

United Nations

Nations Unies

UNRESTRICTED

TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL

CONSEIL  
DE TUTELLE

T/P.V. 151  
9 March 1949

English /

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Fourth Session

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

Lake Success, New York  
Wednesday, 9 March 1949, at 2.30 p.m.

President: Mr. LIU CHIEH China

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

ADMINISTRATIVE UNIONS AFFECTING TRUST TERRITORIES

QUESTIONS ON THE EAST AFRICA INTER-TERRITORIAL ORGANIZATION (T/263)

REPLIES OF SIR GEORGE SANFORD, SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TANGANYIKA

UNDER BRITISH ADMINISTRATION (Continued)

The PRESIDENT: The Council since yesterday has been discussing the question of administrative unions, and it has before it the interim report presented by the Committee of the Council on Administrative Unions. I believe Sir George Sanford has replied to some of the questions raised in that interim report, and I hope the Council can complete these questions this afternoon relating to the remainder of the paper on administrative unions affecting Tanganyika.

I think some members of the Council feel that it would be helpful if the Chair read out the question before the special representative is asked to reply, in order to give a clearer picture of the questions and answers. That may be a little slower procedure than was adopted yesterday, but if there is no objection I will do so.

I think this afternoon we may begin with the questions relating to Part IV: Effect of the East Africa Inter-Territorial Organization on the exercise of functions of supervision by the United Nations. That is on page 9 of document T/263.

Question 21 is as follows: "Does the High Commission and the organs thereunder function in accordance with principles and objectives contained in Chapter XII of the Charter and in the Trusteeship Agreement in so far as matters relating to the Trust Territory are concerned?"

Sir George SANFORD (Special representative for Tanganyika under British Administration): Yes.

The PRESIDENT: "Does the constitutional position of the Governor of Tanganyika in the High Commission differ, in view of the provisions of the Charter and of the Trusteeship Agreement, from that of the Governors of Uganda and Kenya?"

Sir George SANFORD (Special representative): No.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: In other words, all the three Governors have the same legal status?

Sir George SANFORD (Special representative): That is so, with the exception, of course, that one carries the duties of Chairman.

The PRESIDENT: "Part V. Effect of the East Africa Inter-Territorial Organization on the political and administrative organization of Tanganyika"

Question 22: "Is there any provision or method whereby the territorial legislature can inform the East Africa Central Legislative Assembly of its views on a bill?"

Sir George SANFORD (Special representative): The bills are published in the High Commission Gazette before they are introduced in the Central Assembly. Members of the Tanganyika Legislative Council may advise the Tanganyika members of the Central Assembly of their views before the bill is introduced in the Assembly. They may also, of course, consult members of the community in Tanganyika other than members of the Tanganyika Legislative Council.

The PRESIDENT: Question 23: "What benefits do the native inhabitants of Tanganyika derive from the East Africa Inter-Territorial Organization?"

Sir George SANFORD (Special representative): It is quite impossible to assess sectional benefits. The objective of this Inter-Territorial Organization is, in short, the provision of better and better administered services. The result should be general benefits.

The PRESIDENT: I believe that reply would cover the second part of the question, which is "What benefits do the Europeans in Tanganyika, Kenya and Uganda get from such an organization?"

Sir George SANFORD (Special representative): It would also apply to the first part. If you take, for instance, one of the services being administered by the High Commission, that is agricultural and forestry research, a great deal of information requires to be known about agriculture in tropical Africa. The work being done affecting the use of  
/soil,

soil, the effect of climate upon soil, the use of fertilizers, and so on, is directed towards the general benefit of all agriculturalists in East Africa, the vast majority of whom are, of course, Africans.

/Mr. NORIEGA



Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): The question I am going to ask, which refers to this point, is also related quite directly to question 21. According to the reply given by the special representative, there are no special benefits for the inhabitants of Tanganyika in this new kind of organization.

I should therefore like to know what, in the view of the special representative, is the difference between the administration of the Territories of Kenya and Uganda and the administration of the Territory of Tanganyika.

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): Might I have the question put again? Did I correctly understand it to be, what is the difference between the administration in Kenya and the administration in Tanganyika?

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): The question is as follows. The special representative has said that there is no difference as relates to the benefits that the inhabitants derive from their administration; there is no difference as between the three Territories. But I want to know what his view of the difference is as between the administrations of Kenya and Uganda and the administration of the Territory of Tanganyika.

To be as specific as possible, I want to know whether the Administering Authority does not feel itself obligated to give greater services, better facilities for purposes of political, social and economic advancement of the inhabitants in the Trust Territory than in the Territories that are not Trust Territories.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): The answer to that is no. As I pointed out several times before, we have been treating the people in the colonies in exactly the same way as is laid down in the Charter for the people of the Trust Territory. We have done this over a very long period, and we certainly would not wish to give them anything less than the people are getting in the Trust Territory.

The whole point is that we are trying to bring the Trust Territories up to the level of the colonies.

Mr. LIN (China): With reference to question 21, the Chinese delegation is confident that the High Commission and its organs will function in accordance with the principles and objectives of Chapter XII

/of the Charter

of the Charter of the United Nations, and with those contained in the trusteeship agreement.

I should like to ask a question in this connexion. In the East African Order-in-Council which established the interterritorial organization, there is a very lengthy preamble. There are three "Whereas" clauses which refer to certain agreements. I should like to read the operative clause in this connexion. It is as follows:

"Now therefore, His Majesty, by virtue and in exercise of the powers in this behalf by the British Settlement Act 1887 and 1945 referring to the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1890, or otherwise<sup>in His</sup> Majesty vested, is pleased by and with the advice of his Privy Council-In-Order, and is hereby ordered as follows...."

This is a very technical point. I should like to ask whether it would not be appropriate to mention specifically the trusteeship agreement in this connexion. Does Tanganyika come under the British Settlement Act, 1887 and 1945 according to this Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1890? The trusteeship agreement is not mentioned in other parts of the preamble either.

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): I find it difficult to answer that question. As in answer to a question yesterday as to whether the trusteeship agreement was held to be a treaty, I gave a reply that the trusteeship agreement is possibly not strictly a treaty within the usual meaning of the word, but that the Administering Authority regards the duty imposed on the High Commission not to assent to certain bills as extending to any bill affecting Tanganyika which may appear to be inconsistent with the trusteeship agreement for Tanganyika.

All operations of the Administering Authority in relation to Tanganyika would be conditioned by the terms of the trusteeship agreement.

Mr. LIU (China): I said a moment ago that the Chinese delegation is confident that the High Commission and the other organs will observe the principles and objectives of the Charter and the provisions of the trusteeship agreement insofar as matters relating to the Trust Territory are concerned.

The question I put is rather a technical question. We have been told that Tanganyika has been placed under the interterritorial organization, partly by virtue of, I think, article 5, of the trusteeship agreement, which authorizes certain administrative unions. It would appear therefore, at least from a superficial point of view, that the preamble of the East Africa Order-in-Council which established the interterritorial organization,

/might have

might have mentioned the trusteeship agreement in this connexion.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I am quite prepared to agree to the suggestion made by the representative of China. I think it is a highly technical matter on which I would like more legal advice, but I think, from a superficial look at it, that the Chinese representative is right.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): The special representative found difficulty in assessing the benefits to the native inhabitants of Tanganyika derived from the East Africa interterritorial organization.

I should like to ask whether the special representative can inform this Council what are the disadvantages in opposition to the benefits which the native inhabitants of Tanganyika may suffer in view of the interterritorial organization.

/Sir George SANFORD

(Special Representative):

Sir George SANFORD: / In my reply to question no. 23 I referred to the <sup>im</sup>possibility of assessing sectional benefits.

In regard to disadvantages, I know of none. The aim and object of this inter-territorial organization is to secure better services and better administrative services in relation to services which should be administered on an East African basis in order to give the most effective results. I cannot conceive that any disadvantage could possibly result from that process.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): In the Report of the Visiting Mission to East Africa, I find at the top of page 187 a remark from a member of the Legislative Council of Tanganyika, wherein he stated that in past associations with Kenya, Kenya had benefitted at the expense of Tanganyika, and he quoted as examples the <sup>common</sup> Cereal Pool, the East African Airways Corporation and the Posts and Telegraphs Services.

