

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

OFFICIAL RECORDS



CONTENTS:

	Page		Page
Statement by the representative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	253	Examination of the annual report on the administration of the Trust Territory of Nauru for the year ending 30 June 1949 (T/472, T/L.472/Add.1, T/472/Add.2) (continued)	
Examination of the annual report on the administration of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration for the year 1948 (T/357, T/442) (continued)		Report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.108) ..	255
Report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.97, T/L.97/Add.1) (continued)	253	Arrangements for a visiting mission to Trust Territories in East Africa in 1951 (T/724, T/724/Add.1) (continued)	259
Examination of petitions (continued)		Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa	260
Seventh and eighth reports of the Ad Hoc Committee on Petitions (T/L.106, T/L.107)	253	Presentation of draft resolutions on the improvement of nutrition in Trust Territories (T/L.111) and the use of the flag of the United Nations in Trust Territories (T/L.112, T/L.113)	261
Summary of communications received by the Secretary-General (T/696, T/696/Add.1)	254		
Examination of the annual report on the administration of the Trust Territory of Togoland under French administration for the year 1948 (T/367) (continued)			
Report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.109) ..	255		

President: Mr. HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA (Dominican Republic).

Present: The representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, China, Dominican Republic, France, Iraq, New Zealand, Philippines, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Statement by the representative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

1. At the invitation of the PRESIDENT, Mr. ARNALDO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) informed the Council of the decisions taken at the fifth session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, which had recently met in Florence. He read two of the resolutions adopted by the Conference, the first dealing with the question of continued co-operation by UNESCO with the Trusteeship Council, and the second relating to the question of the admission of certain Non-Self-Governing Territories to associate membership in UNESCO. Copies of those resolutions, as well as of other resolutions dealing with certain aspects of education in Non-Self-Governing Territories, would be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

2. The PRESIDENT thanked the representative of UNESCO for the interesting information he had given and expressed the hope that the co-operation between

the Trusteeship Council and UNESCO would continue to yield useful results.

Examination of the annual report on the administration of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration for the year 1948 (T/357, T/442) (continued)

Report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.97, T/L.97/Add.1) (continued)

The report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.97 and T/L.97/Add.1) was adopted without discussion.

Examination of petitions (continued)

Seventh and eighth reports of the Ad Hoc Committee on Petitions (T/L.106, T/L.107)

3. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) congratulated the Ad Hoc Committee on Petitions as well as its Chairman for the able way in which it had dealt with the many petitions submitted. He had one amendment to propose in connexion with the third paragraph of the operative part of draft resolution 1, which appeared in the seventh report (T/L.106). He appreciated the idea contained in the paragraph, but felt that it would be hardly appropriate for the Administering Authority to "urge" the Cocoa Marketing Board to take the action recommended, as the Board was an entirely independent body with the power to take all its

decisions itself. He therefore proposed that the word "urge" should be replaced by the word "invite". That amendment would not in any way alter the effect of the resolution; it would simply make the wording more appropriate to the actual relationship between the Administering Authority and the Cocoa Marketing Board.

4. Mr. AQUINO (Philippines), Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Petitions, accepted that amendment in view of the connotation of urgency which was usually attached to the word "invite" in the vocabulary of the United Nations.

5. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) assured the Council that the same action would be taken whether the word were "invite" or "urge" but that since his delegation found "invite" more appropriate he would be most grateful if his suggestion were accepted.

The amendment proposed by the United Kingdom representative was adopted.

The seventh report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Petitions (T/L.106), as amended, was adopted.

The eighth report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Petitions (T/L.107) was adopted without discussion.

6. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America), Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq), Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) and Mr. LIU (China) congratulated the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Petitions and its Chairman for the successful way in which it had accomplished the very heavy task imposed upon it.

7. Mr. AQUINO (Philippines), Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, said that the Committee's success was due to the fact that it had functioned as a team as well as to the collaboration of the Administering Authorities and the members of the Secretariat.

