

United Nations

Nations Unies

UNRESTRICTED

TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL

CONSEIL
DE TUTELLE

T/P.V. 149
7 March 1949

English

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Fourth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTY-THIRD MEETING
(Transcription from sound recording)

Lake Success, New York
Monday, 7 March 1949, at 2.30 p.m.

President:

Mr. LIU CHIEH

China

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the thirty-third meeting of the fourth session of the Trusteeship Council.

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO EAST AFRICA --
RUANDA-URUNDI

CHAPTER IV -- EDUCATIONAL QUESTIONS (Continued)

The first item on this afternoon's agenda is the continuation of the examination of the report of the Visiting Mission to East Africa.

At the close of the last meeting the Council was coming to the end of the discussion on the report of the visit to Ruanda-Urundi. I believe the representative of the Philippines was on the point of asking some questions. I will first call on him.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): There are one or two more points that I would like to have clarified, on this question of religious mission schools.

At the bottom of page 63 of the Visiting Mission's report, mention is made of religious instruction being given in those subsidized schools.

Do I understand that in those schools subsidized by the Government, religious instruction is given and is not only optional? I would like to be clarified on this point.

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): I think that the report of the Visiting Mission is clear enough in this respect.

We, as a Mission, got the impression that religious teaching was given in subsidized schools, and that it was given according to the beliefs of those who directed the school concerned.

I think that the representative of Belgium informed us the other day that the compulsory character of religious courses was to undergo a change in the near future.

As regards the remarks and observations of the Visiting Mission, I would repeat that religious education was compulsory in the schools which we visited.

Mr. CARPIO

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): If it is true that religious instruction is compulsory in Government-subsidized mission schools, could the representative of the Administering Authority please enlighten me whether, in thus subsidizing a mission school which compels a student to take religious instruction, this does not in a way violate the complete freedom of conscience provided for in the laws governing the trusteeship system?

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): The Visiting Mission has no opinion to express on this point, except to say the following: that is, that children are not compelled to go to a Catholic school any more than they are compelled to go to a Protestant school. Therefore, on this point, there is no violation of freedom of conscience.

As far as the rest is concerned, I think that the question was addressed rather more to the representative of the Administering Authority than to the Visiting Mission itself.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): It would be absolutely impossible to add anything to what I said at our previous meeting. According to the information I have before me, in all subsidized schools religious teaching is non-compulsory, and if the Visiting Mission noted that all children in the schools which they visited did follow religious teaching, that can only be attributed to one thing, and that is that no parent or guardian of children showed any desire for the child not to follow this religious education.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): When the representative of the Administering Authority said that religious instruction in the Government-subsidized mission schools was not compulsory, do I understand him to mean that a student may, for instance, go into a Government-subsidized Catholic school and take all the courses offered, but not the religious instruction given by that Catholic school?

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): That is so.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): Are you sure of that? I want to find out whether it is true, because we have just found out from the
/Chairman of the

Chairman of the Visiting Mission that that is not so.

If the representative of the Administering Authority only thinks that it is so, I want to get to the bottom of the whole thing. I shall ask for documents to that effect, so that we know exactly where we stand in this Council.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I will communicate your doubts to my Government.

The PRESIDENT: I think for the purpose of records, that it may not be correct to say that the Chairman of the Visiting Mission holds a contrary opinion.

I do not recollect that the Chairman of the Visiting Mission made that statement.

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): I have nothing to add, either, to what I said a short while ago, or to what is contained in our report.

First of all, it is a fact that in these subsidized schools all students follow these religious courses. As I said the other day, we did not receive any complaint in respect of these religious courses, or the necessity to follow them.

/A point upon which

A point upon which the Visiting Mission did receive communications on behalf of a certain number of inhabitants in Ruanda-Urundi -- and especially from certain chiefs in the country -- was that there seemed to be a marked preference, on the part of these heads and persons who already have certain higher education, to have, besides this education which is of a religious character, also a lay or civilian education.

As to the legally compulsory nature of these religious courses, I do not think that the Mission is in a position to take any stand. We simply noted that in actual fact they did exist everywhere.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): Does not the Chairman of the Visiting Mission believe that if there were no complaints against this imposition of religious instruction in the government subsidized religious schools, it was because the poorer families could not afford to complain. They had no alternative but to go to the religious schools or to receive no education at all? The Administering Authority would not give them the government schools which they had been clamoring for.

Does the Chairman of the Visiting Mission believe that is the proper explanation?

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): No, that is not exactly the case and I do not think I would go against the opinion of my colleagues in saying that that is not exactly the reason for there not being any complaints.

I would say that the reason is simply that situations exist because they are the result of a certain established order and that against this established order there is no kind of reason among the population for heaping recriminations because of the present situation.

Once again I stress the fact that if there have been remarks made to us -- and we did receive remarks and observations -- it was in order to arrive at the setting up of lay education which would be parallel with the education of a somewhat religious character. It was not precisely in order to arrive at the whole of the schools of the Territory which are subsidized receiving the non-compulsory nature in this religious teaching.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): May I make just a few remarks on that point.

I come from a country which I consider -- and others have considered -- to be the only Christian country in the Orient. About ninety per cent of the population of the Philippines are Christians -- or, more specifically, Catholics.

Off and on I have heard remarks by some members that perhaps I am not a Catholic or a Christian. That is far from the truth. I was born in the Catholic Church but fortunately I do not have the hypocrisy and all the

/other

other undesirable elements that are disliked in some of the so-called religious peoples.

But it is a fact that even in that country of ours where ninety per cent of the people are Catholic, the greatest majority of the people prefer to send their children to government schools where there is no compulsory religious instruction.

I take it that human nature would be the same, whether in Africa, in the Philippines or anywhere else. That is why I am very desirous of learning the whole system of religious instruction in Africa. I feel that it is depriving the indigenous inhabitants of the benefit of purely lay schools.

Somehow the indigenous inhabitants are subjected to a compulsion, whether legal or otherwise, to get whatever education they can or receive nothing at all. I suppose that that is the only explanation that can be given for their not complaining about the situation.

I have one more question and then perhaps I will be through with this troublesome problem.

I notice in the report that some recommendation is made for the establishment of at least some purely lay schools which would be maintained by the government.

Did the Visiting Mission feel, by recommending the establishment of purely lay schools maintained and operated by the government, that that would be more in accord with the requirements set out in the Charter than the present school system in Ruanda-Urundi?

(Interpretation from French)

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission): If I have to interpret the thoughts of my colleagues and myself in order to reply to the representative of the Philippines, I would say that if the Visiting Mission recommended the setting up of lay schools alongside religious schools it was, first of all, because the remark had been made to the Visiting Mission by some elements of the population which appeared to be among the most evolved and best educated. Also because it was the personal opinion of the members of the Visiting Mission that when there are two kinds of teaching which are parallel to one another and can be compared one to the other, the stimulation which may result may be very favourable to the population as whole.

At the present time there is only one type of education and one conception of teaching. There is no doubt that they would reciprocally and mutually benefit one another and it was in this sense that we made this recommendation. It is a question of fact more than a question of principle.

/Mr. RYCKMANS

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): Might I ask the President of the Visiting Mission if the Visiting Mission studied the budgetary implications of such regulations?

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): We understood that the system undertaken at present by the Belgian Government in respect of teaching in Ruanda-Urundi was, of course, much more economical and had enabled them to multiply the number of primary and small secondary schools.

The Visiting Mission did not pretend to go into the budgetary provisions which was beyond the scope of its terms of reference. However, we understood that if an additional form of lay education should be placed alongside the present educational system, the result would be extra expenditure and that necessarily we would have to find the corresponding receipts.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I should like to ask the representative of the Administering Authority whether he believes that it is possible to make only recommendations without budgetary implications or whether, on the contrary, he thinks that both the Visiting Mission and the Trusteeship Council itself cannot make recommendations that do have budgetary implications.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I think that it is impossible to make a recommendation of any real scope which would not entail budgetary implications.

Therefore, it is obvious that any recommendation which the Trusteeship Council might make would entail budgetary implications. The only thing which I request is that when the Council proposes something positive that it should take into account the budgetary implications.

/I presume

I presume, for instance, that the Council might consider that it should have to make a proposal that it considers that the setting-up of such and such an organ or body in a Trust Territory would be highly desirable.

If the Trusteeship Council realizes that the implementation of its recommendation would entail a multiplication by two of budgetary expenditure, the Council might sometimes be led to say that it would be highly desirable to do such and such a thing, but that unfortunately the financial situation of the Territory does not allow such a thing to be done.

I think that it is the duty of the Council, when it makes a recommendation, to take into account any budgetary implications. I do not say that it should set aside any recommendation which would entail budgetary implications, because then it could make no recommendation at all. I simply say that it should take this into account. I think this is the duty of the Council.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): In reading this report through and through, I notice that it glitters with many instances of the capacity of the native Africans to assimilate and imbibe intellectual training. In other words, it shows that, if given a chance, the native inhabitants would be capable of intellectual improvement in the same manner as any other race under the sun.

This being so -- that is, assuming that my conclusion is correct -- does the Chairman of the Visiting Mission not think that if, up to now, as we have read from the report and as we have heard said again and again, the intellectual development of the native inhabitants is still very backward, that is entirely due to the fact that they were not given the chance to educate themselves in the manner they should?

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): It is, of course, quite impossible for the Mission to make a complete psychological examination of those who are at present in Ruanda-Urundi. Nevertheless, as a result of certain observations we made and a certain number of remarks which were made to us that these races are completely capable of being perfected and improved and that they can receive higher education in higher techniques, should we, as has just been said by the representative of the Philippines, state that these races are, at the present time in an extraordinarily or specially backward stage?

/I confess

I confess that I do not think that that was exactly the opinion of the Mission. I think that the opinion of the Mission might be summarized approximately in the following way: up till the Belgian Administration -- that is, up till about 25 years ago,--there was practically no form of education in the country at all, the Germans not having been concerned with that and having simply left a few missions which began to settle in, but, of course, this did not have very considerable results on the population as a whole nor even on individual persons.

Education was undertaken on a very large scale by the Belgian Administration and we were in a position to note that the number of students was extremely high and that the schools had been multiplied, even more, I believe, than they are in any other African territory as far as I can judge.

What may be said, and I think this was the impression of my colleagues and myself during this Visiting Mission, is that this education which is being given to the inhabitants of Ruanda-Urundi was essentially directed towards the dissemination of elementary and primary knowledge with a certain selection or choice being made, nevertheless, in order to furnish the school in Astrida, and in order that the school in Astrida in turn might form a kind of framework.

I think that we may say that the impression of the Visiting Mission, not as regards general dissemination of teaching which was ensured on a very large scale, but as regards the perfecting of teaching, and especially of secondary teaching, was that a greater or a different effort might have been undertaken by the Belgian Administration. This, I believe is the general conclusion which we see in the report of the Visiting Mission.

The Visiting Mission gained the impression, moreover, that this objection which it was making as it realized the actual realities in respect of the school situation in Ruanda-Urundi had been the impression also of the Belgian Administration, since we were told of the new programme of teaching which will include, among other things, the possibility as soon as this year of ensuring secondary education as we understand it in Belgium and France -- that is, the teaching of the humanités -- in the College of Costermansville and, on the other hand, a reorganization of the school in Astrida, at the end of which this school would become a kind of African university in Ruanda-Urundi.