I should like to be favoured with the observations of the special representative on this matter.

(Special Representative):

Sir George SANFORD: / The Cereal Pool, operated from East Africa, emerged from the conditions arising out of the war when it was imperative that East Africa should do anything it could to ensure its own essential food supplies.

Early in 1943 there was in fact a breakdown in native production of food in relation to demand, which arose out of bad climatic conditions, and it became necessary, in spite of the height of the war, for food to be imported from Australia and elsewhere in order to feed the population in East Africa.

Following the experience of those famine conditions it was decided that the measures necessary to ensure the proper distribution of essential foodstuffs, that is to say, cereals, maize and so on in East Africa, should be taken, and the Cereal Pool came into being. That pool still operates.

Generally speaking you may take it that over the years - there has been one exception which I will mention later - East Africa has been able to feed itself in essential foodstuffs by reason of the fact that Uganda has produced maize which has been delivered to the Cereal Pool.

Kenya has been able, on balance, to feed itself and do something more.

Tanganyika has, with the exception of one year, drawn food from the  
/ Cereals Pool

Cereal Pool and has been by far the greatest beneficiary under the Cereal Pool arrangements. The exception was the most recent year, 1947/1948, when owing to good climatic conditions, and owing to the determined efforts of the government and people of Tanganyika, it was possible for Tanganyika not only to feed itself, but to contribute food to the Cereal Pool. That is the first year since the Cereals Pool started that Tanganyika has not been a net drawer from the Pool.

With regard to the Airways Corporation, that corporation is an operating corporation which operates scheduled services within East Africa.

Its capital is found by the East African governments in proportions which have been agreed between them, and the deficit on its operations from year to year is also found by the East African governments in accordance with an agreed arrangement depending upon the country in which the loss occurs.

I have no hesitation in saying that the finances of the corporation, which as I say has been the subject of agreement between the Territories, operate equitably as between one Territory and another. There is no valid suggestion that any one of these countries derives a disproportionate benefit.

With regard to the Posts and Telegraphs services, it must be admitted that those services leave a great deal to be desired; they have suffered from a lack of opportunity for improvement during the war, and a big programme of development is in prospect. But there again, beyond the normal differences which happen as a result of a young country making more use of postal services than another, there is no benefit to one of these Territories as against the other, and now that the Posts and Telegraphs services have become self-contained they will be dealt with as an East African service, and I hope that with the developments in prospect, which it is hoped will reach a capital expenditure of some four million pounds, the services will become efficient and get nearer to the people than they are at the present moment.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): In connexion with a reply to question 2, I would like to refer to the reply of the special representative to question 23. It is stated by the special representative that the High Commission decides, by mutual consent where there are occasions in which a governor of a Territory dissents from the majority of the  
/members of the



members of the commission on the grounds that the interests of the Territory he represents are being seriously interfered with by the decision of the High Commission, it would be open to the dissenting governor to approach the Secretary of State and the Secretary of State would decide the problem on the basis of the interests of East Africa as a whole.

Would it be correct, if we say then that a Territory may be compelled to make sacrifices if, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, a decision reached by the High Commission would serve the interests of East Africa as a whole although it might be disadvantageous to one particular Territory, for example, the Trust Territory of Tanganyika?

(Special Representative):

Sir George SANFORD: / The subject in question is an East African subject. We are dealing wholly with services and matters of common interest to East Africa. If, in any one case, the affairs of one Territory were intimately concerned, I venture to doubt whether that would be a completely common subject; in which case the governments of the Territories concerned would be dealing with the thing on a more local basis.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I should like to add to the remark made by the special representative that the Secretary of State would most certainly be bound by the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement.

Mr. CANAS (Costa Rica) (Interpretation from Spanish): The question I am going to put does not in reality have a direct relation to questions numbers 23 and 24 of document 263 since it is of a general nature and might as well have been put at any other time of the debate.

But since the representative of the Philippines has raised the question of whether some definite advantages might not be incurred by the inhabitants of Tanganyika by virtue of the inter-territorial union, I would like to ask the special representative the following question of a general nature.

/ Article 76 of the Charter.

Article 76 of the Charter establishes as the basic objective of the international trusteeship system "...the progressive development towards self-government or independence" of these "peoples", not the Trust Territories.

Now the word "independence" is not included in Article 73 of the Charter which refers to non-self-governing territories, from which it seems to my delegation that we can infer a basic difference to exist between the trusteeship system and the colonial system. Supposing that in the course of events and in accordance with Article 76 of the Charter the moment should arise when the population of Tanganyika were ready for independence. Taking account of the fact that Article 76 speaks of independence where Article 73 does not, would not the Special Representative say that the inter-territorial union of a territory that under Article 76 of the Charter can become independent with a territory that would not be capable of such independence <sup>would</sup> be a disadvantage for the Trust Territory?

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): No, the circumstances in which one of these three territories acquired independence would obviously require a review of the arrangements entered into with neighbouring countries and nothing more than that.

Mr. CANAS (Costa Rica) (Interpretation from Spanish): From the reply given by the Special Representative I would infer that in the case that one of the territories should achieve independence the present organization would be revised. That is what was said.

Now it would seem to me, then, that the territories are not so interdependent as has been said; they do not require each other's help as much as has been stated if one of the territories can by its own means come into independence. That is to say, inter-territorial union would not seem to be so necessary as has been said if one of them can achieve independence where the others cannot.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): It seems to me to be quite possible that if Tanganyika did achieve independence it would want to continue this arrangement but it would be free to continue it or to drop it as it wished if it was independent.



Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I would like to ask the Special Representative a question. In order to better understand the substance of my question I would refer to page 63 of document T/218. If he does not have this document on hand I will read the appropriate part of the Visiting Mission report which says:

"The Inter-Territorial Organization, it seems to the Mission, would be a purely administrative union, if it possessed only powers of administration over certain common services. As constituted at present, the Organization possesses certain powers of legislation as well as powers of administration, such powers being of course subject to the provisions of the East Africa (High Commission) Order in Council, 1947. For instance, the High Commission may, with the advice and consent of the Central Assembly, make laws with respect to such services as defence, civil aviation, posts and telegraphs, railways and ports, administrative and general provisions (not tariff rates and rates of taxation) of the customs and excise duties and the income tax, Makerere College, inter-territorial research, meteorological services, and so forth. Furthermore, the High Commission may make laws for the peace, order and good government of Tanganyiks, Kenya and Uganda, with the advice and consent of the Legislative Councils of these Territories.

"The Inter-Territorial Organization, it seems to the Mission, is short of a complete political union. It would indeed be a political union, if it possessed full powers of legislation and administration over any or all common services."

And further on page 64 there is a quotation from Colcaba Paper No. 219, Section 45 of Part VI of the East Africa (High Commission) Order in Council, 1947 as follows:

"In the third place, the list of the schedules services shall not be augmented without the 'clearest expression in each instance in each of the three Legislative Councils';"

In this way on the basis of everything that has been said here it seems to me the conclusion can be reached that this High Commission can expand its rights and powers but one of the conditions for doing so is the necessity of having a clear expression in each instance of each of the three legislative bodies.

/In other words,

In other words, it is, I gather, to be understood that without the agreement of the Legislative Council of each of the three territories this cannot take place and I therefore ask the Special Representative to answer that question first. Would that be the correct interpretation -- which I have just given -- of the statement in the Visiting Mission's report? I would like an answer to that in order that I might ask the second part of my question.

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): That is a correct statement of the position. No new services to be administered by the High Commission and no new subjects upon which the Assembly is empowered to legislate can be added to the existing schedules without a resolution being passed in each of the territorial Legislative Councils and without the consent of the Secretary of State.

Furthermore, if there is substantial opposition in any of the territorial Legislative Councils to the addition of that service or that subject the matter will not be pursued without further consideration and further reference to the Secretary of State.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): In this connection the second part of my question is the following. As is known, the Legislative Council of the Trust Territory of Tanganyika is a purely consultative body at the disposal of the Governor of Tanganyika and I think the composition of that body is evidence of this because it consists of the Governor, 15 official European members/ <sup>and</sup> 14 non-official members. Of these 14 non-official members there are 7 Europeans, 4 Africans and 3 Indians.