8. Before formally announcing the completion of the Committee's work, he made three suggestions; first that the Council should in future take steps to enable visiting missions to examine the petitions submitted on the spot, since a full preliminary examination and discussion of petitions submitted to visiting missions would go a long way towards obviating "logrolling" in the disposition of multiple petitions; secondly, that a continuing machinery should be set up for the examination of petitions; and finally, that the precedents established by the Committee during the Council's sixth session as well as during the current session should guide the actions of any future committee which might be set up to deal with petitions.

9. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) recalled that, although the Visiting Mission to East Africa had been able to consider some petitions on the spot, the Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa had been unable to do so in view of the large number of petitions submitted to it. Thus, there might be some practical difficulties involved in implementing Mr. Aquino's first suggestion.

10. The PRESIDENT thanked Mr. Aquino for his helpful suggestions and said that the Council would consider later when it wished to discuss them.

Summary of communications received by the Secretary-General (T/696, T/696/Add.1)

11. Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship) explained that some

of the communications listed (T/696 and T/696/Add.1) dealt with petitions which had already been examined by the Council while others had simply been submitted for the Council's information. Any member of the Council could request the discussion of any of the communications if he considered that necessary, although in practice such requests were rarely made. Consequently, the Council took no specific decision on the majority of communications and it was often difficult for the Secretariat to reply to the authors of the communications when they wrote asking what action had been taken.

12. He therefore suggested that the Council should decide that any communication which had been summarized and brought before it and had not been the subject of any question or discussion before the closure of a session should be considered as requiring no action on the part of the Council. If that procedure were adopted, the Secretariat would be in a position to reply to any inquiries made by the authors of communications.

13. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) thought that the authors of communications would have a poor opinion of the United Nations if they received no reply until they had written asking for one.

14. Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship) explained that whenever a communication was received, the Secretariat sent a letter of acknowledgment stating that the Council would be informed of the contents. In some cases, no further reply was needed but sometimes further inquiries were made to find out what action the Council had taken. It was in order to cover those cases that he had made his proposal.

15. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) thought that, in those circumstances, the Council should consider each of the communications separately and decide what action should be taken, in order to make sure that the authors of the communications would always receive some definite reply other than a mere acknowledgment of the receipt of their communication. He also felt that communications which referred to petitions should be considered in connexion with the relevant petition since they would constitute additional evidence.

16. Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) thought it would be best to follow the procedure suggested by the Assistant Secretary-General, which was indeed the procedure adopted by many parliaments. In his opinion, it was better not to send any reply other than an acknowledgment, unless further inquiries were made by the author of the communication. When such inquiries were made, the Secretariat could send a tactfully worded reply stating that the Council had not decided upon any course of action. That procedure would be less likely to give offence than if the Secretariat were to send out replies to all the authors of communications stating that the Council had formally decided to take no action on their communications.

17. Moreover, the procedure proposed was similar to that followed by the Council when discussing the reports of drafting committees. Such reports were generally adopted without discussion unless a representative raised a particular point.

The procedure suggested by the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship was adopted.

Mr. Ryckmans, Vice-President, took the Chair.

Examination of the annual report on the administration of the Trust Territory of Togoland under French administration for the year 1948 (T/367) (continued)

Report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.109)

Parts I and II of the Drafting Committee's report (T/L.109) were adopted without discussion.

Examination of the annual report on the administration of the Trust Territory of Nauru for the year ending 30 June 1949 (T/472, T/472/Add.1, T/472/Add.2) (continued)

Report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.108)

Part I

18. Mr. STIRLING (Australia) proposed that the last three words of the last sentence of the third paragraph, chapter I, section B of document T/L.108 should be amended to read: "conference of the South Pacific Commission at Suva".

That amendment was adopted.

Part I, as amended, was adopted.

Part II

19. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) suggested that the end of the paragraph entitled "Previous recommendations", in section 1 of Part II, should be altered to read: "to implement the recommendations".

That amendment was adopted.

Section 1, as amended, was adopted.

20. Mr. INGLES (Philippines), speaking of the paragraph entitled "Council of Chiefs" in section 2 of Part II, did not think it would be quite correct for the Trusteeship Council to congratulate the Administering Authority on its "proposals" for the reconstitution of the Council of Chiefs. The Council should commend the Administering Authority for its "intention" to reconstitute the Council of Chiefs, so that the beginning of the paragraph should read: "The Council commends the Administering Authority for its intention to reconstitute the Council of Chiefs . . ."