I think, therefore, that it is not the programme or the methods which were followed in respect of elementary and primary education which can

/give rise

give rise to any criticism, and I do not think that is the point on which the Mission made its remarks. I think the criticism of the Mission was based on the fact that, secondary education or some form of higher elementary teaching with the ultimate result of an African university, had not been set up sooner within the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi. Those, I think, would be the conclusions at which we arrived.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I would like to ask the Chairman of the Visiting Mission whether, in the opinion of the members of the Mission, teaching given exclusively in the vernacular, -- if I understood rightly -- in primary schools is not liable to hinder very seriously the access of students to higher teaching in Ruanda-Urundi. Teaching is given -- if I understand correctly -- in the Swahili language which is a somewhat extensive language

The representative of Belgium says this is not so, in which case teaching is given in the local vernacular or several of the local languages, according to the district. These languages are rudimentary and, in any case, they could not be used for higher teaching.

/I would like to know

I would like to know whether the Mission examined this point and arrived at any conclusion as to whether the exclusive use of the vernacular in primary and elementary schools was not one of the reasons for Ruanda-Urundi not being in a position to encourage the most gifted students to arrive at higher education.

The representative of Belgium told you the other day that the use of the vernacular exists in the schools and it is therefore appropriate that teachers be in a position to give such teaching in the vernacular, and, in fact, the missionaries are the only ones who can use the vernacular because they spend their lives in the Territory and they learn these languages. Whereas, on the contrary, any teachers coming from Europe would not be in a position to teach in the local languages; they would have to learn them and that would require long study.

Therefore, in view of this exclusive use of a vernacular in elementary education, it is essential to use the only element which would be likely to use these languages, and that is the missionaries. Otherwise we would have to set up a body of lay teachers who would have to learn one of the vernacular languages before they could teach.

That is a very complex question, and a difficult one to solve. I would like to know whether the Visiting Mission gained any idea in this respect, and whether it considers that the teaching given in a great world language as early as the elementary schools would be liable to facilitate, to a large extent, the access of higher schools to the indigenous inhabitants.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I should perhaps let the Chairman of the Visiting Mission reply first of all, but I may be able to make certain clarifications. I hope the Visiting Mission did not make a final decision after three weeks in the country.

I would say that the question is a matter of great controversy. But, perhaps in a short while, we shall have elements which will enable us to gain an idea of the situation, and will be useful for others as well, because there is an experiment being carried out under good conditions.

It is incorrect to say that all elementary schools teach in Kirundi or Kenyaunda. There is one elementary school which teaches in French, that is the elementary school at Astrida. In the elementary school at Astrida, we use the vernacular only for explanations to be given, but the teaching is begun in French at the outset.

/The other

The other primary schools as a whole, all the larger mass of the elementary schools, teach in Kirundi or Kenyaunda. All children who have had teaching, either at Astrida or elsewhere, may enter the school at Astrida and carry on their higher studies on the condition that they pass the entrance examinations. It would appear that the children of the elementary school at Astrida have greater facility for presenting themselves for the examinations for entrance to the Astrida higher school than the children coming out of other schools.

The representatives of teaching, which is other than that of the fathers who direct the school at Astrida, blame the school of Astrida for the fact that their elementary school is intended to be a preparatory school for secondary education. In point of fact, however, elementary education in a country should be directed, not only at the preparation of students for secondary education, but also to give the great mass of the population, which has no other possibility of teaching than elementary teaching, the best possible preparation for life. That is where technicians always decide either one way or the other, and they wonder whether we should give the best possible ^{teaching} to the great mass, those who are not intending to go any further -- and it seems here that educators are in agreement in saying that the best possible results are obtained by the teaching in the vernacular -- or else, should we sacrifice the best interests of the greater mass, with a view to orientating elementary education as a preparation for secondary education. There we would probably obtain better results by teaching in a world language, a language which would later enable students to carry on with secondary or even higher education.

We are far from having reached any conclusion in this debate. Technicians themselves are divided and discuss the matter still. I think it would be very unwise for the Trusteeship Council to take any kind of positive or dogmatic attitude in this field, as we are not yet equipped to pass judgment in the present circumstances.

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): I was going to say, precisely, that the Visiting Mission did take an interest in this matter, but that it was careful not to decide on the matter, and that the various conversations we had with members of the teaching staff during our travels led the Mission to note that there was a great diversity among these members of the teaching staff.

/We sometimes

We sometimes heard the remark that children were somewhat backward in the learning of French because of the nature of the programmes, and, on the other hand, we heard, as the representative of Belgium has just stated, that there was an interest in keeping these programmes as they are because they ensured the greatest possible dissemination of teaching to the masses. We also heard that, if on the one hand, there was a slight drawback in the backwardness for, say one year, in a student who might have presented himself to the school at Astrida, we should not, on the other hand, sacrifice the advantage which there is in ensuring very easily assimilable teaching for the greatest possible number of children.

I simply communicate these remarks as they were made to us during our various visits to countries of Ruanda-Urundi, and I do not think that the Visiting Mission did, in fact, try to reach any final decision on this point.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): From the remarks made by the Chairman of the Visiting Mission and by the representative of the Administering Authority, it seems that the primary education given now to the indigenous inhabitants in Ruanda-Urundi is very satisfactory, and if they have followed the present educational set-up we find up to now, it is because they have in view the real interest of the great majority of children of school age.

But I wonder if this assumption is correct. I note, in the figures given on page 64 of document T/217, that there are in the Territory 1,393 private, subsidized primary schools, and that there are some 3,181 non-subsidized private primary schools. The total enrolment in these two types of schools amounts to only 300,187.

If we can assume, as we certainly believe we can, that the total population of Ruanda-Urundi is more or less around 4,000,000 people, and if we must assume, as we have assumed all along in regard to other Trust Territories, that children of school age constitute about 20 per cent of the total population, the children of school age in Ruanda-Urundi should amount to 800,000.

Yet, here in this Trust Territory, we find no more 300,187, which is a ratio of about 1 to 3 between the subsidized and non-subsidized schools.

/The ratio between

The ratio between the subsidized and the non-subsidized schools is 1 to 3. In other words the students going to government subsidized religious schools would be no more than 100,000. And even this number of 100,000 going to government subsidized schools would go to the school for only one or two years and then quit for good.

Now is this the kind of primary education which is in the best interests of the majority of the children of school age, constituting as they do, no more than 100,000 out of 800,000 children of school age?

So that even granting that these figures are correct, I do feel that the elementary education being given to these people is wholly inadequate to the dire needs of the Territory, and that is why, though realizing that there is a great difference between the situation as we find it now, and that which existed when the Germans left the Territory some thirty years ago, nevertheless, this deplorable condition of affairs certainly does not come up to anything like one would expect after twenty-five or thirty years of Belgian administration.

We find, too, that up to now the question of university education has not come to the fore, because there are absolutely none who are ready for university training. And the reason given for that is because there are none who have graduated from the secondary schools.

Yet, in the same report we find that the Administering Authority will not for a moment consider sending secondary students to Belgium because of the age of puberty that we discussed yesterday.

It seems to me that we are just going round and round in a circle. We have no university students because we have no high school graduates, and we have no high school graduates because, in the first place there are no high schools in the Territory, and in the second place because the Administering Authority would not for a moment consider sending students to Belgium.

Are we going to stand here helpless without suggesting to the Administering Authority that something should be done. It is for that reason that while I do admit that the Administering Authority has done something in the way of improving conditions in the Trust Territory, that something is far behind what would be expected after twenty-five or thirty years of mandate administration.

And that is all I have to say on this question of education.

/ Mr. RYCKMANS

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I do not know what the representative of the Philippines believes was to be expected after twenty-five years of administration of the Trust Territory. I have a few figures here:

In 1920, that is, four years after the beginning of our occupation during the war, there were in Ruanda-Urundi 123 schools.

In 1925 there were 2,342.

In 1937 there were 4,424.

In 1922 there were 221 native teachers.

In 1925 there were 2,489.

In 1947 there were 5,808.

In 1920 there were 6,000 students in the schools.

In 1935 there were 182,379 and in 1947, 303,197.

I don't know what one might be expecting after twenty-five years of administration by the Belgian authority, but I believe that very few countries in the world have made such progress in education, and I would advise the representative of the Philippines to look in reference books and to find the proportion of children of school age visiting schools in many countries which have enjoyed independence for quite a long time, including member-States of the United Nations and including States which are now represented on the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French); I think, and we all think, that if the Trusteeship Council sent a visiting Mission it was in order that this Visiting Mission be able to obtain an impression. We considered that our report had precisely given in respect of the general dissemination of elementary education, the idea that the effort was a constant one. It is not only a question of figures - and the figures are indicated in the report of the Administering Power - but what is more important, and more interesting to note, is what we saw and what we heard. Now we saw that everywhere schools were being enlarged and new schools were being built. But everywhere there was the tendency, which was almost irresistible, for teaching to be extended and to reach a greater number of persons.

This was extremely noticeable, and I think one can always, of course, show the Visiting Mission what one wishes, and sometimes impressions may be gained which are somewhat artificial, but I think that in this respect it was quite impossible that such an obvious state of things could be in any way, shall we say, presented or built up to

/ present to the Visiting

present to the Visiting Mission.

This effort of construction, of enlargement of recruiting, we saw everywhere, etc. Once again if the Visiting Mission made any reservation, it was in respect of the delay, which we considered was too long for the planning of a form of secondary education as conceived in Belgium or in France, and in a general way ^{for} the progress towards higher teaching.

But as to the efforts in general for the diffusion of elementary and primary teaching, I think that the impression of the Visiting Mission was unanimous and very strong ^{as} to the question of the considerable efforts which had been very successful.

Mr. CERIG (United States of America): We have followed this rather prolonged discussion on education in this Territory with a great deal of interest, and it reminds us of discussions we have had before and which will recur time and time again, it seems to me, in regard to all these Territories.

On the one hand we see that from an absolute point of view, the situation does not look very good. And that might be said of many other countries. From a relative point of view it appears that a great deal of progress has been made.

We are called upon here, maybe not at the end of this session, but sometime either during this session or at the next one, to give the opinion of the Trusteeship Council in regard to whether sufficient progress is ^{being} made on primary, secondary and higher education in this Territory. That will recur with a number of other Territories.

/ Now it seems to me

Now it seems to me that we do not have an adequate standard to go by and I am wondering if it would not be possible to ask some experts in the Secretariat -- maybe with the assistance of UNESCO, if that were necessary -- to study certain typical countries -- they might be mentioned or they might be left anonymous -- countries that started without any educational facilities whatever and how long it has taken to bring the standards of primary education up to a certain level so that we know what the general practice is.

It seems to me that our discussions here are rather fruitless because we have no really intelligent, scientific standard to go by. For my delegation it would be very useful to have a paper produced by experts who would be able to advise us as to how fast it would be reasonable to expect educational progress to be made in any territory, with the questions of budgetary possibilities and all that sort of thing taken into account.

