Mr. PHANDARI (India) suggested that the alternate proposals of the Belgian and USSR representatives should be amalgamated in a single resolution.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that, if the Committee agreed with the Indian suggestion, the Belgian proposal and the two paragraphs of the USSR proposal might be voted on separately.

It was so decided.

The paragraph consisting the Belgian proposal was approved by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The first paragraph of the USSR proposal was approved by 3 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

The second paragraph of the USSR proposal was approved by 3 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

A vote was taken on draft resolution III as a whole.

There were 3 votes in favour and 3 against.

After a brief recess in accordance with rule 38 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, a second vote was taken.

There were 3 votes in favour and 3 against. The draft resolution was not approved.

Mr. CRAMER (United States of America) explained that he had voted against the draft resolution as a whole because he did not consider it advisable for the Visiting Mission's attention to be called to so many detailed petitions. The question of observance of human rights came within the Visiting Mission's basic terms of reference and to draw its attention to individual cases which would be impossible to investigate, was unnecessary.

Mr. DHANDARI (India) explained that he had voted for the second paragraph of the USSR proposal because his delegation was convinced that general charges of violation of human rights and discrimination against political parties should be brought to the notice of the Visiting Mission. The Mission would not, however, be expected to hold an investigation in respect of each individual petition which included general charges.

Mr. MAX (France) considered that it was both improper to refer specific petitions to the Visiting Mission and unnecessary to inform the Mission of the work it was in any case bound to perform under its terms of reference. Although it had seemed that the Indian suggestion would facilitate the Committee's work, the outcome of the vote had shown that it would be wiser to follow the usual procedure in future.

Mr. CRAMER (United States of America) moved the reintroduction of the Belgian proposal.

A vote was taken on the United States motion.

There were 3 votes in favour and 3 against.

After a brief recess in accordance with rule 38 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, a second vote was taken.

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

Mr. KARTSEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had not objected to an amalgamation of the Belgian and USSR proposals, for it was quite proper to draw the petitioners' attention to the Administering Authority's observations on specific complaints. Nevertheless, he had voted against the reintroduction of the Belgian proposal, because the draft resolution should

contain instructions to the Visiting Mission to investigate the general allegations made in the petitions.

Mr. BHANDARI (India) explained that, although he had abstained from voting on the Belgian proposal when it had been submitted as part of draft resolution III, he had voted against its reintroduction because the draft resolution in that form would be incomplete.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of Syria, said that he had voted for the USSR proposal because he considered that it preserved the balance between the interests of the petitioner and the Administering Authority. He had been obliged to vote against the United States motion, not because the Belgian proposal was unacceptable but because the resulting draft resolution would be incomplete.

Mr. RANKIN (Secretary of the Committee) suggested that, as the situation was somewhat unusual and the Committee had no resolution to submit to the Council, the Secretariat should reflect the whole proceedings faithfully in its report.

It was so decided.

#### IV. Petition from JUVENTO (T/PET.7/415)

Mr. SCHEYVEN (Belgium) proposed the addition of the words "Draws the attention of the petitioners to the observations of the Administering Authority" as the first paragraph of the operative part in alternative A of the draft resolution.

The proposal was adopted.

Mr. MAX (France) drew attention to the vagueness of the unfounded charges in the petition, which had been drafted after a public meeting of JUVENTO.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of Syria, proposed that the word "Decides" in the second paragraph of alternative A should be replaced by the word "Informs".

The proposal was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, even if alternative A was adopted, alternative B could still be put to the vote and, if adopted, included in the draft resolution.

Mr. MAX (France) felt that, as a general principle, such procedure might prove unwise; it might occasionally happen that the two parts of such composite draft resolutions conflicted with each other.

The draft resolution, incorporating alternative A, was approved by 3 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions.

A vote was taken on alternative B.

There were 3 votes in favour and 3 against.

After a brief recess in accordance with rule 38 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, a second vote was taken.