/Furthermore

Furthermore, this Council is not a body which has been elected by the indigenous population on democratic principles, since all members of this Council have been appointed, and if I understand the situation correctly the four members of the Council who are Africans are also appointed to this Council.

Furthermore, among all the <sup>thirty</sup> members of the Council, including the Governor, there are only four who represent the indigenous population.

It would seem that if we base ourselves on the reply which was given by the special representative here, the conclusion can be reached that the expansion of the powers and rights of the High Commission is independent of whether the indigenous population approves it or not. Even if the opinion of the Legislative Council is requested -- and this is a consultative body -- the indigenous population is represented by only four individuals, and they are not elected in a democratic way but are appointed.

Therefore, regardless of the <sup>true</sup> expression of the indigenous population of the Territory, the High Commission is so organized that it could at any time expand its rights and powers regardless of what the indigenous population thinks of this, since the indigenous population of Tanganyika do not have any possibility even in this consultative, legislative Council, to express or show in any other way their opposition, which would envisage the expansion of the rights of the High Commission and of the entire inter-territorial organization.

I would ask the special representative to clarify this particular situation and say whether my conclusions thereon were correct in the light of the report of the Visiting Mission and in the light of facts and situations which seem to me indisputable. Perhaps the special representative might have additional information which is not available to me and which might make it possible to reach conclusions other than those which I have arrived at after studying the documentation which was available to me

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): I have no further information than what is contained in the documents. I would merely repeat what I said yesterday, that the term  
 /"substantial

"substantial opposition" is not necessarily a count of the number of votes; it would be substantial opposition if the opposition was based on substantial arguments and those arguments would be taken into account in any decision reached.

I repeat that Section 45 of the Order-in-Council referring, as it does, to the procedure which should follow if, on any motion in a Territorial Legislative Council to add to these services or subjects, the resolution receives opposition of substance, the matter would be reconsidered.

I said further that the High Commission, as such, has no power whatever over a decision reached by a territorial Legislative Council -- none. And the High Commission is not interested in the addition of services and subjects until they have by this process -- to which the High Commission is not a party -- been added to those matters which come within the purview of the High Commission.

If the terms of Section 35 of the Order-in-Council are examined, it will be seen that all action under that Section is taken by someone other than the High Commission, namely, the three Territorial Legislative Councils and the Secretary of State, before the High Commission comes into the matter by making an order to be published in the Gazette adding to the list of services and subjects <sup>after they have been</sup> decided as a matter of the Territorial Legislative Councils and the Secretary of State to be fit subjects for coming within the purview of the High Commission.

It is only then that the High Commission has any part in this matter.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)  
(Interpretation from Russian): Perhaps my question was not quite clear. I am interested in the position of the indigenous population of the Trust Territory of Tanganyika in the decision of questions regarding the inter-territorial organization.

On the basis of the information which is available to the members of the Council, it seems to me the conclusion can be reached that the interests of the indigenous population cannot  
/be expressed

be expressed because there are no organs or bodies in Tanganyika which are elected by the indigenous population of the Territory on democratic foundations where the indigenous population would be represented, be they legislative, be they executive; but there are no such bodies where they could express their views and present these views to the Administering Authority on such questions as inter-territorial organization.

There are in all four representatives of the indigenous population, and these are the only four who are in the Legislative Council which consists of thirty members. Further, this is a body which is not elected on democratic principles and on this basis it cannot really reflect the true situation and true position obtaining in the Territory of Tanganyika.

Furthermore, even being a consultative organization of that sort, any sort of a majority of the indigenous population, even the appointed representatives, would want to have some decision or some proposal power in view of their absolute minority position in the composition of this Council, but this could not make their position substantial because they do not have a sufficient number of members in the Legislative Council on their side.

That is the thing I was interested in. Is there any other body through which the indigenous population of the Trust Territory of Tanganyika could express its opinions and views on the inter-territorial organization? Is there any organization set up on democratic principles, or is there no such organization? Inasmuch as I understood the reply of the special representative, no such body exists. Perhaps the special representative would expand his reply, or would he definitely state that no such organization does exist? I would like this part of the question clarified further.

/The PRESIDENT



The PRESIDENT: The special representative may be prepared to reply to that question, and at the same time I would like to invite the attention of the Council to this section concerning consultation of the indigenous population. After this question<sup>is</sup> answered, maybe the picture<sup>will</sup> be clearer, and then perhaps the special representative will add such information as is relevant to the questions raised by the representative of the USSR.

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): The question asked seems to me to refer to the constitution of Tanganyika primarily and not, as it were, to the constitution, the functions, the duties or the responsibilities of the High Commission.

I notice that in an early chapter of the report of the Mission to Tanganyika the question of African membership in the Legislative Council is mentioned on pages 11 and 12, and perhaps I might read what the Mission says on this matter:

"The Acting Governor stated that greater African representation was one of the goals for the immediate future and that more Africans would be added as soon as competent people became available. He added that the administration had at one time planned to have one African representative from each of the four provinces (Lake, Northern, Southern and Eastern) which would have been gradually increased to one African representative in the Legislative Council from each of the eight provinces. However, it had been difficult to obtain properly qualified people, and, moreover, qualified Africans who would be cognizant of African opinion and feeling as a whole, rather than representative only of the local interests of their own tribe. The administration hoped that it would be possible to increase the African representation with the next four or five years and later there might be one African from each province which, in turn, might lead to a majority of non-official members in the Legislative Council.

"The Mission was informed in London, by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, that the aim of the Administering Authority was to progressively increase the political responsibility of the Africans and to afford them greater participation in the central organs of government, including the Legislative Council, but that such progress must be parallel with their educational advancement."

/With regard to

With regard to consultation with the African inhabitants of Tanganyika, we have of course as contemplated in Section 45 of the Order-in-Council Africans sitting on the Territorial Legislative Council in Tanganyika, the number of Africans who are sitting there being, as stated in the Mission's report, a matter which the Tanganyika Government hopes to be able to increase from time to time.

In answer to the other question, there is no formal body other than the Legislative Council where opinion in Tanganyika can be gauged as a whole, but in the ordinary course of administration the Government staff has means of putting problems to African inhabitants in their own areas, discussing matters with them and seeking their views on these matters.

But the direct answer to the question is that beyond the Legislative Council there is no formally constituted body which might be regarded as speaking for Tanganyika as a whole.

The PRESIDENT: I believe the replies given by the special representative have partly covered this section of questions, but I propose to go through these questions just the same because the Committee on Administrative Unions has already asked these questions, and I think it would help them if the questions are taken in the order they come, in order to give a really clear picture.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): The representative of the United Kingdom stated a little while ago that the policy of the administration is to raise the territories to the level of the colonies.

I would like to know whether in Kenya and Uganda there are organisms or bodies in which representation is popular and democratic. Are there persons elected by the population and not merely appointed by the Governor that hold political office?

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): The reply is that in Uganda the unofficial members of the Legislative Council are nominated by the Governor. In Kenya European and Indian members are elected by ballot; the African members are nominated by the Governor.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I should like to add to that,  
/if I may,



if I may, that in very many colonies all the unofficial members are elected by the people.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): This explanation leads us to hope that in the near future the indigenous members of the General Legislative Assembly will come to be elected and likewise the members of the local legislatures elected, rather than merely nominated by the Governor, so as to equalize the status of the Trust Territory with that of the colonial territories.

The PRESIDENT: I propose to continue these questions as listed in document T/263. I would also like to suggest that representatives will follow these questions and then ask supplementary questions on the questions as they are asked, and will try not to anticipate them. Otherwise we would be repeating the statements and questions.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I believe that perhaps the translation of my last question was put as a direct statement rather than with a question mark. It was meant as a question.

I find that this question is relevant, inasmuch as it bears upon Part V of the questions, namely political and administrative effects of the new form of organization.

I was asking whether, in view of the equalizing policy, so to call it, of the Administration, can we not expect that the legislative bodies of the Trust Territory will be elected -- will be constituted by election?