Otherwise I fear that we will just be going in circles here. We will be accusing each other, on the one side, of lack of progress, and on the other side, pointing out the amount of progress that has already been made.

I have listened to both points of view here. I am impressed each time with the arguments put forward on both sides but I really would not know what a good standard would be by which to judge the conclusions which are to be made by this Council. Therefore I should like to make a concrete proposal that we ask the Secretariat or experts in this field to bring together -- and I do not think it would be very difficult, you could take certain typical countries -- to bring together the experience and lay it before us, by which we would get a standard.

It is absolutely foolish for us to expect that more could be done in a Territory like this than we have been willing to do in our own countries over a long period of time. That would be, it seems to me, entirely impractical.

I should like to make that a concrete proposal. I believe that it would give us very important guidance when we come to examine this question as we do two or three times at every session of this Council and we should have something to go by.

The PRESIDENT: I think it would be useful if the representative of the United States would formulate his proposal in writing. My first reaction is that this proposal involves

/tremendous difficulties

tremendous difficulties. First of all, in order to study a country with a view to measuring the length of time it would take to reach a certain educational standard you would have to find a country that is comparable in conditions with the existing conditions in the Trust Territory. Otherwise it would not be useful at all because it is the Trust Territories we are dealing with.

If we do so, if I understand the proposal correctly, it would mean the selection of a country that was say, a century ago, in the conditions in which the Trust Territory is now and then measure the progress that has been made. But then we at once come to this difficulty: if we think that there is a yardstick for human progress then it may mean many centuries before a country -- for instance New Guinea about which I have heard the representative of the Administering Authority state that the conditions there are not too far from the Stone Age -- can achieve results.

But if we did study a country in order to measure the time taken for progress -- what we consider to be an acceptable standard -- without any assistance from outside or any accelerated process (it will ^{have} taken many centuries to achieve educational progress in the country which was in the same conditions as any of the Trust Territories is now) then the Council may well ask whether the trusteeship system is set up to permit natural development so that a Trust Territory can take as long a time as any of those virgin countries which in ordinary circumstances and in historical perspective take towards the attainment of the goal set up in the Charter.

That is my first impression. I say it now because it may help the formulation of the proposal and I am sure the representative of the United States who has played a very important part in setting up the trusteeship system will be able to formulate some workable and more practicable formula than his verbal suggestion has conveyed to me. I shall look forward to something put down on paper.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): As the delegate of Mexico I wish to remind the Council that in connexion with this point it seems to me to be of the highest interest -- this point made by the representative of the United States -- that my delegation has made a proposal for establishing some seminars
/in Africa

in Africa for the purpose of studying educational problems. I am sure that these seminars which will work in consultation with the Administering Authorities will be able to assemble all the necessary documentation and statistics on this subject. Then, later on, the Council will be in a position to measure the degree of advancement attained in educational practice.

All that I would have to add to this discussion at this stage is that of course the efforts realized by the Belgian Authority in Ruanda-Urundi according to the figures supplied by the representative of Belgium is an appreciable and considerable effort. But, unfortunately, as the basis of education in that Territory is religious it would seem that we would be justified in deducing that the purpose of education would be to save souls down there.

We want an education that would assist the population from the physical point of view as well as from the cultural point of view. Educational advancement has to be general before you can compare the education in an area of the world with education in other areas. That is, we want education there to be modernized, we want it to be more effective for purposes of political and economic advancement because in the phase in which education is now, the standard of the inhabitants has in some sense improved, at least from the religious point of view.

But we now need a new kind of education there. I think the delegate of the Philippines was right in being surprised. I, too, am surprised. As the representative of Belgium has explained, all those who teach in the mission schools are graduates of normal schools besides being religious. That is, they are trained teachers.

I do not understand why some second stage of education was not developed. Basic primary education is of little practical effect if it is discontinued so soon and abruptly. The outgoing students will keep in their minds a few fundamental principles of religion and that is all. Their judgment will not have been formed. They will have no notion of how to improve their own lot in the Territory.

/I think that on this

I think that on this point the representative of Belgium would agree with me that it is necessary immediately to undertake the establishment of as many secondary schools as would be necessary, making all the necessary economic sacrifices that this would imply.

I think studies in this field can be undertaken. We hope that in the next report on Ruanda-Urundi, next year, we will hear about concrete efforts in this direction of the establishment of secondary schools; because, as I said before, the stage of saving souls has been passed, and we must now attend to the physical and cultural needs of the student population.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): As far as we can judge from the essence of the statement made by the representative of the United States in his verbal form, it appears to me that the proposal is a very good one.

I understood him to say that he is asking for working documents in the form of informational papers regarding the development of education in various countries during the past thirty or forty years, so that while we study the question of education in Trust Territories we would be able to see the factual situation as it exists in a number of countries and thus see how education could be developed.

That is, I understand his proposal to mean that we would take countries which, thirty or forty years ago had, let us say, a hundred or ninety per cent illiteracy and we would see how these countries developed during the past thirty or forty years to see how literacy grew in these countries. In this way we would be able to see the picture as it now exists after this period of thirty or forty years.

The Soviet Union could be taken as an example of this, because thirty or forty years ago there was about 88% to 90% illiteracy, and if you consider the so-called backward areas of that time there was complete illiteracy.

Other countries which had a very high degree of illiteracy could be taken and it could be seen what happened in those

/countries

countries over a period of thirty or forty years. I think that this proposal could be really carefully studied when it is submitted to us in a written form. At the moment it is difficult for me to speak on the subject of that proposal, not having it before me in writing.

It seems to me, therefore, that when we get this document in written form, if it contains a proposal of the sense which I have just stated, I consider that that would be a very important and valuable addition to the work of our Council.

I am not saying that we should overlook the very specific conditions existing on the Trust Territories, but as reference material which would help us in our work, I feel that such information would be extremely important, and if I understood the representative of the United States correctly, I completely support his proposal.

Now I would like to see it in writing; I think we should study it; and I certainly think that we should adopt it. It seems to me that it would not be a very big job; I think the Secretariat could, in a couple of hours, prepare this sort of a paper and submit it to the Council for its guidance and assistance.

The PRESIDENT: I am sure the proposal is worth looking into, and for that reason I have suggested that a written proposal be presented to the Council, and I suggest that we leave the discussion of that proposal until we have seen the written proposal.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I listened with great interest to the proposal made by the representative of the United States and I also noted the proposal which was made by the representative of Mexico, which we shall have to discuss at a later stage.

Some comparisons might usefully be made and especially the representative of the Soviet Union proposed that we should take as an example the backward areas which have shown an exceptional development of education and extremely appreciable results in the Soviet Union.

/I would

I would like to ask if possible, if the seminar which was proposed by the representative of Mexico could not also -- first of all, perhaps -- go to the Soviet Union to enquire on the rapidity with which backwardness and illiteracy were struggled against in this country and then this seminar might go to Africa to make a comparison, as suggested by the representative of the United States.

I think that a seminar should be in a position to act not only on the basis of statistics -- which are of course of interest -- but also by field visits on the spot in order to be able to make comparisons and to note whether in a certain Trust Territory the backwardness in respect of education which may be noted in certain cases is justifiable and whether, in effect, a much greater effort might not have been made, for instance, in the period of twenty-five years which covers the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
(Interpretation from Russian): It seems to me that the representative of France, regardless of all the efforts of the Trusteeship Council and of the Soviet^{Union}/delegation that the Trusteeship Council should work only on the tasks of the Trusteeship Council, always tries to turn the discussions of the Council into the question of what the situation is in the Soviet Union.

First of all, I must state point-blank that the Soviet Union is not a Trust Territory; some might wish that the Soviet Union were a Trust Territory; however, it happens to be an independent and a sovereign territory. On this basis, I must suggest to the representative of France that his proposal does not have any force, and on this formal ground I feel that his proposal is not acceptable.

As to the substance, it seems to me that the verbal proposal of the representative of the United States was quite well formulated and I do not think that we have any grounds to doubt the statistics supplied by any given country; and I think the general political, economic and cultural progress of any country, as well as the experiences of the Second World

/War

War, -- all of these things would show the level of development .

The joint effort against Hitlerite fascism and Japanese militarism would show the level of development, and I think the desire expressed by the French representative to be in the Soviet Union and to see the high development, and who has seen the development of the Soviet people in the cultural field, -- he would require least of all this information.

I am stating here that the Soviet Union is not a Trust Territory and therefore no questions regarding it are questions to be taken up by the Trusteeship Council, and I simply must regret again the propoganda statements made by the representative of France. I very deeply regret them; they simply hinder our work and constantly bring up questions which have nothing at all to do with the work of the Trusteeship Council.

The PRESIDENT: I said that I could foresee some difficulties involved, and this is one of them. I suggest that the Council should not discuss the United States proposal until a written proposal is presented. I think that would save a lot of time.

Mr. CARIÑO (Philippines): Without going further into the proposal of the United States representative, I think we are fortunate enough in having now before us certain figures about Trust Territories alone.

We found out in our study of Western Samoa that students of school age have now reached a 95% literacy. Thank of that - 95%! And students of secondary capacity are being sent to New Zealand for education, presumably also university education.

/In our

D

In our study of Togoland and ^{the} Cameroons under French Administration we have found out that the students are being sent to metropolitan France for university education, and yet, do we find any single student from Ruanda-Urundi studying either in secondary or university education in Belgium? These are facts and figures that speak more clearly than words, and I think that the British Cameroons and Togoland along with Ruanda-Urundi and Tanganyika all came from Germany; that what we can find now in these other Trust Territories should have shown some semblance of similar conditions in Ruanda-Urundi.

Yet the disparity in the facts that we have found is such that it stuns my imagination to find out ^{that} ~~even~~ ^{school} secondary ~~students~~ are not allowed to go to Belgium.

It is these facts in my mind that impel me to go deeply into the whole root of the educational system in Ruanda-Urundi -- not because I want to criticize the administration, but rather because I am taking our work seriously to see to it that the best that can be done for the indigenous inhabitants should be done if it can be done at all.

We found out that it had been done in the French Cameroons and Togoland; it had been done in Siam; why not in Ruanda-Urundi?

Mr. CANAS (Costa Rica) (Interpretation from Spanish):

Returning to the point we were discussing a few minutes ago, I would like to welcome warmly the United States proposal in the way it was explained orally. I indeed find that on many occasions we have been disconcerted at the lack of necessary statistics for purposes of pursuing our work. I remember that in the course of the studies that we made last year a discussion arose in connexion with the percentages of budgets that were being dedicated to the educational advancement of Territories, the reports for which we were examining last July. But there was no basis for comparison with Territories of other classes in order to have an idea whether this percentage was high enough or not.

I can recollect the case of some countries which by their history would indeed offer us a basis for the kind of comparison suggested by the United States -- take countries like Cuba that were colonial territories until about forty years ago; countries like this could be utilized in this way. Similarly perhaps, the Philippines, which is a territory that did not obtain its independence until a short while ago, might be used as a basis for comparison. These would be two countries which, being

/amongst those

amongst those that have most recently obtained their independence, would be of service in the pursuit of a comparative study of educational advancement in their diverse parts of the world. These two countries would give us an idea of what the minimum requirements, at least, would be.