That amendment was adopted.

The paragraph, as amended, was adopted.

The paragraph entitled "Administrative posts" was adopted.

21. Mr. STEYAERT (Belgium) recalled that his delegation had made a reservation in the Drafting Committee regarding the paragraph containing the recommendation on the judiciary. It was not convinced that it would be feasible to set up an independent judicial system in Nauru, in view of the very small population

of the Territory. He proposed that the recommendation should be amended to read: "The Council, considering that it is desirable that judicial authority be independent from executive authority, invites the Administering Authority to study the judicial organization with a view to ensuring the judiciary all the independence compatible with the circumstances".

22. He believed that such a formula would enable the Trusteeship Council to reaffirm the principle of separation of powers while taking into account the special situation in Nauru.

23. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) and Mr. CRAW (New Zealand) supported the Belgian amendment.

24. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) said that he would not object to the amendment, on the understanding that it did not preclude the establishment of a separate, independent judicial system.

25. The PRESIDENT agreed with the Philippine representative with regard to the interpretation of the Belgian amendment.

The Belgian amendment was accepted.

The paragraph, as amended, was adopted.

26. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom), speaking of the paragraph entitled "Future economy", in section 3, thought that the words "as soon as possible" conveyed an erroneous impression of urgency in view of the fact that the problem was not expected to arise until the year 2000 or 2020. He therefore suggested that they should be deleted.

That amendment was adopted.

27. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) thought it was not quite correct to refer to the recent "institution" of the copra industry. As he understood it, the copra industry had been re-instituted. He therefore proposed the substitution of the word "re-institution" for the word "institution".

That amendment was adopted.

The paragraph, as amended, was approved.

28. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) thought there was some contradiction between the statement in the first sub-paragraph of the paragraph "Phosphate industry" that the Council remained "handicapped" in its appraisal of economic conditions because of the absence of information, and the statement in the second sub-paragraph that it considered the restoration of a phosphate industry to full production to have been of "clear" benefit to the Territory. To lessen the contradiction, he suggested that the word "general" should be substituted for the word "clear".

29. The PRESIDENT suggested that the order of the two sub-paragraphs should be reversed.

The amendments suggested by the Philippine representative and by the President were adopted.

The two sub-paragraphs, as amended, were adopted.

30. Mr. CRAW (New Zealand) thought that the words "neighbouring islands" in the paragraph "Transport facilities" might erroneously be interpreted to refer to

islands immediately adjacent to Nauru. To avoid such a misconception, he suggested that the words "other Pacific islands" should be substituted for "neighbouring islands".

That amendment was adopted.

The paragraph, as amended, was adopted.

31. Mr. INGLES (Philippines), referring to the paragraph on "Co-operatives", said that he understood that the Nauruan Co-operative Society had been in existence since the time of the Mandate, had always shown a clear profit and had always been managed by Nauruans. It might therefore not be altogether appropriate to speak of "increased participation by Nauruans in the economic development of the Territory, particularly by the Nauruan Co-operative Society." The Council might wish to modify the recommendation by noting the continued, rather than the increased, participation by Nauruans in the Nauruan Co-operative Society, retaining the remainder of the recommendation unchanged. Before making a proposal in that sense, however, he would like to hear the views of other members of the Council.

32. Mr. STIRLING (Australia) said he understood that the Co-operative Society had come into being towards the end of the Mandate. It was, however, correct to speak of an "increased participation" by Nauruans in the economic development of the Territory, and he would therefore advocate retention of that phrase.

33. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) concurred with the Australian representative.

34. The PRESIDENT thought that both points of view were right: participation of the Nauruans in the Co-operative Society was only a continuation of previous participation, while, on the other hand, the greater activity of the Co-operative Society, consisting entirely of Nauruans, meant that participation of the Nauruans in the economic development of the Territory had increased. If the representative of the Philippines considered the latter aspect, he might not insist on the modification he had suggested.

35. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) said the President had stated the situation correctly. He added that his delegation, while maintaining its original observations on the matter, would not press its amendment.

The paragraph was adopted.