The PRESIDENT: <sup>of the representative of Mexico</sup> The last statement/was interpreted as a statement instead of a question,

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): My remark made a little earlier was due to the fact that members of this Council seem always to suggest that there is something inferior in the treatment of British colonies to what is envisaged for Trust Territories. I have always denied that, and I will again deny it.

It is the policy in all the colonies gradually to increase the representation of the people by election on the different legislatures. I have seen that myself happen in colony after colony. In the first  
/instance

instance, they are nominated; later some are elected and some nominated, and later they are all elected. That is the policy that has been followed in many colonies in which I have served, and it is the general policy followed.

I have not the slightest doubt that that is the policy that will be followed in East Africa in the same way.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: Question 24 -- the questions under that section refer to consultation of the indigenous population.

The first question is:

"Will the indigenous inhabitants of Tanganyika be given an opportunity to express their opinion regarding the continuation of the East Africa Central Legislative Assembly, its composition, powers and functions?"

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): It is the intention to give opportunity to the indigenous inhabitants to express their opinion on these matters, insofar as it is practicable to do so. If I might also in this sentence refer to sub-question (2), namely, "How will the indigenous inhabitants express their opinion?", I should like to go on with the consultation, which will, insofar as it is practicable to do so, also be by the means considered most suitable.

I should say that that means that the proposals, when made, will be explained to the people, and their reaction will be tested, but not necessarily in a representative body covering the whole of the Territory. It is customary for consultation to take place at meetings between the Government spokesman and the people in their own areas.

The PRESIDENT: This question is, I think, countered by the understanding of the committee that this organization would be only a temporary one, for a period of four years. In other words, the indigenous population will be consulted at the end of four years as to whether they wish this inter-territorial organization to be continued or otherwise.

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): Not quite that. The intention is that the operation of this inter-territorial organization insofar as the Central Assembly, its powers, functions and constitutions are concerned, should be re-examined before the end of 1951, and that proposals should follow that re-examination.

It would be those proposals, which I cannot anticipate at this moment, which would be a subject for consultation with the population.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: As the special representative has already referred to sub-question (2), I will come to sub-question (3), under question 24.

"May it be assumed that if there is substantial opposition on the part of the indigenous inhabitants, that the whole scheme, i.e. including Parts II, V and VI of the Order in Council 1947, may be reorganized or abolished?"

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): If substantial and responsible opposition is encountered in regard to proposals for the future composition of the Assembly, the views so expressed and arguments put forward will be taken seriously into account. Depending on the outcome of the proposals to be worked out and considered before the end of 1951, some of the provisions of Parts II, V and VI of the Order in Council may have to be reviewed.

I should like, however, to make this point clear: that the problem for consideration will still be the same problem that was encountered in 1947; i.e., how best can the common services be administered, and how best can we provide a forum of public discussion of common subjects. That problem will still be the problem to be solved in 1951.

Mr. IECLES (Philippines): I find it difficult to reconcile the statement of the special representative that, if there is substantial opposition on the part of the indigenous inhabitants to the prolongation of the scheme of inter-territorial organization, that opposition will be taken into account.

On the admission of the Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1947, at the time the inter-territorial organization was being considered, there was strong opposition among the African inhabitants of Tanganyika. I am wondering just how far this opposition was taken into account.

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): I regret I have not got the reference made by the representative of the Philippines. Could he give me the reference to that part of the report from which he was quoting?

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Philippines must be referring to page 57 of the Visiting Mission's report. Is that right?

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): In the first place I got it from the opening statement in question 24. The other aspects of the matter are treated in the Visiting Mission's report, referring to the opposition not on the part of certain members of the Legislative Council for Tanganyika, but also as expressed by the views of the Africans themselves.

The PRESIDENT: The opening statement of question 24 is:

"It has been admitted by the Secretary of State for Colonies that there has been strong opposition among the African inhabitants of Tanganyika against any form of closer union, especially with Kenya, which might lead to political union."

Is that what the representative of the Philippines is referring to?

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): At the bottom of page 57 of the Visiting Mission's report, it is stated:

"The Secretary of State reaffirmed the statement in the 1947 Annual Report on Tanganyika 'that substantial opposition on the part of the unofficial members of any of the three Legislative Councils to a motion for the extension of the list of scheduled services will be a bar to proceeding further in the matter until it has received further consideration and there has been further opportunity for debate'."

Sir George SANFORD: (Special Representative): I have nothing to add. The Mission's report refers to the attitude taken by the Secretary of State, which still holds.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): I am referring to the original opposition.

The PRESIDENT: I think the representative of the Philippines meant that originally there was opposition to such a union, and he was interested in knowing how far that opposition was taken into consideration /in the formula:

in the formulation of the subsequent plans.

Air George SANFORD (Special Representative): May I read what the Secretary of State said in the House of Commons on 29 July 1947, in his announcement authorizing these proposals and conveying the decision of His Majesty's Government that the High Commission should be set up.

"The revised proposals have not pleased everybody, but I am satisfied that they are fair, that they will not prejudice the interests of any community, and that under them no single community could possibly secure a predominant influence over the affairs of the Assembly. They are, moreover, introduced for an experimental period of four years only, in the first instance."

The Secretary of State went on to say that he had been impressed by the fact that few of those who had criticized the proposed composition of the Assembly had denied the necessity for a scheme on the general lines suggested to give constitutional backing to the operation of the inter-territorial services in East Africa and to associate representatives of the public in their control.

The urgency of this need has been amply shown by experience in East Africa since the war ended, and the Secretary of State was convinced that if the general, and in particular the economic, development of the East African Territories was not to be hampered, the scheme proposed should be brought into force without further delay.

He regarded the Assembly as the essential feature of the whole scheme, since without it there could be no adequate popular control.

/Finally he said



Finally he said:

"I am satisfied that the scheme is in the best interests of the East African Territories and that, with the additional safeguard in Colonial Paper 210, the interests of the three Territories and of all races in them will be full secured."

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I would be grateful if the special representative would explain, in greater detail, the manner in which the indigenous population would be able to express its views on the question of the Interterritorial Organization.

What practice is envisaged for the indigenous population to express its views? Who is going to poll the opinion of the population? Will special officials be sent for this purpose or will there be specially selected individuals from the indigenous population in the Trust Territory? Will a questionnaire be distributed to the population? Would it be only by means of a meeting such as that to which the special representative referred?

I am asking these questions in order to get a clear picture of the method which will be employed to gauge the opinions and the views of the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territory of Tanganyika on this matter.

Further, does there exist any sort of legislative provision for this purpose. Or, perhaps there is some projected plan if there is no legislation. Perhaps the Administering Authority has a plan that, if substantial opposition -- as stated on page 57 of the Visiting Mission's report -- continues, the Administering Authority would not go against the interests of the indigenous population and will accept this expressed desire of the indigenous population and will do as the majority of the indigenous population in the Trust Territory desire.

I would like to see clearly whether there is any legislative measure in effect which provides for a real concensus of opinion among the indigenous population in the Trust Territory of Tanganyika regarding the Interterritorial Organization; that is, an expression of views which would be expressed in a democratic way.

Or, if there<sup>is</sup>/no legislative provision, is there in existence a line of policy which the administration has adopted to the effect that if this opposition of the indigenous population should continue in the future, the Administering Authority will not go against this opposition and will therefore not go against the interests of the indigenous population of the Trust Territory.

I ask for an explanation or clarification from the special representative.

/Sir George SAIFORD



Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): In regard to consultations with the African peoples in Tanganyika, there is a later question asking information on this point in reply to which I was about to give information obtained from the Tanganyika Government in relation to the consultation which actually took place before these proposals were brought into effect.

However, it may be convenient for the members of the Council if I give that information now so as to indicate to the members the kind of consultation which took place on that occasion and the kind of consultation which might be expected to take place in the next two or three years when further proposals, which have not yet been thought up, come to be considered among the East African populations.

However, I shall first reply that there is no separate legislative provision for a complication of this kind. This is done in the ordinary course of administrative practice in these Territories.