My attitude is different from the USSR delegation's. I would also offer you the statistics on my country and open my country's doors for investigations of this kind.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I wonder really what we would have heard if the representative of the Philippines had wished to criticize the Belgian administration. What he said he did not say in order to criticize the Belgian administration. What would he have said if he had wanted to criticize us?

To give you an example of the complete absence of yardsticks, as said by the representative of the United States, the representative of the Philippines wishes to fustigate Belgium by comparing the results which we have obtained in Ruanda-Urundi with the results obtained by New Zealand in Samoa.

I am an Administering Power; therefore, according to the representative of the Philippines, a priori, anything that another Administering Power does I find ^{all} is right. Apart from this, I am a great friend of New Zealand, and I am a great friend of Samoa. Therefore, I am not prepared to criticize either New Zealand or Samoa.

But between Samoa and Ruanda-Urundi there is one tiny little difference and that is that thirty years ago, when New Zealanders arrived in Samoa, the population was almost 95% literate. Everybody knew how to read in Samoa thirty years ago, and nobody knew how to read in Ruanda-Urundi thirty years ago. When the comparison is made we are told that there are 75% of the people who know how to read in Samoa and only 30% in Ruanda-Urundi. Therefore, Ruanda-Urundi should be condemned.

When the representative of the Philippines said that he was stunned by the reading of the report, we wonder whether he knows how to read, because I read in the report as a conclusion or general idea that the report says that ⁱⁿ hospitals, dispensaries, schools and many schoolrooms, one saw a feeling of monotony which is transformed by the pure statistical knowledge. Perhaps it might be difficult to say how many children go to school and how many do not, but what it is possible to state is the passion for education of this population and the effort made in order to

/satisfy this

satisfy this. The enlargement of existing schools and the setting up of new primary schools are one of the striking facts and features of Ruanda-Urundi.

The Mission did not go into one single place without finding something being built, either houses for chiefs, or schools, or laboratories, or churches and so forth. This is being built in an elegant style, in a solid manner and is consistent with the durable needs of the population.

The Mission has seen all this, and drew an impression of vigour which is certainly correct.

I think the Mission for having paid tribute to what was done in Ruanda-Urundi, and I hope that the members of this Council have read the report in another spirit than that of the representative of the Philippines. After that, I will not answer anything else.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): As far as comparisons are concerned, ^{since} this question was raised, I would like simply to say that if you take a country which has made a very great effort against illiteracy and for the development of education -- shall we say, for instance, the Philippines -- the representative of the Philippines has often said that the effort had been made and that an extraordinary result had been obtained in a very few years; nevertheless, comparison could hardly be made between a country like Ruanda-Urundi and the Philippines, because the Philippines for many centuries had been in constant and close contact with Western culture. The Philippines were not born yesterday and did not arise out of a rudimentary state of things in a quarter of a century. There was perhaps a great number of illiterates. There were very backward areas in the Philippines, but nevertheless, for centuries there had been religious schools. There was a university; there were students from the Philippines who had reached the higher degree of education. Therefore, we cannot make a valid comparison between a country like the Philippines and Ruanda-Urundi.

A short while ago I made a proposal which appeared strange to the representative of the USSR. I would not like him to misunderstand my proposal. If I spoke of this seminar, it was because the proposal was made in this sense by the representative of Mexico, but I meant to say that we could not simply make comparisons on the basis of figures by taking, for instance, the figures of 1920 in such and such a country and the figures of today. That is not sufficient.

/We would have

We would have to make a very lengthy and detailed study of all the conditions of the problem. For instance, in the Soviet Union itself, where I was in a position to see what a wonderful effort was made -- and I am very happy to pay tribute to this -- even the very backward areas where education has been stimulated and promoted, and obtained good results, cannot be compared to a country of Central Africa.

All these areas of the Soviet Union, where such a great effort has been made, were not in the rudimentary stage of Ruanda-Urundi. They were provinces of the Russian Empire, where there had been a certain number of elements which reached higher education.

Perhaps there were a great number of illiterates, but at any rate, in these areas there were not only elementary schools, but also secondary schools and even universities.

Even if we go a little further back, for instance, the areas of Turkestan were areas which had known a very brilliant civilization some centuries ago, and wonderful historical remains give us the proof of this fact.

These countries could not therefore be compared to an African population which has for a very short time been in contact with western civilization. The problem of comparisons is extremely difficult, and I repeat that we should not limit ourselves to statistical comparisons, but should also study the whole historical condition of all these countries. Otherwise absurd conclusions will result.

That is what I wished to say a short while ago, and I wished to say that if a seminar were to be set up to examine the specific problems of education in the Trust Territories, this seminar first of all need not be on the spot for that purpose. It may proceed to comparisons which were proposed to us by the representative of the United States, such as, for instance, on the plane of general studies of UNESCO. Technicians might then proceed with a more detailed study of the problem, and they might see in what circumstances we can fight against illiteracy in very backward countries, which have not been in contact with western civilization, at any rate before the twentieth century.

The PRESIDENT: As I said, I think that we should not discuss this proposal at any length until we have it in written form.

If we have completed the examination of the Visiting Mission's report on Ruanda-Urundi, then I would like to draw the attention of

/members of the

members of the Council to the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of France.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I would like one clarification on the report of the Visiting Mission. As regards the statement to ^{be} made on this, I understand that after the discussion we shall be able to speak.

I would like to draw the attention of members of the Council to Annex III on page 82 of document T/217. As you know, in considering the report of the Administering Authority on Ruanda-Urundi at the third session of the Trusteeship Council, the USSR representative pointed out a number of facts, as stated in the report, which showed that the majority of the population of Ruanda-Urundi is illiterate, that the indigenous population has no political rights, that organs of self-government in which members of the indigenous population participate do not exist.

The representative of the USSR further pointed out that the standard of living of the indigenous population is very low and that the Belgian companies operating in this Territory derive great profits on the sale of goods which they export, since they buy them for very low prices and pay extremely low wages to the indigenous population.

The USSR representative further noted frequent famines, the heavy tax burden on the indigenous population, and serious violations of its rights. The fact was noted that the health situation in the Territory was very poor, and that the Administering Authority was not doing much to further primary and secondary education in the Territory.

As members of the Council will recall, this statement made by the representative of the USSR during the third session did not please the representative of Belgium. On this basis the representative of Belgium made a proposal to the effect that the Visiting Mission, when it visited the Territory, should take the most serious parts of that statement for public reading in Ruanda-Urundi. He assured us that this would call forth gales of laughter, and that the Belgian Administration would be completely cleared of the attacks made on it in the Trusteeship Council.

The representative of Belgium proposed that the statement made by the representative of the USSR be brought to the attention of the indigenous population, whose comments should be afterwards brought to the Council.

/On 12 July 1948

On 12 July 1948 the representative of Belgium said:

"All that I ask is that your speech be given wide publicity, and I hope that the Visiting Mission will be loyal enough to see that this is done. For my part I shall request the Governor of Ruanda-Urundi to have the more impressive parts of this speech read publicly, as this will show the Africans of Ruanda-Urundi that not everyone shares their views as to the quality of the administration which protects them under the auspices of the United Nations."

The representative of the USSR agreed with this proposal, and he stated:

"I accept Mr. Ryckman's proposal. I should be very pleased if the statement which I made this morning were translated into the native languages and disseminated among the native inhabitants of Ruanda-Urundi. I should welcome this step. I think it would be a very good thing. I repeat, I accept Mr. Ryckman's proposal and hope that my statement will reach the native inhabitants."

On the basis of Annex III of the Visiting Mission's report, I think the conclusion could be arrived at that the Visiting Mission did not carry out the request of the representative of Belgium. The Administering Authority also has done nothing to carry out the promise made by their representative at the Trusteeship Council. In this way, neither the Visiting Mission nor the Administering Authority have done anything on this question.

The indigenous population of Ruanda-Urundi was not familiarized with the statement made by the representative of the USSR, which, as you recall, was seriously insisted upon by the representative of Belgium.

It is in this connexion that I would like to have an explanation from the Chairman of the Visiting Mission, and, if it is possible, perhaps from the representative of Belgium himself.

As you know, it was requested during the third session of the Trusteeship Council not on the initiative of the representative of the USSR, but of the representative of Belgium. You will understand that under these circumstances, the representative of the USSR at the Trusteeship Council has the right to ask for an explanation as to what was done in this connexion. I should be very grateful for such an explanation.

/The PRESIDENT

FMP/DG

T/P.V. 149
49-50

The PRESIDENT: Before I ask whether the Chairman of the Visiting Mission or the representative of the Administering Authority would like to say anything on this subject, I would like to state my own reaction to this episode.

/I think the

I think that the explanation given by Mr. Laurentie through Governor Simon in his letter, which is part of the appendix, is an entirely correct attitude on the part of the Visiting Mission.

When anything is said in the Council in the heat of debate it may not represent the collective vote of the Council. I believe that I was in the Chair when this verbal duel was fought. My impression was that there was more rhetoric involved than any actual formal proposal or acceptance.

When the representative of Belgium said "If you read that to the local population they will laugh at you," I did not take that as a formal proposal. And when the representative of the USSR said that he accepted such a proposal, I took it as a challenge.

It was for that reason that I do not recollect making any definite remarks from the Chair which would have given this exchange the validity of a Council opinion that should be carried out by the Visiting Mission. Therefore I think that the Chairman of the Visiting Mission was quite right when he stated in his letter that the Visiting Mission did not receive any specific instructions in this matter.

I just wanted to give my reactions as they were then and as they are now.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): Last year when the representative of the USSR stated that he accepted my proposal and would be very pleased/^{to} have the statement he made that morning translated into the native languages and circulated among the native inhabitants of Ruanda-Urundi, Mr. Tsarapkin knew quite well that I had never made any proposal of this sort.

What I did say -- and everyone in the Council understood me perfectly well -- was the following:

You are saying things which you know are not true. It has been quite right to say that everything is not perfect in Ruanda-Urundi, and I agree.

'But that you should say to the students at Astrida that a member of the Trusteeship Council considers that the Belgian Government has done nothing for public education in Ruanda-Urundi, those people, of course, will laugh at you.'

I asked the members of the Visiting Mission -- I did not offer -- to give the representative of the USSR the opportunity of spreading propaganda and causing agitation which he thought he saw in my proposal.

I asked the Visiting Mission to choose a few passages which I considered excessive and where I said that he was condemning himself -- it was self-condemnatory -- and to read them in circles which were in a

/position

position to understand them; for instance, in the school of Astrida. I suggested that they ask people what they thought about them.

I am quite convinced that if the Visiting Mission, after some of the visits which it made to institutions in Ruanda-Urundi, had done what I suggested and had said to people: This is what one member of the Trusteeship Council stated. What do you think about it? the people would, of course, have replied, as I announced that they would, that you only have to look around you and you see what the Belgians have done in Ruanda-Urundi.