The paragraph entitled "Human rights" in section 4, "Social advancement", was adopted.

36. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) suggested that the words "through further increases in wages and allowances" should be deleted from the first sub-paragraph of the paragraph on "Cost of living, wages and labour conditions" as the Administering Authority might find it possible to maintain or increase the standard of living of the inhabitants by other means, for example, reduction in prices.

37. He also found some difficulty in the phrase "and keep raising the standard of living of the inhabitants" and considered that the real intention of the Council would be better expressed by the words "and, where possible, to raise the standard of living of the inhabitants".

Those amendments were adopted.

The sub-paragraph, as amended, was adopted.

38. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) requested an explanation of the words "augment the holidays of the Chinese, Gilbertese and Nauruan workers" in the following sub-paragraph.

39. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) stated that the Drafting Committee had discovered that Chinese workers in Nauru were given fewer holidays than Gilbertese workers, who in turn had fewer holidays than the Nauruan workers. The Committee had found the question rather delicate, but had reached a compromise after careful study. He did not believe that the Drafting Committee could alter its recommendation, which very specifically expressed its opinion.

40. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) wondered whether the intention of the Drafting Committee would not be more correctly rendered by substituting the word "equalize" for the word "augment".

41. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) stated that if the word "equalize" were used, European workers would also have to be mentioned. He said that the reason for the recommendation to increase the holidays of the Chinese, Gilbertese and Nauruan workers had been the desire to give them the same number of holidays as the European workers.

42. Mr. LIU (China) agreed with the representative of the Philippines.

43. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) said the Drafting Committee had adopted the wording appearing in document T/L.108 after careful consideration of all the factors involved. It had felt that all holidays should be augmented and equalized, bringing the holidays of the Chinese and Gilbertese up to the highest level of the Nauruan worker. The same regime could not, however, apply to the Australian workers, who were more handicapped by the climatic conditions and therefore deserved special consideration. The Drafting Committee had thus deliberately decided on the present wording; if the Council was to return to questions which had been fully discussed in the Drafting Committee, it should not have set up such a body in the first place.

44. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) said that he did not wish to repeat the work of the Drafting Committee, but he thought Council members were entitled to ask what was meant by a text. In the particular case under consideration, it was quite clear that, however agreed members of the Committee might have been on the text, they were not agreed on its interpretation. The first answer of the Chairman of the Drafting Committee had led Mr. Fletcher-Cooke to make a suggestion. That suggestion would not, however, give effect to the wishes of the representatives of the Philippines and China, whose statements had differed from that of the Chairman of the Drafting Committee.

45. He considered that every delegation must satisfy itself as to the meaning of a recommendation before it could be expected to vote for it or tacitly accept it. He was at present even more confused than he had been when he had first asked his question. In the circum-

stances he would record his reservation to the effect that he did not understand the last part of the recommendation in question and did not desire to be associated with it.

46. The PRESIDENT said the Drafting Committee had not brought up the question of European workers, which the representatives of the Philippines and China now desired to introduce.

47. Mr. INGLES (Philippines), while not withdrawing his suggestion for the inclusion of a reference to European workers in the event that the word "augment" should be changed to "equalize", thought that such a change would not express the views presented in the Drafting Committee as well as in the Council. Equalization could be effected in one of two ways: the number of holidays of Gilbertese and Nauruan workers could be brought down to the level of the Chinese workers, or the level of the Chinese and Gilbertese workers could be brought up to that of the Nauruan workers. His delegation therefore preferred to retain the present wording of the recommendation as being less ambiguous.

48. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) suggested that the phrase "augment the holidays of the Chinese, Gilbertese and Nauruan workers" should be replaced by the words "to assure to the Chinese, Gilbertese and Nauruan workers the most favourable system of holidays".

That amendment was adopted.

The sub-paragraph, as amended, was approved.

49. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom), turning to the third sub-paragraph of the passage containing recommendations on cost of living, wages and labour conditions, suggested that it should be re-drafted to read as follows: "The Council, recalling its previous recommendation that Chinese workers should be accompanied by their families, noting that the Administering Authority has not yet been able to find a way to comply with this recommendation, suggests that the Administering Authority review this situation".