I am now dealing with information given by the Government of Tanganyika on the steps taken in Tanganyika to ascertain the views in various parts of the Territory on the proposals which were contained in Colonial Paper No. 210.

As the members of the Council are aware, there was a Swahili text of this paper published and distributed early in April 1947, and provincial commissioners were instructed to discuss the matters with the intelligentsia in the African areas. Their efforts, said the Tanganyika Government, were of necessity largely confined to that class -- that is, to the intelligentsia -- because the vast majority of the African population would not be interested in or be capable of understanding the proposals.

Examples of the reactions discovered by the various provincial commissioners are as follows. The first four instances come from the Tanga Province which, as members know, is on the northeast of the Territory.

The Tanga Native Authorities stated that they were not capable of knowing whether any good or any evil can come out of any agreement for closer co-operation between Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika Territories.

If the Government was of the opinion that such closer co-operation would be of benefit, the Tanga Native Authorities were prepared to accept that opinion and to acquiesce in the agreement.

The Tanganyika Government goes on to say that, as an epitome of the reaction of the masses of the African population to the proposals, if it were physically possible to consult them at all, this expression of opinion could not be better worded. One or two of the better educated Africans

/in Tanga

in Tanga said that they were in agreement with Colonial Paper 210 provided that there was no question of political union with Kenya.

The Pangani District Native Authorities -- that is still in the Tanga Province -- were, as a whole, favourably disposed towards the reorganization. Some Africans in that district expressed the fear that the new organization might affect existing African rights over land in Tanganyika by allowing excessive alienation.

The Native Authorities of the Korogwe District, who do not appear to have taken the trouble to read the Swahili translation of Colonial Paper 210 which was supplied to them, said that if, in the opinion of the Government, Colonial Paper 210 was to the benefit of better administration, they would trust the word of the Government.

In the Pare District there was no reaction except from an infinitesimal minority of the more sophisticated who saw in Colonial Paper 210 the thin end of the wedge to a unified East Africa and were therefore opposed to it.

In the Eastern Province -- that is the Province in which Dar-es-Salaam is situated -- there was no reaction to Colonial Paper 210 following the distribution of the Swahili translation. Little real interest was shown in the Paper by the African intelligentsia and the bulk of the population was quite indifferent to it. There was no expressed opposition.

In the North Mara, Musoma, Ngara, Biharamulo Districts of the Lake Province, there was no reaction at all from any of the indigenous people. A few of the more educated Africans from various parts of the Province expressed their fear of domination by European settlers in Kenya and a suspicion that proposals for East African union for specific purposes -- either economic or scientific, whatever the present intentions of the Government -- would, in fact, lead to administrative union or federation.

/Turning now

Turning now to the Northern Province, in Moshi those who understood the paper expressed approval of it. In Arusha the views expressed were: a) that the paper was a preliminary step towards the political fusion of Tanganyika and Kenya, and b) that it was far less favourable to African interests than paper 191.

In the Southern Highlands Province, the number of Africans who could understand paper 210 was very small, but the views expressed were fear of any kind of political union with Kenya as the Africans consulted were convinced that such union would impair the racial impartiality which they enjoyed in Tanganyika. They were slightly sceptical about the assurance against political union on the ground that the policy of the British Government can change after an election.

From the remaining Provinces of the Territory no reaction at all was reported.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I am not clear when this questioning of the intelligentsia took place.

Sir George SANFORD (Special representative): In June 1947, before the Secretary of State had reached his decision which he reached at the end of July.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): On the other hand, in the report of the Visiting Mission, document T/218, page 58, the following is stated regarding consultations which were held with non-official members: (I shall read this part in English)

"As indicated in Annex 2, the two African members of the Tanganyika Legislative Council abstained from voting on Colonial Paper No. 210. At a meeting between the members of the Visiting Mission and representatives of the Chagga Council at Moshi, on 10 September 1948, Chief Abdiel Shangali was questioned concerning his abstention in the Council. He replied that the two African members present during the extraordinary meeting of 15 and 16 April 1947 had not been given sufficient time to consult representative African opinion on the matter as the Kiswahili

of Colonial Paper No. 210 had been given to them only two days before it had been voted upon. Therefore they could not express any definite opinion and had abstained from voting. Now that there had been time to study the proposals it was still not an easy task to formulate a definite opinion as it was not known what economic benefits Tanganyika would gain since the scheme had not been working a sufficient time. African opinion, generally however, was against Inter-Territorial Organization as there was a strong fear that it would lead to the political amalgamation of the three Territories."

On the basis of the information given to us by the special representative, I think the conclusion could be reached that the questioning which took place in July 1947 was carried out after this report was compiled, and after the report had been considered by the Legislative Council. When it came up before the Legislative Council, I think the situation was that which is stated in the Visiting Mission's report. Is that correct?

Sir George SANFORD (Special representative): Is what correct? I have not quite understood what I am asked to comment on.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): Is it not a question of when this questioning took place? When did this questioning take place in relation to the discussion in <sup>the</sup> Legislative Council?

Sir George SANFORD (Special representative): The answer to that is that the Provincial Commissioners met in June 1947 and were then instructed to get in touch with the intelligentsia in the various Provinces, whereas the resolution in the Tanganyika Legislative Council was taken in April 1947. The Secretary of State's decision, however, was not reached until the end of July.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): Could the special representative tell us what the attitude of public opinion is at the present time -- especially of African public opinion, insofar as African public opinion exists in the Tanganyika Territory -- now that the system has been functioning for a certain time.

/Sir George SANFORD

Sir George SANFORD (Special representative): I have had no evidence whatever that the public at large has any interest in the Organization, other than in the services it renders. As a political issue I have heard no comment at all from any East African territory since it came into effect.

As I said yesterday, the members of the territories who sit in the Assembly are cooperating very fully and very freely, and they give very good promise of the Assembly itself doing most effective work in the control and preservation of these common services, but insofar as public reaction to the existence of the High Commission and the Central Assembly is concerned, I have heard no expression one way or another.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): They have had no opportunity so far to see that the new set-up is beneficial to the country? That is what I meant to ask. For instance, if they found out that the railways are more efficient now and that the postal service is better, and so on, they might realize that it is a good thing for the country. I meant to ask whether they have had occasion to appreciate the services of the new set-up.

Sir George SANFORD (Special representative): It is still somewhat early to appreciate the improvement in the services. Particularly in the case of the railways and the postal and telegraph services, improvement must await the provision of supplies and the installation of new equipment in those services. Again, one of the features of the railway amalgamation is that there shall be an assimilation of rates through the Territory. The rating question is at present under consideration, but it takes time to get an amalgamated system of rates applying to East African railways and harbours as a whole. The effect of the revision of rates when it comes will be, as I said yesterday, to apply rates on the Tanganyika railways lower than the Tanganyika railways themselves were able to apply before the amalgamation took place.

/Mr. SOLDATOV



Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I would like to ask for a reply to a question which I asked earlier, a reply which I think was lost in connexion with several other questions which were asked. The reply I wish is to the question as to how the Administering Authority intends, specifically, to gauge the expressions of the indigenous population in the future.

I think I explained my question in detail at the time I asked it. If the special representative recalls the manner in which I put my question and the question itself, I will not repeat it at this time, but will ask for a reply.

The PRESIDENT: That is the same question as sub-question 2 under question 24. I believe the special representative has replied to that question but perhaps not in as full a manner as the representative of the USSR would like.

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): I have done what I can to indicate the measures in which such consultation does habitually take place between the Government of Tanganyika and the inhabitants of Tanganyika.

I can add very little to the description I gave, which was written by the Tanganyika Government on the measures it took. Speaking as an old administrative officer myself, it is quite the common practice for the administrative officer to go around to each district to meet groups of people in the various centers -- they are quite close together -- talk to them and put the whole problem to them and ascertain their reaction. It is quite a common feature of ordinary administrative work in territories.

The PRESIDENT: In other words, it is not anticipated that there would be a plebiscite or something of that kind?

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): It is a matter of telling them what it is all about and ascertaining their reactions. There is no question of voting.

The PRESIDENT: The next question, sub-question 4, has already been referred to in the special representative's remarks. I shall refer to it again.