Perhaps the Chairman of the Visiting Mission was right in maintaining complete impartiality and not ridiculing a member of the Trusteeship Council before the population. I think he will not challenge the fact that if the test that I suggested had been carried out, the result would have been exactly the one which I announced. For instance, when you know the number of dispensaries which were built in Ruanda-Urundi in the last few years, you go and ask people who know the situation -- chiefs in Ruanda-Urundi -- Has the Belgian Administration really done nothing for medical assistance to the population?

You would receive the reply "What have you done in this Country? What have you been looking at in the three weeks you have been here? Have you not seen the hospitals, the dispensaries? Have you not seen the thousands of people going to medical consultations?"

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): After what the President has just said and the reference he made to the letter which I signed and addressed to the Governor of Ruanda-Urundi on behalf of the Visiting Mission, I do not think it would be appropriate for me to add very much.

As is stated at the end of this letter,

"...during the enquiry into public opinion conducted by the Mission, it did not fail to ask for information on all the essential points raised in the Trusteeship Council's discussion, including those contained in Mr. Tsarapkin's observations."

I think that the reflection of this is found in the report itself and that there is not much more to add. It is quite obvious that whenever the mission put questions it was in accordance with instructions given by the Council and in the light of the discussions of the Trusteeship Council.

It is obvious that the Visiting Mission never acted in accordance with the personal opinion of a member of the Council; it is a Mission of the Council and should bring its report back to the Council.

/The Visiting Mission

The Visiting Mission acted only according to the instructions given to it by the Council as a body set up by the Council and not as a number of individuals having taken part in these discussions.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): So seriously do I take this question of education that after some reference had been made....

The PRESIDENT: If there are no further comments on this exchange of correspondence with the Governor of Ruanda-Urundi I propose to have the recess.

There will be a draft resolution in regard to this report and there is an item on our agenda with respect to educational advancement. I suggest that we reserve any further discussion on education until we come to these items.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): I am perfectly willing to do that but the Philippines has been dragged into this question of comparison and I would like to explain in one or two short sentences.

Even if it is true that the Philippines had been in contact with western civilization for centuries before Ruanda-Urundi was touched by "the white man's hand" there were sections of the country that were totally untouched by western civilization when the Americans came there at the beginning of the century.

What the Americans did was to choose from among all the most promising of these mountain peoples, untouched by civilization -- Igrots, Morcs, Negritos -- take them over here at their juvenile stage, as we mentioned yesterday, at the age when, according to the Administering Authority in Ruanda-Urundi it would be dangerous for a student to be transported from Africa to Belgium. They were transported to a temperate climate with all the rigours of winter directly from the torrid zone, and ten or fifteen years later, these mountain tribesmen returned to the Philippines to assume positions of leadership and since then, up to now, many among those mountain peoples are taught by leadership that endures, and you can find in those places now schools all over, from one end of the barrier to another.

Those are the conditions that I envisage could be imitated in Trust Territories, no matter how backward they may be. I do not claim that the Filipino or tribesman in the Philippines, who was untouched by civilization at the time that the Americans came there, could be any superior to the mountaineer or backward tribesman of Ruanda-Urundi. Yet if it could be done to the Filipino Negrito or to the Filipino Moro or to the Filipino Igrot, why could it not be done with the Ruanda-Urundi African? That is the point.

I hated to bring the Philippines into this comparison, but since the representatives of France and Belgium have touched upon it, I feel it is my duty to call the attention of the Council to this fact, and it should never be touched upon again unless they want to follow it up further.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): One word please: Ruanda-Urundi has been dragged into these discussions. The representative of the Philippines says that there are schools all over the island. I reply that there are schools all over Ruanda-Urundi too.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I have listened very carefully to the explanations which have been given here, and I would like only briefly in a few words to state and to repeat once again, as is well known, that it was not the representative of the Soviet Union who, during the third session of the Trusteeship Council, proposed the public reading of his statement to the indigenous population of Ruanda-Urundi. It was not the Soviet representative who proposed it. This was the proposal of the representative of Belgium, and,

/furthermore,

furthermore, the representative of Belgium directly stated that, for his part, he would ask the Governor of Ruanda-Urundi to have the more impressive part of the speech read publicly, and so forth.

That is the first comment that I wished to make: that the Soviet representative was not the one who made this statement and it would be ridiculous to speak, therefore, of propaganda in this connexion.

Secondly, the representative of Belgium made this proposal. He made it both as regards the Visiting Mission and again when he said that he would ask the Governor of Ruanda-Urundi to read publicly part of the statement of the Soviet representative. This proposal and this promise made by the representative of Belgium were not carried out, and it is for this reason that I find I have to make a third, very brief, comment.

That is that when any delegate in the Council is addressed, and anything is proposed in order to place any member of the Council in a ridiculous position, I think that such things should be carefully thought out first to avoid having the same thing happen as happened during the third session, because it seems to me that it was a very, very sorry incident.

My fourth comment is that I must regretfully state that the representative of Belgium did not carry out his promise regarding the statement of the Soviet representative at the third session, and he keeps on insisting that, if this had been done, there would have been such and such results. Who prevented him from doing this? Why is he trying to confuse and mislead the Trusteeship Council now at its fourth session. This argumentation, I feel, is not serious and is not well-founded. I raise this question and I want an explanation simply to show that the Soviet delegation was never of the opinion that any question should be discussed in any other than a very businesslike way and, if facts are produced in an argument, those facts are taken from purely official sources and documents presented by the Administering Authority. They certainly have absolutely no propaganda purposes such as the Soviet delegation has here been accused of.

The PRESIDENT: We consider this incident closed. In fact, if I may say so, I was surprised to find such a formal exchange of letters between Governor Laurentie and the Visiting Mission.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): Are we closing this report of the Visiting Mission now?

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: There will be a short resolution. If anyone wants to discuss it further, he can express his opinion when we have tried to formulate this.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): I would just like to formulate one question of information in connexion with things generally.

The other day a student of Columbia University, who is apparently taking courses with regard to the work of the United Nations Trusteeship System, asked me whether or not it is true that it is only Belgium now who has not ratified the Trusteeship Agreement.

I understood from our discussions last year that that was to be ratified during the forthcoming session of the Belgian Parliament. I wonder whether it has been ratified or not, so that I could tell this student who is enquiring into the matter. I suppose the Belgian Parliament has convened since that time, and that the matter of formal ratification of the Trusteeship Agreement has been completed, but I would like to be reassured so that I could tell this student. Has it or has it not been ratified?

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): The discussions in committee are finished, and the Bill is now before Parliament with the suggestion by the committee that it should be approved to be voted. They have not been filibustering about it!

The PRESIDENT: I may say, perhaps, that the acceptance of the Trusteeship Agreement by the Belgian Government can be borne out by the fact that the Administering Authority has submitted reports to the Council, that a Visiting Mission has been to the Trust Territory, and the fact that we have been discussing it here will, I think, bind the Belgian Government officially so that they cannot get out of it.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): It will be voted this session anyway.

The PRESIDENT: But let my remark be taken in a commonsense manner. I do not want the Belgian Government to think that I say anything that interferes with its prerogative.

I would suggest now that the Council have a brief recess of a quarter of an hour and come back to consider the draft resolution submitted by

/the delegation

the delegation of France in regard to this report.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I would like an explanation: when we discuss the resolution, will it be possible for us to speak in general on the report, because I thought we had agreed that first we would ask questions and then we would be able to make a statement. Now we have finished the questions, and I think we can make a statement. Do I understand correctly?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, that is correct.

The Council is adjourned until 4.45 p.m.

The meeting rose at 4.28 p.m. and reconvened at 4.52 p.m.

/The PRESIDENT: The Council now has

The PRESIDENT: The Council now has before it a draft resolution submitted by the representative of France. I notice he is not here yet. I believe it would not be anticipating what the representative of France might wish to say if other representatives would like to make some observations on this draft resolution. It is self-explanatory, and I do not think it needs any introduction.

The draft resolution is contained in document T/270, under the date of 4 March 1949.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): As I understand it, we have not yet completed the discussion of the report on Ruanda-Urundi. I think the procedure we agreed to follow was this. First, we would ask questions and receive replies, and after completing that, we would reach the second stage wherein the members of the Council would make any comments or remarks which they wished to make.

I noticed that there was some discussion during the question period and some of the members did speak on the substance of the matters contained in the report, but, if you will recall, the USSR delegation did not speak at any time on the substance of the report.

Am I to understand, therefore, that we are first going to have an opportunity to speak on the substance of the report, and having done that, the Council could then go ahead and discuss the draft resolution submitted by the representative of France?

I, for instance, have certain comments which do not refer at all to the draft resolution of the French representative, but do refer to the report of the Visiting Mission. I do not have many such comments, but I would like to make them.

The PRESIDENT: If the statement is of a general character, then of course the representative of the USSR may request the opportunity to make it, but otherwise, if the statement is merely a comment on the report of the Visiting Mission, I should think that a draft resolution of this kind would furnish a basis for such general discussion.

I cannot see why remarks of a general character cannot be introduced by a discussion of this draft resolution. The draft resolution is to the effect that the Trusteeship Council has examined the report and,

/Having taken

"Having taken note of the fact that the observations of the Administering Authority are not yet available,

"Requests the Administering Authority to submit to the Council such observations as it may deem necessary not later than 30 May 1949;

"Decides to resume the discussion of this report at its next session."

If any representative disagrees with this report, he can make his general statement in regard to the report. I feel that this procedure does not preclude any member from making his statement of a general character on the report, as well as saving the time of the Council by putting before it a concrete basis for discussion.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): It makes no difference to me what procedure you wish to set up. Since we have had the French draft resolution since 4 March, I only want the opportunity to make those statements which I wish to make, but I do not want to speak on the resolution.

The delegation of the USSR has several comments which it wishes to make on the report of the Visiting Mission to Ruanda-Urundi. The information contained in the report of the Visiting Mission to the Trusteeship Council supports the very fact that the policy of the Belgian Administration toward the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi is directed towards strengthening the colonial regime in the Territory.

In fact, it mentions that the Administering Authority has annexed the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi and has, for all practical purposes, annexed it to the adjacent colony of Belgian Congo, which violates the Charter of the United Nations, which provides for the development of Trust Territories toward self-government and independence.

In the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, there are no legislative bodies nor administrative bodies which are not subject to the administrative union between the Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi. The indigenous population of Ruanda-Urundi is deprived of the possibility of participating in the legislative, executive and judicial bodies of the Territory. There does not exist in the Trust Territory any system of self-government based on democratic principles.

The entire administration of the Trust Territory is centered in the hands of the Belgian Vice-Governor, who is subject to the Governor of the Belgian Congo which is a Belgian colony.

/This Vice-Governor

This Vice-Governor administers the Territory through Belgian officials. For the convenience of administration, particularly for the purpose of collecting taxes, the Belgian officials utilize the services of so-called tribal notables, sultans and sheiks. The indigenous population does not participate in the appointment of these sheiks and sultans.

It is sufficient to analyze the consultative body, the consultative council, to get a clear picture of the fact that the indigenous population is completely devoid of any participation in the true administration of the Territory.