50. The proposed changes in all but the operative part of the text were only of a drafting character. He had suggested the substantive change in the operative part because he felt that the Council should hesitate before urging the Administering Authority to do what he, for one, did not yet know to be feasible. The Administering Authority should certainly be invited to study the problem and to report thereon to the Council, but it was as yet not even known whether transportation and living quarters could be provided for the wives of the Chinese workers concerned. He did not wish to initiate a long debate on the matter; therefore, if the Chinese representative felt that he ought to insist on the original wording of the operative part but that he could accept the first part of the proposed changes, Mr. Fletcher-Cooke would leave it at that, with his reservation.

51. Mr. CRAW (New Zealand) pointed out that the Council had not previously recommended that Chinese workers should be accompanied by their families. Instead, the Council had noted that Chinese workers were brought to Nauru without their families and had considered that that factor might lead to serious consequences.¹

52. Mr. LIU (China), while agreeing with the New Zealand representative about the first part of the recommendation, asked the Council to retain the operative clause unanimously suggested by the Drafting Committee.

53. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) suggested that the previous recommendation of the Council should be paraphrased very closely in the recommendation which the Council was at present considering.

54. The PRESIDENT requested the Secretary to read the draft, as amended.

55. Mr. ALEKSANDER (Secretary of the Council) read the following text:

"The Council, recalling that during its fifth session it adopted a recommendation in which it noted that Chinese workers are brought to Nauru without their families, considered that this practice may lead to serious consequences and recommended that the Administering Authority endeavour to find some humane solution to this problem; and, noting that the Administering Authority has not yet been able to find such a solution, urges it to take steps to comply with its previous recommendation."

The sub-paragraph, as amended, was adopted.

56. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) suggested the substitution of the words "hospital facilities for the indigenous population" for the words, "hospitalization of the population" in the paragraph "Medical facilities".

That amendment was adopted.

57. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) thought it was possibly redundant to say "train Nauruans as native medical practitioners" and suggested the deletion of the word "native".

58. The PRESIDENT stated that the term "native medical practitioners" had a technical meaning and did not refer to practitioners who had completed university training. The diploma that they received was not a doctor's diploma.

59. Mr. STIRLING (Australia) thought that the point of the representative of Iraq might be met by using initial capital letters in the term "Native Medical Practitioners".

60. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) accepted the President's explanation and the suggestion of the Australian representative.

61. He wondered whether the words "if necessary" should be retained. If the condition to which those words referred existed, then the Administering Authority might properly be requested to consider recruiting medical practitioners among displaced persons; if it did not exist, there would be no need even to allude to it.

62. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) stated that the Drafting Committee had used the words "if necessary" because it had not been sure what the situation in Nauru in that connexion was and because it had not believed that the Council itself was quite confident that it was

¹ See *Official Records of the fourth session of the General Assembly*, Supplement No. 4, page 77.

in fact necessary to increase the number of medical personnel.

63. Mr. STIRLING (Australia) reminded members of the Council that the position of Nauru differed from that of New Guinea in respect of the recruiting of doctors among European displaced persons: New Guinea had a population of some one and a half million, while the total population of Nauru numbered some three thousand. He did not think that it could be claimed that the medical facilities of Nauru were inadequate, and no such claim had in fact been made. The medical facilities available on Nauru had been the subject of commendation.

64. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) said it was quite clear that at most one or two European displaced persons could find employment as doctors on Nauru. He wondered whether in the circumstances it was worth while to include a specific recommendation to that effect, considering that to do so would merely detract from similar recommendations in the case of other Trust Territories where they were of much greater importance. He thought that it would be preferable to omit the reference to that particular point altogether.

65. The PRESIDENT, agreeing with the United Kingdom representative, proposed that the passage in question should be amended so as to read "... that the Administering Authority take steps to bring the number of personnel up to strength".

That amendment was adopted.

The paragraph, as amended, was adopted.

66. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq), speaking of the paragraph entitled "Housing", suggested the deletion of the phrase "recalling its previous commendation of the Administering Authority for its housing programme"; the Council had not previously adopted the practice of reiterating earlier commendations. Following the suggested deletion, the paragraph would read: "The Council, noting that in the year ending May 1950 approximately 100 new houses for the indigenous inhabitants had been practically completed, commends the Administering Authority for this progress".