It says: "The Tanganyika Legislative Council is composed of 4 Africans, 3 Asians and 7 European unofficial members and 15 official members. The Administering Authority has stated that the number of

/African

African and Asian representatives will be increased.

"Will there be a great increase in the number of these representatives and, if so, will it take place by 1952?"

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): It has been publicly stated that it is the intention to increase the number of African members of the Tanganyika Legislative Council. I have already quoted from a passage on pages 11 and 12 of the Visiting Mission's report which contains the latest information available to me on this subject. I have no doubt at all that the remarks attributed to the Acting Governor and the Secretary of State on pages 11 and 12 of this report correctly represent what they said.

The PRESIDENT: In other words, at this moment you cannot give any reply as to the number of representatives contemplated in the increase, and also whether it would take place in 1952.

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): The report says on the bottom of page 11:

"The administration hoped that it would be possible to increase the African representation within the next four or five years and later there might be one African from each province which, in turn, might lead to a majority of non-official members in the Legislative Council."

The Acting Governor of Tanganyika has also referred to the desire to increase the number and also to the difficulty of finding suitable people to sit on the Legislative Council.

The PRESIDENT: The next question is sub-question 5 under question 24:

"How will the provision of Section 45 of the East Africa (High Commission) Order-in-Council 1947 enabling the High Commission to add other services to the list of common services be applied?"

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): I think that this question has also been covered in answers already given. That is to say, the High Commission does not enter into the matter until each of the territorial Legislative Councils have passed a resolution, without substantial opposition being present in any of them, and until the Secretary of State has given his consent.

The PRESIDENT: As I said, some of the questions that were asked by members anticipated the questions submitted by the Committee, and that is why I requested members not to anticipate these questions. Otherwise there will be repetition.

/In order to



In order to obtain complete replies to the questions asked by the Committee, I have read out the questions again.

The Council has come to the end of question 7. I will call the usual recess at this moment, and we will meet again at 4.30 p.m.

The Council recessed at 4.15 p.m. and reconvened at 4.40.

The PRESIDENT: Will the Council please come to order.

We have now arrived at Section VIII on page 10 of document T/263, Economic Aspects of the question of the Administrative Union, Question 25.

Does the Legislative Assembly of Tanganyika have any power at all over the finance, management and projects of the self-contained services? If so, how is such power exercised?

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): The administration of self-contained services has been transferred in whole to the High Commission, such services coming under the objective jurisdiction of the High Commission, and the Central Assembly has power to legislate on those matters.

Therefore the Legislative Council of Tanganyika has no power over the finance and management of the self-contained services.

With regard however to projects of the self-contained services, it is realized that any one of the governments may have its own reasons for wishing to have services extended, as by the building of a new railway branchline or a new series of postal services, and that such a government may derive substantial benefits from the construction of, say, a new line.

But if the Transport Administration - that is to say those people interested in transport including the Transport Advisory Council - feel that that branch railway would not contribute to the welfare of the railway system as such, it would propose to the government concerned that there should be guarantees against loss on that railway.

To that extent the Legislative Council of Tanganyika might find itself concerned with the construction of branch lines in Tanganyika and might be asked, before construction was undertaken, to give a guarantee against loss on the working of the line. In that event the Legislative Council, of course, would be concerned with the voting of any funds required under that guarantee.

The PRESIDENT: I will go on to the next question and I suggest that we ask the special representative all the questions contained in this section, and then representatives of the Council may ask such supplementary questions as relate to this section in order to avoid any repetition.

Question 26. Given that the opposition of certain sections of the population of Tanganyika seems due to fear of too great economic influence on the part of Kenya Colony on Inter-Territorial Organization, what measures does the Administering Authority contemplate taking to protect Tanganyika economic interests?

/ Sir George SANFORD

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): There is adequate Tanganyika representation on all the inter-territorial bodies to ensure that Tanganyika's interests are kept prominently in mind. In fact no question arises of disproportionate influence being exercised in the operation of the inter-territorial services by the white settlers of Kenya.

In the Assembly itself Kenya has two European unofficial members, which is the same as the number of European unofficial members from Tanganyika.

There is parity of representation as between the three Territories on all boards, advisory bodies and consultative bodies set up by the High Commission.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): I do not quite understand the President's remark a while ago about supplementary questions. Do I understand that we will finish sub-section A before we are able to ask supplementary questions.

The PRESIDENT: We will finish sub-section A before asking supplementary questions.

Are there any additional or supplementary questions which you want to ask, relating to those that have been already asked by the Committee? Otherwise members of the Council may be asking the same questions as the committee has already put down on paper and that would be a repetition.

Question 27. What economic advisory bodies of the High Commission are in existence? The East African Industrial Council serves as an advisory body. It has the power to decide what industries are to be established in each area. At the present time, its licensing power is limited to certain categories which may be later increased or decreased. A person who desires to manufacture for sale in Tanganyika must obtain a manufacturing licence not from the Government of Tanganyika but from the East African Industrial Council.

And the question is, what economic advisory bodies of the High Commission are in existence, and in what way does the Administering Authority intend to ensure that the implementation of the East African Industrial Council does not adversely affect the development of industries in Tanganyika?

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): I gave yesterday a list of the advisory and consultative bodies which had been set up by the

/ High Commission

High Commission, including the Transport Advisory Council and the Posts and Telegraphs Advisory Board and so on. I assume that it is not necessary for me to refer further to those bodies even though they may be dealing with economic subjects from time to time, and that the question here relates primarily to the two councils mentioned in this question; namely the Industrial Council and the Production and Supply Council.

It is true that the Industrial Council has been entrusted by territorial legislation to decide upon the grant of licences to applicants who wish to manufacture articles which have been scheduled under the territorial industrial licensing ordinances.

I should like to describe the position in relation to industrial licensing. The main difficulty in East Africa has been to get industries which are admittedly badly required in East Africa, started anywhere. Very long consideration was given - it extended from 1943 to 1948 - to measures which might appropriately be taken in the Territories to try and break down some of the impediments which had been found to exist preventing entrepreneurs from coming in and developing industries in East Africa.

In the event, the three governments agreed to enact parallel legislation, which set up an East African body to perform certain functions in relation to application for licences to manufacture articles which had been scheduled. Those articles are scheduled by resolution in each of the Territorial Legislative Councils.

/ There are at present

There are at present seven such articles and they are all mentioned in the report of the Mission to Tanganyika.

It was agreed that no item should be scheduled under these laws except by resolution of all three Legislative Councils and in each case strong reasons have to be put forward for the scheduling of an article.

That is to say, the industrial licensing legislation does not aim at any general control over the manufacture of articles in East Africa. It aims only at the control of the manufacture of articles which have been scheduled for reasons which appear good to the Government. Generally speaking those reasons are that in relation to the potential demand in East Africa the capital investment would be too high for an entrepreneur to be willing to invest unless he received a certain measure of security.

Now that measure of security which is set out in the law is merely this: that if someone has started on the manufacture of a scheduled article and another entrepreneur wishes to have a licence to manufacture that article, the fact of a new application has to be published and anybody already manufacturing that article is at liberty to make objections. The application and the objections are then considered by the Industrial Council.

The Industrial Council will grant a licence unless on one or more of named grounds the Council decides that a licence should not be granted. Those named grounds are: first, that the capital, technical skill or raw materials available to the applicant are, in the opinion of the Council, inadequate to secure the successful establishment and operation of the factory and that the failure of the applicant's enterprise would be likely to prejudice the successful development of the industry; secondly, that factories already established in Tanganyika, Kenya or Uganda for the manufacture of the article which the applicant for the licence proposes to produce in the factory which is the subject of the application for the licence have an actual or potential output which is sufficient to meet the actual or potential demand of consumers in East Africa; the price to such consumers must not be less favourable than that which, in the opinion of the Council, such applicants would find it necessary to charge in order to return a reasonable return on the capital required to establish such factory, with the proviso that in considering actual or potential demands under this paragraph the Council may, in its discretion, take expert potentialities  
/into account



into account; and, thirdly, that the place at which the applicant proposes to establish the factory is not a suitable situation for production of the article concerned either from the point of view of availability of raw material, electric power, water or fuel or proximity to the main consuming centres. Those are the grounds upon which the Council may decide that the licence should not be granted and they are the only grounds upon which the Industrial Council can so decide.