/The Vice-Governor's

The Vice-Governor's Council has 22 people composed of high officials. Three members are appointed by the Governor of Ruanda-Urundi on the basis of their competence in colonial questions. Nine are representatives of trading houses, employers, and the various companies and civil service organizations. Five members are supposed to represent the indigenous population. Out of these five, three have to be appointed by the Vice-Governor from among the indigenous and white population of Ruanda-Urundi, and two are appointed by the Governor-General, one on the advice of the Sultan of Ruanda and the other on the advice of the Sultan of Urundi.

These five members have been appointed from the ranks of European missionaries and traders and therefore are not true representatives of the indigenous population. Therefore there are no representatives of the true indigenous population in the Governor's Council.

The report points out that the Administering Authority considers that the East Africans are not wise enough, nor educated enough, to understand the complex problems which are considered by the Council (see page 22).

The report of the Mission states:

" The Mission is firmly convinced that there is no justification for the fact that the representatives of the indigenous population are not drawn into the work of the Governor's Council."

The Visiting Mission's report further points out that the Administering Authority is not planning any measures for the creation of organs of self-government with the participation of the indigenous population.

It is further stated that in conversations with officials of the Administration, it was pointed out that the political development of the indigenous population is considered as an extremely slow process, and their opinion obtained that many generations would be required before any positive results are achieved. (see page 16 of the report).

As stated before, in the Trust Territories the Administering Authority fosters the tribal system. This tribal system is irreconcilable with the process permitting the development of the indigenous population of the Trust Territory towards independence and self-government.

As is known, all of these questions arose and were considered during the discussion of the annual report on Ruanda-Urundi during the third session of the Trusteeship Council in 1948. In this connexion the delegation of the Soviet Union considers that in the Trust Territory there should be set up legislative and executive bodies which would not be subject to any bodies set up on the basis of a union between the Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi. Therefore it should be recommended to the

/ Administering Authority

Administering Authority that they carry out the necessary legal and other measures which would provide for the participation of the indigenous population of Ruanda-Urundi in the legislative, executive and judicial organs of the Trust Territory.

The Trusteeship Council should recommend to the Administering Authority that they take measures for the transition from the tribal system to the system of self-government based on democratic principles.

In the report of the Visiting Mission there are a large number of facts which support the situation that the Administering Authority is carrying on anti-democratic policy in regard to the indigenous population. It allows, for instance, racial discrimination, and allows for serious violation of the rights of the indigenous people. The indigenous population lives in a condition of abject poverty and exploitation.

The report states that the indigenous population receives a very low salary, and the Mission considers that the wages in money paid to the African workers should be increased. The indigenous population can not participate in trade, which is completely in the hands of Europeans; and that, of course, refers to the substantial type of commerce.

The report further states that in this connexion certain Africans have expressed a strong desire to participate in transportation and commerce dealings but they have received no help from the administration.

The following facts further bear out the bad situation in which the indigenous population finds itself..

There is such a large labour force, which is paid so low - two francs a day, to be exact - that it is very easy for the administration to simply have a lot of things done manually which could be better done mechanically.

The report further states that the living standards of the population as a whole is very low. The pay of African workers in Ruanda-Urundi is extremely low, and further, (on page 52) the daily wage of one or two francs is extremely widespread. The very low pay is one of the bases of the economic system of Ruanda-Urundi.

The report of the Mission further states that there exists no legislation on minimum wages (see page 54). The indigenous population must live not only in abject poverty, but are placed in a condition where they are devoid of any rights. And it should be noted therefore that in case of a breach of employment contract there are very serious punishments imposed, including imprisonment. In 1947, 758 workers were condemned to prison for breach of contract.

/ The Mission further

The Mission further points out the widespread application of fines for the same violation of the law.

Therefore we can see that the indigenous population are imprisoned for not being able to live on this beggarly wage. And in the prisons the most rigid prison regime is applied and whipping is also used as a punishment.

It should be further noted that the very abject, and uncivilized form of whipping is very widely used in Ruanda-Urundi. The report of the Visiting Mission says that whipping still exists and is often used by the chiefs and their assistants, and even by certain European officials, particularly as regard agricultural workers and in connection with forced labour on the construction of roads.

The local court can impose punishment of this kind. All this shows not only racial discrimination but serious violation of the rights and interests of the indigenous population.

Further, the information contained in the report completely supports the conclusions which were reached in the third session of the Trusteeship Council when the annual report of the Administering Authority on Ruanda-Urundi was discussed. Those conclusions were in respect of the very poor situation of health and medicine in the Territory, also education. The report says that the population of Ruanda-Urundi finds itself in a very primitive state of development (page 52 of the report).

As regards medicinal care, the report says the following: The Africans to whom the Visiting Mission spoke, workers and officials, all said that medicinal help should be increased ^{and} the number increased of maternity homes, dispensaries and hospitals. Such requests were often repeated by all the Africans who were contacted by the Mission (page 48).

This is not surprising if we bear in mind that in the entire Trust Territory, with a population of 3,700,000 there is only one maternity home.

There is no need to adduce any other facts regarding the absolutely low development of education and health in the Territory because all these facts are very well known to the Council.

/ It should be pointed out

It should be pointed out that the Administering Authority does not carry out the requirements of the Charter or of the Trusteeship Agreement in the economic and educational fields. The budgetary allocations for social, educational and health needs are insufficient. The Administering Authority ought to increase the budgetary allocations for medicinal care and to carry out the necessary measures to assure the implementation of the resolution of the General Assembly of 18 November 1948 regarding the question of the improvement of education in Trust Territories.

These are the few preliminary comments which the Soviet delegation wished to make at this stage of consideration of the report of the Visiting Mission on Ruanda-Urundi.

Mr. BAKR (Iraq): We have read the Visiting Mission's report to Ruanda-Urundi with great interest. One is exhilarated with the sense of objectivity and fairmindedness that prevails in the report as a whole. The political backwardness of the Trust Territory seems to stare one in the face, yet the local administrative officials seem to us to be complacent and so oblivious of an urgent need for development in political and other fields, that they conceive progress to be only possible at an extremely slow rate, and after many further generations.

Modern ideas and research have dispelled the old theories of slow progress, and empirical evidence in many parts of the world has demolished the old conception of slow progress and the unwarranted conviction that natives require unduly lengthy periods before they can take progressive steps forward.

Indirect rule is practical in this Trust Territory where its only virtue seems to be in appeasing the chiefs and sub-chiefs, and avoiding what is conceived as social unrest. This arrangement may be convenient, or expedient, but it certainly has no other virtues. On the contrary it makes for the stagnation of the people under trust, and ensures their continued backwardness. The Administering Authority may well consider the possibility of lifting this screen between the real authority in the Territory and the mass of the population and take up energetic steps to train the natives to occupy responsible posts in the administration rather than perpetuate an old and superstitious system which the Administering Authority is there merely to correct.

The report has shown the dire need for the democratization
/of the whole

of the whole political structure in as early a moment as possible. We can readily conceive the circumstances that lead this responsible Visiting Mission to make this statement (page 19) and we believe that the Trusteeship Council may wish to add its voice to that of its Visiting Mission. The status of the Trust Territory seems to be inextricably mixed with that of the Belgian Congo. The Visiting Mission has rightly urged that less rigid control of Ruanda-Urundi by the Governor-General of the Congo be exercised (page 24).

During the examination of the petitions we referred to the grave problem of discrimination against Asiatics and Africans. We were not able to pursue this subject then, but we reserved the right of our delegation to express our view with respect to this grave matter when the Visiting Mission's report was before the Council.

On page 58 of the Visiting Mission's report, document T/217, the problem is brought out with all its unfortunate details. We may well wonder whether the Trusteeship Council may condone such practices, presumably done on its behalf, by the Administering Authorities. We need not burden the Council with all the details enumerated in the relevant part of the report, and which shall soon be placed before the Council when some of the petitions on discrimination in this Trust Territory are considered.

We may mention, however, that the Visiting Mission recognized discrimination against the Asiatics was apparent in local legislation which is to be found in four fields: 1. residence in urban districts; 2. laws on alcoholic beverages; 3. possession of arms; 4. the prison system.

The position of education, and particularly higher education is deplorable, where education is mostly disseminated through the missionaries. We have placed before the Council some of the grave drawbacks of this system and our remarks in this respect are particularly applicable to the Trust Territory under consideration.

The report refers to an official document which instructs the missions not to enlarge their educational facilities such as they are while government schools are not instituted on any satisfactory scale. The Visiting Mission has frankly stated that missionary schools spend most of their time on theological topics which are compulsory.

In conclusion, I should like to put on record our high appreciation of the Visiting Mission's effort on behalf of the Trusteeship Council for the objectivity and clear picture they place
/before us.

before us. In this connexion we may again urge that moving film units be attached to future Visiting Mission, to be used at the discretion of the Mission.

The PRESIDENT: I would again reiterate that members of the Council may discuss this report either as a general statement or in reference to the draft resolution presented by the delegation of France. I would like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to this draft resolution.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): I would have preferred to keep quiet at this stage except that misapprehension might be given to silence on my delegation's part now.

But I would like to state that the Visiting Mission has presented to us a very objective report the observations and recommendations of which can only find sympathy and active support on the part of my delegation. As I believe that there will be some other occasion to further discuss this report I will simply state just now that I sympathize with the constructive suggestions given by previous speakers and that I might find it more desirable later on to emphasize some points when we finally discuss the report at a later date.

/DRAFT RESOLUTION

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE FRENCH DELEGATION

The PRESIDENT: Are there any observations on the draft resolution? If not, I shall put it to the vote.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): I would like to offer some amendment to this positive part of the resolution which starts with the word "decides".

Instead of this positive part, I would prefer -- and I now formally propose -- that it should read as follows:-

"Decides in the meantime to tentatively approve the observations and conclusions contained therein, particularly those appearing in Chapter V, pages 72 to 76 of the report, and to resume further discussion on said report at its next session in June, 1949."

That paragraph should take the place of the last paragraph of the proposed resolution.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Frussian): On the French draft resolution which is before us a certain number of questions have occurred to me which I would like to state here to the Council; certain ideas have also arisen in my mind in connexion with this resolution.

The draft resolution submitted by the representative of France to a certain extent reflects the discussion which took place in the Trusteeship Council at the very beginning of this session, when we were discussing the problem as to whether we should or should not take up the report of the Visiting Mission on Ruanda-Urundi and Tanganyika at this session.

What has brought about the submission of this draft resolution by the representative of France? This draft resolution has been based on the fact that the Administering Authority in Ruanda-Urundi has not submitted its observations on the Visiting Mission's report on time and the representative of the Administering Authority, based on the fact that the Administering Authority "wishes to submit its observations on this report," says that the Administering Authority wants to submit its observations

observations, and therefore they do not want to have any discussion on the report until these observations are in and that no decision should be reached by the Council on the findings of the Visiting Mission.

It seems to me, therefore, that the draft resolution submitted by the French delegation is proposing a very undesirable and, I feel, needless precedent which is in essence counter to the provisions of the Charter and counter to the rules of procedure of the Trusteeship Council.

Neither the Charter nor the rules of procedure provide that the consideration of the report of a Visiting Mission and the findings of the Council thereon should not be made until the observations of the Administering Authority on these reports have been received by the Council.