There were 3 votes in favour and 3 against. Alternative B was not adopted.

V. Petitions from Mr. Amadou Guinguin and others (T/PET.7/418, T/PET.7/423)

Mr. MAX (France) recalled the fantastic assertions in the petition, particularly the statement that the inhabitants of Mango were grouped in districts according to their political affiliations.

A vote was taken on the draft resolution incorporating alternative A.

There were 3 votes in favour and 3 against.

After a brief recess in accordance with rule 38 of the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council, a second vote was taken.

There were 3 votes in favour and 3 against. The draft resolution incorporating alternative A was not adopted.

The draft resolution incorporating alternative B was approved by 3 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Mr. BHANDARI (India) explained that he had voted in favour of alternative B for the same reasons as in the case of alternative B in section IV.

VI. Petitions from Mr. Paul Y. Agbetété (T/PET.7/419 and T/COM.7/L.22)

Draft resolution VI was approved by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

VII. Petition from Mr. Joseph G. Kunakey (T/PET.7/424)

Draft resolution VII was approved by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

VIII. Petition from Mr. Nicolas K. Akakpoh (T/PET.7/425)

Draft resolution VIII was approved by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

IX. Petition from Mr. Vincent G. Kpotufe (T/PET/7.412)

Mr. MAX (France) remarked that, as the petitioner had waited for several months before lodging his complaint and as there had been no witnesses of the attack on his person, it was unlikely that he would obtain much satisfaction from pursuing the case any further.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the petitioner was still legally entitled to take further action.

Mr. MAX (France) agreed but felt that the second paragraph of the operative part of the draft resolution was superfluous, since a very well-known lawyer was defending the petitioner and would presumably ensure that the petitioner enjoyed his full rights.

Mr. CRAMER (United States of America) requested a separate vote on the second paragraph of the operative part.

The second paragraph of the operative part was approved by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Draft resolution IX was approved by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

X. Petition from Mr. Amadou Guinguina (T/PET.7/416)

Draft resolution X was approved by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. CRAMER (United States of America) suggested, for the completion of paragraph 3 of the draft report, that the Administering Authority should be asked for special information concerning the action taken on resolution IX.

It was so agreed.

The draft report was approved by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Document T/C.2/L.133

I. Petition from Mr. P. Theophile Mally (T/PET.7/428)

Draft resolution I was approved by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

II. Petition from the General Secretary of the RPRIF (T/PET.7/427)

Draft resolution II was approved by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

III. Petition from Mr. William Amenka Kofi (T/PET.7/408 and Add.1)

Mr. MAX (France) reminded the Committee that the petition had raised the question of principle whether a petitioner who used extravagant and insulting language about the Administering Authority should not be reproved by the Council.

Mr. KARTSEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

Paragraph 3 was approved by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Draft resolution III was approved by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

IV. Petition from JUVENTO (T/PET.7/414)

Draft resolution IV was approved by 4 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

V. Petitions from Mr. André Tougnon, Mr. Georges Ganke and Mr. Jonathan Nadhon (T/PET.7/364, T/PET.7/404, T/PET.7/405)

Draft resolution V was approved by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.



VI. Petition from Mr. Mathias Eklu-Natey (T/PET.7/406)

Draft resolution VI was approved by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

VII. Petition from Mr. Vincent G. Kpotufe (T/PET.7/411)

Draft resolution VII was approved by 4 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

VIII. Petition from Mr. Boniface Dotse (T/PET.7/417)

Draft resolution VIII was approved by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

IX. Petitions from Mr. El Hadj Issa (T/PET.7/393 and Add.1, T/PET.7/426)

Draft resolution IX was approved by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. CRAMER (United States of America) suggested that all the resolutions except VII should be entered in paragraph 3 of the draft report.

It was so decided.

The draft report (T/C.2/L.133) was adopted by 3 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Document T/C.2/L.134

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

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.