Each of the territories has passed parallel legislation. Each of the territories has come to the conclusion that in the establishment of industries of the kind which are scheduled it is essential that the administration should be on an East African basis and each of them has entrusted the work of dealing with these applications to an East African body called the East African Industrial Council, upon which each territory is represented as well as certain members also appointed by the High Commission.

The PRESIDENT: The same question <sup>states</sup> that as there are other advisory bodies such as the East African Production and Supply Council dealing mainly with agriculture, how do these bodies influence the policies affecting agriculture and industrial production in the three territories? What is the composition and recruitment and what are the precise functions of these various Councils?

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): I think that I need only here refer to the East African Production and Supply Council <sup>with</sup> whose composition and functions I dealt in some detail yesterday.

I then said that the Production and Supply Council had emerged as an East African body formed for the consideration of common problems as they arose during the war and that it still continues to sit to deal with common problems such as the Cereal Pool, production programmes, importation programmes of scheduled goods and goods in short supply such as jute, and various problems which should be considered on an inter-territorial basis.

I also said, and I repeat, that the Production and Supply Council, though it may reach decisions on matters which come before it, can only operate through the Governments of the territories concerned in any matter where policy is affected. The short answer, therefore, in relation to the Production and Supply Council is that

/the discussions

the discussions in that Council may affect the policy of the Governments but only after those Governments have considered the recommendations put forward by the Council.

The composition of the Production and Supply Council is: four members hold their position on the Council as inter-territorial officers plus three representatives from each of the mainland territories and one from Zanzibar. The composition and constitution of the Council are not formally prescribed.

The PRESIDENT: Question 28. It is apparent that with respect to certain services, for example, the Industrial Council, the Production and Supply Council, and the Railways and Harbours Administration, that the High Commission has powers of legislation that involve or touch upon economic policy. Would the Administering Authority give in concrete terms its opinion as to what economic advantages would accrue to Tanganyika through the placing of these policy decisions in the High Commission?

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): I will begin by saying that the High Commission and the Central Legislative Assembly had more power of legislation in respect of the operations of the Industrial Council and the Production and Supply Council. I have already indicated that the Industrial Council has functions placed upon it by legislation passed in the territories, not by the Assembly, not by the Inter-Territorial Organization. There is no legislation dealing with the Production and Supply Council work as such but if any legislation were required on matters coming within the purview of the Council that again would be territorial legislation.

/The Assembly has

The Assembly has power to legislate on railways, harbours and inland water transport and has already passed an Act giving transitional powers in respect of the railway amalgamation. A more comprehensive Railway Bill is at present in course of preparation and will come before the Central Assembly at its next meeting or the one immediately after.

Hitherto, legislation on railway matters has been territorial and this has not been uniform in all respects, but this legislation should be uniform throughout East Africa.

The main connexion between railways and economic policy are, I suggest, new routes and railway rating. It has been settled policy for many years that new routes should be decided upon having regard to the requirements of East Africa as a whole and it was for that purpose that the East African Transport Policy Board was established about fifteen years ago, so as to ensure that there was no wasteful competition in railway construction with limited funds and materials, and so on.

In regard to railway rating, I have already said that steps are now being taken to work out a common tariff for the whole East African railway system and when that has been done and a common tariff has been worked out, it is expected that the rates laid down will be less than those which have been charged in the past on the Tanganyika section of the railways.

The PRESIDENT: The next question is: How will the amalgamation of services and legislation common to the three Territories affect the economic advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory?

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): If I may take one or two services in order, the amalgamation of the railway services, as I have said, will lead to the introduction of a common tariff which will be to the advantage of users in Tanganyika as against the tariff operating on the Tanganyika railways before. It is hoped that the post and telegraph services will be able to expand and come into a position where they can be of greater use to the inhabitants of the Territory than they have been in the past.

/In reply

In reply to this question, I might perhaps place particular emphasis on research services which are designed solely in order that farming in the East African Territories can be improved and that more may be known about the natural soil contents of the Territories in relation both to agriculture and so on. That research work which, as I said yesterday, is substantially assisted by funds provided by His Majesty's Government, is of the first importance to the economic advancement of the inhabitants of East Africa and to the inhabitants of the Trust Territory no less than to those of any other country concerned.

The PRESIDENT: Question 30: According to the report of the Visiting Mission to Tanganyika, the amalgamation of the railways and port services may divert the trade of Northern Tanganyika to Mombasa at the expense of Dar-es-Salaam. Kindly explain the effect of the amalgamation upon the development of trade and communications of Tanganyika.

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): It is the case that ~~there is nothing to prevent the Tanganyika~~ Government from taking steps to ensure the movement of Tanganyika produce to Tanganyika ports. The question of whether such steps should be taken and whether it would be in the interests of Tanganyika users to take them, would be a matter for the Tanganyika Government to decide.

The places where the Tanganyika section and the Kenya and Uganda sections of the East African Railway systems impinge are in the Lake Victoria basin and to the west of Lake Victoria, and in the foothills of Kilimanjaro near Moshi. There are at present equalizations of rates by both systems from those areas, whether to a Tanganyika port or to the port of Kilindini.

In reply to the last part of this question, the immediate gains to Tanganyika of the railway amalgamation are: a larger pool of experts to draw upon and a common tariff at a lower level than the existing ones, as well as immediate financial provision for the replacement of assets and the financing of new railways other than the Tanganyika Territory's Government.

/One may

One may expect that these will develop upon efficient lines and that the trade and communications of Tanganyika will improve accordingly. There is, I should say, very great pressure on the Tanganyika section of the railways at present and very substantial additions to rolling stock and so on are required in order to move the goods. The fact that there is such pressure is fully realized, and satisfaction of the demands which depends mainly, of course, upon manufacturers in industrial countries, is a problem which is facing the management very acutely at the present moment. But it may be taken for granted that with the larger pool of experts available to deal with these matters, the interests of Tanganyika will be very well served in respect of this amalgamation.

The PRESIDENT: I think we have come to the end of Section A and I would invite representatives to ask questions in relation to the effect of the economic policy under the East Africa Inter-territorial Organization on the development of Tanganyika.

/Mr. NORIEGA:



Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I can remember the case of a country under a colonial regime that was prevented from producing silk with the purpose that this production should not enter into competition in the same way that the Philippines was hindered from producing olive oil. Roads were built only to and from the mining centres and economic advancement was in the interests of specific enterprises only; that is, railroads were built that were to service the exportation enterprises, and so on.

I give these as examples of what I would call a directed economy. This is a practice that is known to economists. I find that in the administrative organization there are a series of councils, the purpose of which is to direct the economy.

I wonder whether in this attempt at economic development there is not the danger of the contravention of given legal principles. For instance, I would like to know whether the existence of an Industrial Council does not in effect imply a limitation of enterprise in Tanganyika, and whether it would not also mean that the indigenous population is kept from initiating its own economic steps for the purpose of creating industries that would make them self-sufficing, so that they would not have to continue to be dependent upon the metropolitan territory.

Therefore, given the conditions that the indigenous population would wish to establish an industry and that finds that the Industrial Council is against the setting up of some specific enterprise, I would like to know whether the same occurs in the United Kingdom if a person wishes to establish an industry. Do entrepreneurs require specific permits in this sense to set up industries? This being of the greatest importance to the natives, I would like to know whether the possibility exists for all these Councils that exist in the Territory whose purpose is to direct the economy of the Territory -- I would like to know whether the Administering Authority envisages the possibility and contemplates making the natives members of these Councils.

In connexion with the amalgamation of the railroad services, I think it is of the greatest importance to know whether the Administering Authority has provided some plan in connexion with possible new railroads in Tanganyika because I understand that some extensions and connections are planned, but that these do not properly belong to the Trust Territory, or do not properly fall within its area.

I want to know whether in the construction of railroads there is  
/a graduated plan

a graduated plan which would in an equitable way as far as the management of the railroads is concerned be distributed equally amongst the three Territories.