Furthermore, the draft resolution submitted by the French delegation not only proposes this absolutely needless precedent which is in violation of our rules of procedure, since it allows us to conclude that the Trusteeship Council cannot consider a report and express its conclusions on this report until such time as the observations of the Administering Authorities on these reports are received.

It proposes a period of seven months for the submission of the observations on the report.

In view of all the problems raised by the draft resolution of the French delegation it can be seen that it is not directed towards improving the work of the Council.

In this connexion, I cannot see how we can possibly agree with the draft resolution before us, and it seems to me that these questions which arise on the basis of this resolution should be resolved. Many of the doubts and questions which I have just expressed have arisen in the mind of the Soviet delegation on the basis of the draft French resolution before us.

We feel that these questions are very important ones and that they should be resolved.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): The draft resolution which I have submitted to the Council was, as
/you have

you have understood, a compromise between the proposals made by the representative of the Government responsible for the Trusteeship and in the light of the objections formulated by the representative of Belgium.

The contention of the representative of Belgium was that the observations presented to the administration of Ruanda-Urundi would ~~xxx~~ be in the next report which would, therefore, be submitted to Lake Success on 30 June.

The result would have been a very long delay in the examination of the report of the Visiting Mission.

The representative of the United Kingdom, for his part, had asked for a reasonable delay in order to present the remarks if necessary of his Government on the report.

The representative of the Soviet Union told us that the result of the proposal would be to give a delay of seven months to the two Governments to send in these remarks. I do not know how he counted his time-limit of seven months, because it seems to me that the Secretariat had submitted the report officially two months ago.

If you take into account the delay of transmission of the report to London and to Brussels and then the transmission of the same report from London and Brussels to the Administering Authorities on the spot, the examination of the report by the administration and the referring of these remarks to London and Brussels and then re-transmission of such remarks from Brussels and London to Lake Success, it is also a considerable amount of time.

I suggested that those remarks should come to us on 30 May. If I am not mistaken, that makes hardly five months, and you must deduct from these five months all necessary delay in transmission both there and back. Therefore it seems to me that it is quite a reasonable time-limit.

Afterwards, the Trusteeship Council could admit that the remarks of the Governments concerned should be received in a lesser time if it was considered that this was too long a delay.

The representative of the Soviet Union told us that this is a violation of the Charter. I do not see what violation there is in any text of the Charter. Of course, the Charter

/has not

has not expressly provided that the report of a Visiting Mission should only be examined by the Council when the Council has received the remarks of the Government concerned, but the Charter did not need to provide for such a thing. It is up to the Council to determine whether it is appropriate and reasonable to formulate conclusions and observations and resolutions on a report without having heard the other side.

I think it is essential, in order that the Council may appropriately elaborate resolutions and conclusions, that the Council should receive the remarks of the Governments concerned, because the Visiting Mission only remains in the field a very short time and a Visiting Mission -- however good may be its intentions, and however serious it may be -- may still make mistakes in judgment and in any case, if criticism has been formulated in a Visiting Mission's report, it is always correct and just to hear the other side's point of view and thus you have every element for appreciating and judging the situation.

/I think

I think that that is the actual intention which we may give to the resolution which the French delegation has presented. It is submitted with concern for justice to be granted to the governments on whose administration and territory a Visiting Mission has made its report.

I think there are no delaying tactics in this respect, and I think the Trusteeship Council should take this into account.

I considered, and I think most of my colleagues should agree with me, that we cannot wait too long for remarks and run the risk of not being able to present the conclusions and observations of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly this year. We might have been obliged to wait until next year otherwise.

I think that if the Trusteeship Council, after it has discussed at length, as has already been done, the report of the Visiting Mission and receives at its next session the observations of the Governments and discusses in a final manner in the light of these observations on the substance of the report and formulates its observations and its conclusions and recommendations, then all these observations, recommendations and conclusions will come to the Assembly in good time, that is, for the September meeting. There would therefore be no delay in the examination of the report concerned.

This is simply a question of courtesy, therefore, in the relations between the Trusteeship Council and the Governments responsible for Trust Territories. That is the spirit in which the French delegation took the liberty of submitting its resolution.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): The representative of the USSR suggested that it was unnecessary and contrary to the terms of the Charter that the Council should be required to wait until it had before it the comments of the Administering Authority.

I should like to invite the attention of the Council to rule 99 of its rules of procedure, which reads:

"Each visiting mission shall submit to the Trusteeship Council a report on its visit, a copy of which shall be promptly" -- and as a general rule, simultaneously -- "transmitted to the Administering Authority" -- and to each other member of the Trusteeship Council.

Then it goes on a little later to say that the report on the decisions or observations of the Council with respect to each such report, as well as the comments made by the Administering Authority concerned, may
/be published

be published in such form and at such date as the Council may determine.

It is quite clear that this Council, in my opinion very rightly, contemplated that it would receive from the Administering Authorities comments on any visiting mission's report, and it seems to me inconceivable that the Council could do otherwise.

The representative of France has suggested that it is only fair when charges are made that some opportunity should be given to the person against whom the charges are made to rebut those charges. That seems to me ordinary justice.

I may also suggest that it is only common courtesy. I wonder what the Trusteeship Council would think if it were treated with such a lack of courtesy by the Administering Authority as it is suggested now should be meted out to the Administering Authority by this Council.

If I may turn to the amendment suggested by the representative of the Philippines, I am not in favour of this amendment, because it seems to me quite wrong that the Council should in any form approve a report when it has not had the comments of the Administering Authority. It is unfair, and in my view it is discourteous, and I shall oppose it for this reason.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Allow me to note the following regarding the statement made by the representative of France. When I referred to the Charter, I had in mind Article 87 of the Charter, which very clearly tells us how we are to act when we consider reports of visiting missions. In sub-paragraph (b) when we speak of petitions, it says quite clearly:

"accept petitions and examine them in consultation with the administering authority;"

As far as visiting missions are concerned, there is a sub-paragraph (c) of Article 87, which says:

"provide for periodic visits to the respective trust territories at times agreed upon with the administering authority;"

In sub-paragraph (c) it quite clearly says that the periods of visits and the times of visits to the territories should be agreed upon in consultation with the Administering Authorities. But no such conditions are set forth in sub-paragraph (b); they are contained in sub-paragraph (c).

It seems to me that if the Charter wanted to make a condition of this sort, it certainly would have done so.

/That is why

That is why I spoke of those difficulties which have arisen in the minds of the delegation of the Soviet Union as a result of the draft resolution of the representative of France. I have stated my difficulties in this connexion; I have asked the Council to comment on these problems. I certainly have not proposed anything; I have not proposed anything at all. I simply drew the attention of the Council to the difficulties which arise in connexion with the proposed draft resolution of the representative of France.

If the draft resolution is studied, it will be seen that it goes counter to the provisions of the Charter and the rules of procedure, because the rules of procedure follow quite strictly the provisions of the Charter.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I have just read Article 87 and the two sub-paragraphs pointed out by the representative of the USSR. It is simply said that the Trusteeship Council shall:

"provide for periodic visits to the respective trust territories at times agreed upon with the administering authority;"

The Charter does not say any more about this because there is nothing more to be said. The Charter did not say either that the Trusteeship Council should ratify a report of a visiting mission, because it is natural, it goes without saying, that the visiting mission is not an independent body. It receives from the Trusteeship Council terms of reference to proceed to an examination of the situation on the trusts, and this report includes remarks, conclusions, and may also include recommendations, but these recommendations, conclusions and observations are intended for the Trusteeship Council.

That is why we have examined the data given to us by the visiting missions, and on the basis of this information the Trusteeship Council should formulate conclusions and observations. It may not even formulate any at all according to the Charter; it might limit itself to taking note of the report and doing nothing more, but it is normal, since the visiting mission brings us back a report, that this report be examined by the Council and be the subject of conclusions and recommendations on the part of the Trusteeship Council. But in order that these conclusions and recommendations be made, it is appropriate that the party concerned be in a position to present its own remarks as well.

/As I stated

As I stated a short while ago, the best visiting mission, in view of the short time it spends in the field, may make errors in its appreciations and judgments. It may do it in complete impartiality or in complete good faith. It is therefore appropriate that when the Council examines the report of the visiting mission, it should first of all do this in the light of the remarks which may be received on the part of the Administering Authority. It is therefore important that we give a decent time limit to the government concerned in order to transmit to the Council its remarks.

/When the Trusteeship

When the Trusteeship Council is seized of the two elements of judgement-- that is, the report of the Mission on the one hand, and on the other hand the remarks of the Administration concerned-- then the Council is in a much better position to make proper recommendations, observations and conclusions.

That is why, although we understand the spirit in which the representative of the Philippines presented his amendment, I could not agree to it for the very reasons I set forth a short while ago.

What would be the use of provisionally approving the observations and conclusions of a report, when we have not yet received the appropriate, and I would even say necessary, remarks of the Administration, which will enable us to have a correct and just idea of the state of affairs? Why should we not await the time when we have all elements of judgment before us; then we can formulate final conclusions.

I am sorry not to be of the opinion of the representative of the Philippines on this point, but I do not see that it would be appropriate to take any step at the present time, such as he has proposed.

We shall arrive at final conclusions in good time. If we take the necessary steps for final decisions in the June session, our report will arrive at the Assembly in good time.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): The representative of the USSR has raised such an empty issue, that I am really at a loss to understand what his reasons or motives are.

The Charter prescribes nothing in the sense in which the representative of the USSR would try to impress on the Council. This is basically a procedural matter, and it is entirely for the Council to decide how the procedure shall be established and handled.

There is only one duty laid upon the Council in this respect, and that is to present to the General Assembly at the proper time its considered conclusions and recommendations arising out of the report of the Mission. There is no other duty before the Council. It is not part of the Council's task to arraign any particular Administering power -- certainly not on the basis of one part of the evidence only.

Therefore it is not only a matter of fairness, courtesy or even justice; it is a matter of plain reason and commonsense. The Assembly expects from the Council proper conclusions and recommendations. How can the Council render those unless it has before it not only the report
/of the Mission

of the Mission, but also the comments of the Administering power concerned, when they are available -- and they should naturally be available as early as possible.

To attempt to handle the matter in any other fashion suggests that there are different motives on the part of some members of the Council; that their motives are, in fact, other than to present the most considered and well-founded report to the Assembly. For that reason I, for my part, cannot accept the proposed amendment of the representative of the Philippines, either.

I agree with the representative of France that it is quite pointless to form tentative conclusions. If we see reason or cause to revise them later on, in the light of the observations of the Administering power, then we shall have wasted our time.

By far the best course is to accept the provision as it is, to enjoin the Administering power to furnish its comments, as suggested here, by the end of May, and to resume the discussion and formulate our conclusions thereafter -- in time, of course, for presentation to the General Assembly.

Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico): I must say at the start that my delegation does not have any particular interest in whether the Council approves the report of the Mission or makes the conclusions that it will deem appropriate at this moment, or whether it makes them later on.

I believe that the observations on this report by the Visiting Mission and the recommendations that the Council might make to the Administering Authority will receive the same acceptance, and will be seen with the same interest by the Administering Authority, whether they are made now or later. Therefore I do not attach particular interest to the practical side.