That amendment was adopted.

The paragraph, as amended, was adopted.

67. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider section 5, "Educational advancement".

68. Mr. STEYAERT (Belgium) recalled the reservations made by his delegation in the Drafting Committee with regard to the recommendation for the merging of school facilities for European and indigenous children. Australian children in Nauru were educated in the English language so as to enable them to continue their studies in Australia. The Nauruan children, on the other hand, were taught in both English and Nauruan, many of the explanations being given in their native language. Consequently, without formally opposing the recommendation, he doubted whether it would serve to raise the standard of instruction of indigenous children, and thought that on the contrary it might deprive them of instruction in their native language.

69. The PRESIDENT noted that the recommendation in question seemed to be at variance with the prin-

ciple generally accepted by experts in the field of education, that educational programmes should be adapted to the countries concerned.

70. Mr. LAURENTIE (France) pointed out that since the recommendation merely called for a preliminary study, there was no need for specific reservations.

71. Mr. STIRLING (Australia) agreed with the Belgian representative's remark. There were also other reasons, such as different standards of hygiene, which, as the special representative for Nauru had pointed out earlier, would make such a recommendation undesirable at the present time.

72. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq), with reference to the phrase "not only as a measure of economy . . .", did not think it appropriate for the Council to make recommendations for economy to an Administering Authority.

73. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) shared the doubts expressed by the preceding speakers concerning the usefulness of the recommendation. Not knowing the conditions in the Territory, he would not be able to vote for the recommendation.

74. Mr. FLETCHER-COOKE (United Kingdom) associated himself with the view of the United States and Iraqi representatives. Moreover, the last phrase of the recommendation seemed to prejudice the preliminary study recommended in the first phrase. He therefore hoped that the Council would agree to delete that recommendation; if not, he would be obliged to ask that the recommendation should be put to the vote.

75. Mr. CRAW (New Zealand) said that while he was normally not in favour of separate schools, he did not think that the Council should adopt a recommendation on such a delicate question without sufficient knowledge of all the facts involved. He therefore wondered whether the Philippine representative, who had originally proposed the recommendation, would not agree to its omission pending the receipt of the information which would no doubt be included in the report of the Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific.

76. In answer to a question by the PRESIDENT, Mr. STIRLING (Australia) gave an assurance that the Australian Government would study the question raised in the recommendation and include the results of that study in its following annual report on Nauru.

77. After some further discussion, Mr. INGLES (Philippines) stated that he would not press for the retention of the recommendation pending the receipt of the report of the Visiting Mission and the additional information to be provided by the Australian Government in its subsequent annual report on Nauru. He reserved the right to reopen the question at the following session of the Council, if necessary.

The recommendation concerning European and Nauruan schools was deleted.

Section 5, as amended, was adopted.

Part II, as amended, was adopted as a whole.

78. The PRESIDENT urged the members of the Council to submit to the Secretariat as soon as possible the observations which they wished to be included in part III of the Council's report on Nauru.

Parts I and II of the report of the Drafting Committee on Nauru (T/L.108), as amended, were adopted as a whole.

The meeting was suspended at 4.55 p.m. and was resumed at 5.15 p.m.

Arrangements for a visiting mission to Trust Territories in East Africa in 1951 (T/724, T/724/Add.1) (continued)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mascia, representative of Italy, took his place at the Council table.

79. Mr. MASCIA (Italy) said that the Italian Government would welcome a visiting mission in Somaliland in either 1951 or 1952; it had no preference concerning the year of the visit. The local authorities would assist the mission in its work with all the means at their disposal. He noted, however, that if the Council decided to send a mission in 1951, the mission might arrive in Somaliland without sufficient knowledge of local problems if the first report of the Administering Authority was not available at the time. It might therefore be preferable to send the mission in 1952 when it would be fully acquainted with the first report of the Administering Authority, which would be made available as soon as possible after the end of the first year of Italian administration, that was, 1951.

80. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the Secretary-General's note on the cost of sending visiting missions to East Africa with varying itineraries and composition (T/724/Add.1).

81. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) suggested that, in spite of the higher cost involved, the Council should provisionally decide to send two visiting missions, one to Tanganyika and the other to Ruanda-Urundi and Somaliland. The Secretariat would make any changes in the estimates that might result from unforeseen circumstances. In any case, the final decision in the matter would rest with the General Assembly.

82. Mr. GARREAU (France) thought that, in view of the present need for economy, two separate missions would be too expensive. Furthermore, while it was desirable that as many members of the Council as possible should participate in the work of the missions, the membership of the Council was not sufficiently large to permit it to send eight of its members on visiting missions. The only alternative, then, would be to send persons who were not members of the Council and on whose experience the Council would therefore not be able to draw later.

83. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) noted that the work of visiting missions was generally rendered more difficult by the fact that they had no time to visit every part of the Territory. However, the thoroughness of a study did not necessarily depend upon the amount of territory covered.

84. The two primary questions to be considered were membership and expenditure. So long as the Council's membership was limited to twelve members, the Council could not send too many of its own members on visiting missions at one time. On the other hand, sending outsiders, particularly representatives of countries which

were not members of the Council, was useless, as such persons did not have sufficient knowledge of the work of the Council, the Trusteeship System itself and the different problems involved.

85. Consequently, without taking any position on the question whether a visiting mission should be sent to Somaliland in 1951, he felt that pending the proposed re-organization of the Council's work and the possible increase, in that connexion, of the Council's membership, only one mission should be sent to the Trust Territories in East Africa. If necessary, the length of the mission might be somewhat extended.

86. The PRESIDENT, speaking as representative of BELGIUM, associated himself with the remarks made by the Iraqi representative, particularly with regard to the fact that the members of the Council were in a much better position to study the conditions in the Territories than outsiders. Furthermore, Ruanda-Urundi, which covered approximately the same area as the Cameroons under British administration, had a highly developed road network making it possible to travel from one end of the Territory to the other in about five or six hours. Hence the visiting mission should be able to cover Ruanda-Urundi in a comparatively short period of time.

87. In view of those considerations he suggested that the Council might agree on the first itinerary proposed by the Secretariat and postpone the visit to Somaliland until 1952, by which time the first annual report on the Territory would be available. The detailed instructions could be given to the visiting mission at the Council's following session; the Council need decide now only on the general itinerary, which had to be approved by the General Assembly at its fifth session.

88. Mr. GARREAU (France) noted that since there were not sufficient funds to provide for a special visit to Somaliland in 1952, if the visiting mission did not visit Somaliland in 1951, the Territory might not be inspected until two or three years later when another mission would be sent out to East Africa. On the other hand, the previous Visiting Mission to East Africa had done much of the preliminary investigation work in the Trust Territories in that area, so that the new visiting mission should be able to inspect the two Territories of Ruanda-Urundi and Tanganyika in two and a half months. He therefore proposed that a single mission composed of four members and six Secretariat members should be sent to Ruanda-Urundi, Tanganyika and Somaliland, spending two and a half months in the first two Territories, and two weeks in the third.

89. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) agreed with the other Council members that visiting missions should, in so far as possible, be composed of Council members exclusively. The Council might therefore not have sufficient members to send out two visiting missions each year, particularly as every mission should be composed of at least four members. The question of cost must also be considered, and he did not think it wise in the current world situation to incur the added expenditure of two missions.

90. On the other hand, he agreed with other representatives that the sooner a visiting mission could be sent to Somaliland the better, provided the Trusteeship

Agreement for that Territory was approved at the fifth session of the General Assembly. He therefore supported the second alternative suggested by the Secretariat, namely, that one visiting mission should be sent to Tanganyika, Ruanda-Urundi and Somaliland, and that three months should be allowed for the visit to those Territories, and one month for the preparation of the report at Lake Success. If the Council later found that the time of the visit could be reduced without impairing the efficiency of the mission's work, it could take steps to that effect.

91. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) said that a visiting mission should be sent to Somaliland as soon as possible, even if the first annual report was not ready at the time. The same mission which visited Ruanda-Urundi and Tanganyika should also visit Somaliland. The question of the length of time needed for the visits to those Territories should be left to the visiting mission itself, which would be in a better position to decide on it. Subject to those provisions, he agreed with the United States representative's suggestion.

92. Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship) said that the Council need not concern itself with the respective costs of the different alternatives, but should consider only the duration of the visit, the size of the mission and the place to be visited. The figures given by the Secretary-General were merely tentative estimates for the Council's information.

93. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) withdrew his proposal.

94. The PRESIDENT concluded that there was general agreement that a visiting mission composed of four members and six Secretariat members should be sent to Tanganyika, Ruanda-Urundi and possibly Somaliland, with provision for a three-month stay in those Territories and one month at Lake Success for the preparation of its report. The Council would consider the question further at its following session.

It was so decided.

95. Mr. CRAW (New Zealand) drew attention to paragraph 8 of the Secretary-General's note, which stated that the cost of spending one month at Lake Success for the preparation of the visiting mission's report would be lowered to the extent that the visiting mission was composed of members drawn from delegations at the temporary Headquarters since transportation costs would be reduced. He noted, in that connexion, that other cost items, such as per diem payment, would also be reduced, if the members of the mission were drawn from permanent delegations.

96. Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq) noted that the reports of visiting missions were not always written at the temporary Headquarters. The Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, for example, had drawn up its report in Geneva so as to be near the capitals of the Administering Authorities concerned.

97. Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship) said that the Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa, after

considering the question, had decided against going to London and Paris. Generally, the practice was to draw up the reports at Lake Success where all the facilities could be provided. If the Trusteeship Council had not been meeting in Geneva at the time, the Visiting Mission would probably have come to Lake Success to draw up its report.

Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa

98. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft resolution concerning the reports of the Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa (T/L.105).

99. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) wished to raise a question of substance in connexion with the observations of the Administering Authorities mentioned in the fourth paragraph of the draft resolution. One of the documents considered by the Visiting Mission to West Africa and by the Council itself had been the memorandum of the Representative Assembly of Togoland under French administration (T/Pet.6/23-T/Pet.7/21). Speaking about that memorandum, the Administering Authority had stated under part II, chapter I, of document T/673 that the officers of the Representative Assembly who had conferred with the Visiting Mission had not been authorized by the other members of the Assembly to speak on their behalf. Yet an extract from the verbatim record of the meeting of that Assembly of 15 April 1950, which had appeared as an addendum to the petition of the Representative Assembly (T/Pet.6/23-T/Pet.7/21/Add.1), showed that the memorandum submitted to the Visiting Mission had been put to the vote of the Assembly and ratified by 22 votes to one, with one abstention. He suggested that a note explaining that fact should be inserted in the relevant part of the Administering Authority's observation in order to avoid any misunderstanding.

100. Mr. GARREAU (France) said that there had indeed been some error in the observations sent in by his Government. He believed that that error was due to the fact that the French Government had not been aware of that vote of confidence, which had been taken after the petition had been sent out and while the French Government's observations had been in the process of being drafted. He suggested that the error might be corrected by deleting the paragraph in question from his Government's observations.

101. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) declared himself satisfied with the explanation given by the French representative.

The French representative's suggestion was adopted.

The draft resolution was adopted.

102. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft resolution concerning the printing of the reports (T/L.110).

The draft resolution was adopted.

Presentation of draft resolutions on the improvement of nutrition in Trust Territories (T/L.111) and the use of the flag of the United Nations in Trust Territories (T/L.112, T/L.113)

103. Mr. MUNOZ (Argentina) presented a draft resolution on the improvement of nutrition in the Trust Territories (T/L.111). The question was an important one which had given rise to numerous comments by members of the Council, including the Administering Authorities, and which was closely connected with the progress and advancement of the inhabitants of Trust Territories. He therefore hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by the Council.

104. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) drew attention to a draft resolution presented by his delegation together with the delegations of China and Iraq concerning the use of the United Nations flag in Trust Territories (T/L.112).

105. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) similarly drew attention to his delegation's amendment (T/L.113) to the joint draft resolution by China, Iraq and the Philippines.

106. The PRESIDENT said that the Council would examine the various texts at its following meeting, in accordance with rule 57 of the rules of procedure.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.