

UNITED NATIONS  
TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL



Distr.  
GENERAL

T/C.2/SR.462

3 June 1958

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: FRENCH

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FOUR HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Friday, 13 December 1957, at 3.10 p.m.

CONTENTS

Reports of the Committee on Classification of Communications  
(T/C.2/L.312-315)

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. ZADOTTI	Italy
<u>later:</u>	Mr. JAIPAL	India
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. YANG	China
	Mr. de CAMARET	France
	Mr. ZADOTTI	Italy
	Mr. BENDRYSHEV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. SANKEY	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
<u>Also present:</u>	Mr. SMOLDEREN	Belgium, Committee on Classification of Communications
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. COTTRELL	Secretary of the Committee

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON CLASSIFICATION OF COMMUNICATIONS (T/C.2/L.312-315)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Smolderen (Belgium), Committee on Classification of Communications, took a place at the Committee table.

Third report of the Committee on Classification of Communications (T/C.2/L.312)

In reply to Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. COTTRELL (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Standing Committee on Petitions had not yet examined petitions T/PET.5/931 and T/PET.5/1095.

Mr. Jaipal (India) took the Chair.

Mr. YANG (China) proposed that the Standing Committee should approve the classification recommended for the petitions referred to in paragraph 3 of the report.

The classification recommended in paragraph 3 of the report was approved.

The classification recommended in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the report was approved.

Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the petitions referred to in paragraph 6 (a) and (c) of the report related to questions concerning the general situation in the Territory; he proposed that the Committee should recommend that the Council should examine the petitions when it considered the next report of the Administering Authority.

It was so decided.

Fourth report of the Committee on Classification of Communications (T/C.2/L.313)

Mr. YANG (China) proposed that the Committee should approve the reclassification recommended.

Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had no objection to petition T/PET.4 and 5/11, referred to in paragraph 3 (c), being reclassified under rule 85, paragraph 2; as, however, it contained important complaints of a specific nature, he proposed that the Standing Committee should consider it in conjunction with other petitions relating to the same matters.

At the request of Mr. de CAMARET (France), the CHAIRMAN put the USSR representative's proposal to the vote.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 4 votes to 2.

Mr. YANG (China) explained that he had voted against the proposal in deference to the recommendations of the Committee on Classification.

Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not think that petitions T/PET.7/531 and 533 should be reclassified as inadmissible. He asked for a separate vote on paragraph 3 (d) of the report; he would vote against that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 3 (d) of the report to the vote.

The recommendation in paragraph 3 (d) was approved by 4 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The recommendations in paragraph 3 (a), (b), (c) and (e) were approved.

Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on the recommendation of the Committee on Classification that the last complaint in petition T/PET.5/888, section 2, appearing in paragraph 3 (f) (i), should be regarded as inadmissible.

The recommendation was approved by 4 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the petitions referred to in paragraph 3 (f) (ii) concerned not only general questions but also specific complaints. He proposed that those complaints should be considered by the Committee together with other petitions relating to the same subject, or separately if there were no other petitions with similar complaints. The classification would not be changed.

The CHAIRMAN put the USSR proposal to the vote.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 3 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

The classification recommended in paragraph 3 (f) (ii) was approved.

Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked why it had been found necessary to reclassify the petitions mentioned in paragraph 3 (f) (iii). What had been recommended by the Committee on Classification was that

/...

(Mr. Bendryshev, USSR)

these petitions should not be considered at all, either by the Committee on Petitions or by the Trusteeship Council. Such recommendation had to be explained and supported by serious reasons.

In reply to questions by Mr. YANG (China), Mr. SMOLDEREN (Belgium), Committee on Classification of Communications, said that a number of petitions listed in paragraph 3 (f) (iii) were addressed to the President of the General Assembly or to the Chairman of the Fourth Committee. It was the practice to classify them as communications; in that way they could reach the addressees more quickly.

Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had heard no serious argument that would justify a recommendation not to consider these petitions. The Belgian representative's argument that that action was necessary in order to facilitate publication of those petitions was of no value, since those petitions had been published long ago, even before the establishment of the Committee on Classification. The fact that some petitions were addressed to the General Assembly was not relevant since it did not alter in any way the substance of the petitions or their importance. He therefore would be obliged to vote against the recommendation to reclassify these petitions.

The classification recommended in paragraph 3 (f) (iii) was approved by 3 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) opposed the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 (f) (iv) that the petitions listed there should be regarded as inadmissible. He pointed out that those petitions raised very serious questions concerning, among others, land alienation and human rights. As the Committee on Classification itself had pointed out, some of these petitions referred to general problems, such as the immediate unification and independence of the Cameroons, and the release of all political prisoners. He wondered how such petitions could be considered inadmissible. His delegation could not agree to that and he would vote against the recommendation.

The classification recommended in paragraph 3 (f) (iv) was approved by 3 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

/...

Fifth report of the Committee on Classification of Communications (T/C.2/L.314)

The classification recommended in paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the report was approved.

Mr. COTTRELL (Secretary of the Committee) drew attention to an error in the English text of the penultimate sub-paragraph of paragraph 6 (c): the symbol T/C.2/L.310 should be T/CCM.7/L.70.

Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the established procedure for petitions should be applied to petitions T/COM.7/L.62, T/COM.7/L.56 to 61 and L/63 to 70.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 3 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked that the recommendation of the Committee on Classification that the Standing Committee should declare the communication in document T/COM.7/70 inadmissible under rule 81 of the rules of procedure should be put to the vote separately.

The recommendation was approved by 3 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

The classification recommended in paragraph 6 was approved.

Sixth report of the Committee on Classification of Communications (T/C.2/L.315)

The classification recommended in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the report was approved.

Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the Committee should apply the established procedure for petitions to the communications in documents T/COM.2/L.43 and T/COM.5/L.214.

At the request of Mr. de CAMARET (France), the CHAIRMAN put the USSR representative's proposal to the vote.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 3 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Mr. BENDRYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the Committee should recommend that the Trusteeship Council should take into consideration petition T/CCM.5/L.218 when it examined the next annual report of the Administering Authority. He pointed out that the petition raised questions concerning the general situation in the Cameroons.

At the request of Mr. de CAMARET (France), the CHAIRMAN put the USSR proposal to the vote. Speaking as the representative of India, he said that he would vote in favour of the proposal.

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 proposal was not adopted.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.