I would like to make some observations with respect to the principle that is involved in this question. It is very easy to be misled by dealing with this problem in a theoretical way.

If the Administering Authority is being attacked or criticized by the Visiting Mission, the statement that the Administering Authority should be ^{given occasion to} answer before the Council makes a judgment is acceptable. But I do not think that that is the case.

In the first place, I believe that the prestige of the Visiting Mission and the Council, and the faith that the Council has in the Visiting Mission deserves

Mission deserves some consideration. The Visiting Mission has been entrusted with that job by the Council, because the Council considered that they were worthy of making that visit and stating their opinions in respect to the situation in their report.

The Mission is representative of the Council and not of the Government. If we study the conclusions of the Visiting Mission, what I would like to know is to which one of these conclusions, whether in the political, social or educational fields, the Administering Authority objects.

It is possible that in one of those conclusions a statement is made that is not within the knowledge of the special representative that came here, and that was questioned by the Council, or by the representative of the Administering Authority in the Council. If that statement by the Visiting Mission is obscure, and the representative of the Administering Authority is not in a position to answer it, then in respect of that statement it might be necessary that no conclusion of the Council should be made until he is in a position to make some observations that he expects will completely change and correct the statement of the Visiting Mission.

As far as I can see, I do not understand how the comments of the Administering Authority on these particular conclusions of the Visiting Mission could change the situation.

I will refer to some of these conclusions that have probably been more familiar to us as having deserved wider attention in respect to education. If we study, for instance, conclusion No. 6, on page 75 of document T/217:

"The Mission is of the opinion that the Administering Authority should provide higher and university education for the indigenous inhabitants, in Belgium, the Congo or Ruanda-Urundi. It hopes that it will be possible in the relatively near future to implement the plan to develop the higher sections of Astrida into an African University,"

What could be the observations of the Administering Authority in respect of this conclusion? It might say that it is difficult to go so fast, that there are budgetary implications, and that it is doing everything possible in view of the budget of which it disposes.

/If still

Perhaps still, after that observation, the Council will insist in expressing its hope that it will be possible in the future to implement that plan to develop sections of Astrida into an African University.

/That has already been

That has already been stated by the special representative and the representative of the Administrative Authority. All the other conclusions in respect to education fit in that case. I shall not take up the Council's time by reading them one by one but I have read every one of them and I have not seen any of these conclusions that could be modified by the observations of the Administering Authority.

I do not think that the Administering Authority could say that the Visiting Mission was in error in reaching these conclusions or that these conclusions were arrived at by making false assumptions. If that is the case, the representative of the Administering Authority or the special representative could have said that there was an error in that respect.

I have not seen a report that shows more fairness than this one. No criticism has been made that has appeared to be unfounded and the Visiting Mission has expressed the hope that the situation criticized could be modified or improved and that same assertion has been made again and again by the representative of the Administering Authority and by the special representative himself.

For instance, we see in the social field one problem that has deserved the special attention of the members of this Council. Question 5 on page 74 of document T/217 says:

"The Mission deplores the practice of illegal and arbitrary whipping as a measure to compel people to obey orders and recommends that the Administering Authority take strong and effective measures to prevent it."

The representative of the Administering Authority and the special representative have not said that that is a false assertion on the part of the Mission and that such a situation does not exist. How could a comment or an observation of the Administering Authority prevent this Council from still deploring this situation.

The Administering Authority might explain, as the representative of Belgium once did, that that is the only effective means of punishment. We heard once that if this punishment was not applied the natives would sometimes prefer to be in jail and therefore imprisonment is not effective. That is an explanation.

But could that explanation change the Council's feeling that it deplores that situation? Could it prevent the Council's asking the Administering Authority to explore the possibilities of correcting that situation?

If we were to view this situation more objectively we would see that in order for this Council to approve this report we really do not need the observations of the Administering Authority. We have already had such

/observations

observations through representatives here. As I have said, at the moment it is not a question of giving consideration to these reports.

If the Council decides, at the request of the representative of the Administering Authority, not to take any decision at the moment in order that the representative may ascertain facts of which he is unaware at the present time, I do not object to that.

But I do not think that, as a matter of principle, the Council is absolutely obliged to wait for the observations of the Administering Authority before taking any action on the report of its own mission. In respect of rule 91 of the rules of procedure, which was modified, when we discussed this rule at the first session of this Council we accepted the opinion of the Administering Authority on its first report and that was only in respect to the publication of the report. I agreed to that.

If we are going to publish a report of the Visiting Mission that makes some criticism of the situation in a Trust Territory, that report which is going to be circulated should not be circulated alone. The Administering Authority would be given an opportunity to circulate its observations also in order that whoever reads the report could also read the observations of the Administering Authority.

However that situation is entirely different from the question as to whether or not, after having appointed a Visiting Mission and having received a report, the Council could express an opinion on the conclusions of the Visiting Mission which it sent to a Trust Territory until we hear the answers of the Administering Authority on each part of that report. Of course, that is, except in the case where the representative of the Administering Authority in the Trusteeship Council points out to us the statements which, in his opinion, are not correct.

In respect of that particular statement, the Council would wait until the Administering Authority submits its observations. However I have heard no such remarks on the opinions of the Visiting Mission in this case.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): It is impossible for the Administering Authority to say what it objects to until we have the comments of the Administering Authority.

For instance, I have no comments whatever on the report of the Visiting Mission to Tanganyika. I cannot say what there is to object to. When we discussed this earlier in the session, I pointed out one trivial error but there may be others for all know. I cannot possibly say what is wrong until I have heard from the local government as to the facts.

The PRESIDENT: It is now six o'clock and I think that it is impossible for the Council to reach any definite conclusions this afternoon. I therefore /defer this

defer this question until tomorrow.

The Drafting Committee will meet at 11:00 a.m. in conference room 5.

If the Council disposes of this item tomorrow then I propose that the Council abide by the time-schedule and proceed to an examination of the question of administrative unions as listed in the time-schedule; that is, the interim report of the Council's committee on administrative union will form the basis of our discussion.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): I thought that our time-table provided for the discussion of the petitions that had been deferred after the discussion of the report of the Visiting Mission.

The PRESIDENT: That is according to our agenda of today, but since the Council has taken a longer time than anticipated in the discussion of this report the revised time-table has reserved three days for the question of administrative union. But the discussion of petitions will be taken up afterwards.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): If I may venture a suggestion, it seems to me that the logical course would be to take up the petitions before we discuss administrative unions.

/The President

The PRESIDENT: I agree, and if the Council can finish this report tomorrow, then the Council could perhaps utilize the rest of tomorrow's session for the consideration of petitions. As regards the question of administrative unions, I understand that the United Kingdom special expert is here and we want to take advantage of his presence. The timetable states that we will begin discussion of that question on 8 March.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I just want to say that as soon as I saw the timetable I telegraphed, and Sir George Sanford arriving tonight in New York. I hope he will be able to get away within a few days: he is a very busy man and I do not want to keep him here unnecessarily.

The PRESIDENT: We will try to complete the report of the Visiting Mission tomorrow and to devote the rest of tomorrow afternoon's meeting to petitions. We will begin the question of administrative unions the day after tomorrow.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I do not mind, but I mean that he has come here specially in order to be here tomorrow in accordance with the timetable. Is there such an urgency about the petitions that we could not take the question of administrative unions in the order in which it is supposed to come and on the date at which it is supposed to be discussed?

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): I have no objection, naturally, to giving precedence to the special representative of the Administering Authority in this matter of administrative unions, but does it not look kind of queer? Is it fair to the Council that every time a matter of this kind is discussed and a special representative appears here, we should do deference to that and forget altogether our time schedule on petitions?

We have been told time and again in traditional "papa knows best" style that we should respect the Council and our work, and yet what are we doing? We are now told that the special representative has not yet arrived, but must be given precedence here. How do we know that he will arrive tomorrow?

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): He will not arrive tomorrow. He is arriving now in New York.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: I think the question of administrative unions as I said before, will be taken up on 8 March. If we have given our promise to the British representative in order to ensure his arrival to be here on that date, I think that we should abide by that timetable because the question of petitions will still be on our agenda and the Council will have time to come back to it.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I am so surprised at the attitude taken by my Philippine colleague that, if he wishes to have these petitions taken tomorrow, I am perfectly willing to let Sir George Sanford, who has come here specially, waste his time, and, if the Council does not finish with administrative unions by the time he has to go back, he will go back.

I do not want to provoke any feeling of suspicion in the mind of my Philippine colleague and I am prepared to waive everything in his favour.

Mr. CARPIO (Philippines): It is not a question of waiving anything in my favour. It is a question of the work of the Council that I am thinking of. I have been charged here with disrespect because I introduced the amendment to the French resolution this afternoon, and it seems to me that an attitude has been formed in some quarters that we must be told to do this or to do that because "papa knows best".

I disdain the idea. We have our work and it just happens that we have not finished our petitions which should come naturally and logically after the discussion of the Visiting Mission's report.

The PRESIDENT: I said that tomorrow the Council will try to complete the Visiting Mission's report as soon as possible and then we can take up this question of administrative union inasmuch as the representative of the United Kingdom has told us that the special expert is due to arrive now. I yield to that request of the representative of the United Kingdom because I feel that, in determining the timetable, the Council has already stated to the representative of the United Kingdom that these are the days when the Council will discuss this question, in order to ensure the arrival of the special expert. Therefore, if the Council has already given that date, I think it is incumbent on the Council to stand by the timetable. Otherwise, if we do not follow the timetable and the special representative should be late in his arrival, I think the

40
fault lies on the other side. If the expert arrives in time to observe our timetable and we do not allow him to appear as soon as we can, then I think the fault would lie on our side.

It is for that reason that I feel that the Council will lose nothing by standing by the timetable, but I can assure my Philippine colleagues that the question of petitions will be taken up again.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): Could we not finish tonight very rapidly with the question of the closing of the discussion of the report on Ruanda-Urundi?

Since my resolution has given rise to a certain number of criticisms or draft amendments, I wonder whether the President could not rule that we defer the continuation of the discussion on the report of Ruanda-Urundi to the next session under paragraph (g) of rule 56 of our rules of procedure. He could simply rule that and I think that many of these objections would fall since, in fact, I do not think that we can arrive at any final decision in respect of the report before we have had a re-examination. Therefore, I think that rule 56 of the rules of procedure provides in paragraph (g) for the postponing of the discussion of the question to a certain day or indefinitely.

If we could agree on such a ruling, we would not have to return tomorrow to the problem of the continuation of the discussion on the report. That would free the Council for tomorrow, in which case I would be quite prepared to give up my resolution if this ruling of deferment should be taken under rule 56.

The PRESIDENT: I would not prefer to give a ruling, because I always feel that is an arbitrary way of doing things, but if the representative of France wants to move an adjournment of this question, I will put it to the vote immediately.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I would like to say a few words tomorrow about some general statements that have been made.

The PRESIDENT: It is for that reason that I feel it would be best to leave this matter until tomorrow. Otherwise we cannot complete this discussion in half an hour.

The Council is adjourned until 2.30 p.m. tomorrow afternoon.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.