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): The first question raised was in relation to the operations of the Industrial Council in relation to the indigenous inhabitants.

As I said before, there is no general control of industry in East Africa, and the fact that an industry was being practiced by the indigenous inhabitants would be quite sufficient, in my view, to prevent such an industry ever being scheduled by any of the legislative councils.

The one thing above all others in the industrial field that the East African Government wants is the development of economic industry. They recognize that the countries are too much agricultural; an undue proportion of the population is engaged in agriculture, and with the population increasing as it is, it is of vital importance to find new ways of getting employment in industry.

At the present moment, as I said, there are seven items scheduled under these Industrial Licenses Ordinances. In fact, there are three groups. The first three items are cotton yarn, cotton piece goods (not including knitwear) and cotton blankets. Knitwear is excluded because it might become a village industry. The second group is woolen yarn, woolen piece goods (again, not including knitwear) and woolen blankets. The third group is glazed articles of pottery -- not pottery, glazed pottery -- including glazed pipes, piping and tubing, glazed tubes of earthenware, glazed sanitary earthenware and stoneware. Those are the only articles which are at present scheduled, and I have reason to believe that the Government, which went through this list very carefully, will go through very carefully again in its suggestions for adding to the schedule.

I think the Council can rest assured that insofar as any possible development of indigenous industry in East Africa is concerned, every effort will be made to stimulate it. There can be no question of legislation desired to impede that because all the Governments are absolutely convinced that any step taken to promote industry in East Africa would be for the benefit of the inhabitants.

With regard to the second question, there are certain new railways being constructed at the present moment in East Africa, but none of them  
/are in Kenya

are in Kenya or Uganda. There are two railways being constructed in Tanganyika -- one to give access to a lead mine at Kpanda, and another to give access to areas which will be developed by the Overseas Food Corporation in the southern province of Tanganyika. A third railway in Tanganyika has been suggested linking the Central Railway and the Tanga Railway system, but proposals to that end have not yet advanced, and there is no immediate prospect of such a railway being constructed.

I say there are two lines in course of construction in East Africa and they are both in Tanganyika. There is no suggestion that I know of for any further railway construction at the moment on the northern part of the system.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): My question is linked with the one which has just been put by the representative of Mexico, and the special representative replied partially to this question.

I presume that as a result of the fact that at present the only two railways which are being built are in the Tanganyika Territory that at a later date other programmes will be set up and that Kenya and Uganda might say, "This time it is our turn." And then the Railway Board should <sup>not</sup> build a third railway in Tanganyika; it would be the turn of Kenya or Uganda.

If the Government of Tanganyika considers that another railway is necessary in Tanganyika but if the Railway Board says no, the next plan should be carried out in one of the other Territories.

Will the Government of Tanganyika have the right either to build on its own a railway which would <sup>not</sup> be linked up with the amalgamated system or to grant a railway concession to a company which, if necessary, might consent to accept the risk, whereas the amalgamated railways would refuse to accept such a programme? Or, is there a complete monopoly for any future construction of railways under the amalgamated system as it exists today?

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): I should like to reply to that question in three parts:

(1) The Railways and Harbours system is an East African Railways and Harbours system, and a decision on new lines to be constructed would be reached in the interests of East Africa as a whole. The territorial -- that is, the sectional -- aspect might be expressed in the Transport Advisory Council, but the recommendation of the Council would be reached on the welfare of East Africa as the main point for consideration. The fact that two railways had recently been constructed in Tanganyika would not necessarily weigh at all with the policy decided upon in further railway construction.

(2) I should like to mention that railway construction in any part of East Africa is not to be lightly embarked upon. We are, in fact, short of materials for ordinary things. We have to compete with very important projects in other parts of the Colonial Empire, as well as in the metropolitan country, and the case for a new railway must be an overwhelming case, or there is no prospect of getting either the material or the money to do it.

(3) As I understand the matter, the position in East Africa is that all railways would necessarily have to be constructed by or on behalf of and administered by the East African Railways and Harbours Administration, which by law has, I think, got the monopoly; in practice it certainly has.

As I said earlier, if any Government wished to construct a railway in its Territory, which was not reported as a transport undertaking by the transport authorities, it would be free to do so, through the agency of the East African Railways and Harbours, on condition that the question of guarantee against loss is satisfactorily settled with the transport authorities. The transport authorities would certainly agree to administer that railway.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): In his reply to the question asked by the representative of Mexico, the special representative stated that the Administering Authority is taking steps towards the development of the Territory.

I would like to know what industries he referred to specifically, and what specific measures are being taken to develop these industries in the rural areas. Are money subsidies being offered? If so, could he give us some statistics as to the subsidies which are granted to  
/the indigenous population



the indigenous population, and, further, through what organizations and offices is such assistance given?

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): I fear that I am not in a very good position to answer this question. It is some years since I was in close touch with the Government of Tanganyika. I was Chief Secretary in Tanganyika for two years from 1944 to 1946, and at an earlier stage I was Financial Secretary from 1936 to 1940. But I have not been a member of the Tanganyika Government during the past three years, and the reply to the question by the representative of the USSR requires up-to-date knowledge which I am afraid I do not possess.

He asked what industries are in question and what measures are being taken to develop them in the rural areas. The only information I have is contained in the report for 1947, which has already been considered by this Council, and which refers to certain industries such as the milling of rice and flour, oil extraction, saw milling, cotton ginning, coffee curing, tobacco curing and manufactures from local products including soaps, cigarettes, furniture, leather, butter, cheese, etc., and also to the manufacture of clarified butter and ghee and the establishment of creameries.

Many of the industries I have mentioned are carried out mainly by non-natives, but some of them will be industries carried out by the indigenous inhabitants.

I am not aware of any method of subsidizing industries in the hands of the indigenous population, and I do not know what, if any, other measures are being taken by the Government of Tanganyika in that way.

Mr. LIN (China): The special representative has made a very careful and significant statement on the criteria by which the Industrial Council grants industrial licences. I have to read that statement more carefully, in order more fully to understand it.

I would like to ask a few questions in that connexion. The possible loss of capital is stated as one reason for refusing the granting of industrial licences. It is said that the possible loss of capital may prejudice the future development of industry.

/Lack of market



The PRESIDENT: Question 32. "The conversion of certain services into "self-contained services", for example, the Railways and Harbours Administration and the Posts and Telegraphs Department would apparently deprive Tanganyika of considerable revenue and the power to expend such revenue, thereby directly affecting the fiscal policies of the Trust Territory and indirectly affecting social and educational policies. Would the Administering Authority comment upon this?"

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): For many years past, the annual and supplementary estimates of the Tanganyika Railways and Harbours Administration have been submitted separately to the Tanganyika Legislative Council and since 1940 any excessive revenue or expenditure on the Tanganyika railways has been used exclusively for railways and ports purposes. That position has been in existence on the Kenya and Uganda railways system since 1925. The finances of the railways and harbours were completely divorced from those of the Governments of Kenya and Uganda in 1925.

Consequently, interterritorial administration of railways and harbours services will not affect the budgets of any of the three Territories in any way whatever. The railway finances have been separate from those of the Government. In one case that situation has existed for nine years and in the other, for twenty-four years.

In regard to the Post Office, I gave a general description yesterday of the situation. It is true that direct postal expenditure, which had been voted in the Legislative Council, may fall short of the revenue from postal services. But that is not the whole picture if all matters which properly come within the Posts and Telegraphs sphere are taken into account.

What is happening is that the Posts and Telegraphs is being turned into a self-contained service. All factors affecting postal revenue and expenditure will be taken into account. The assets, which at present belong to the Government, which are being constructed or bought for postal and telegraph purposes are being valued and the intention is that the Postal and Telegraph Administration shall repay that capital fund to the Government and shall pay interest on the money meanwhile.

To take this one instance, there will be an item of revenue in the estimates of each of the Territories representing an interest payment and a repayment of capital in respect of buildings and equipment which have been constructed and bought for Posts and Telegraphs services in past years.

Furthermore, the Posts and Telegraphs Department will carry its own pensions liabilities and will take onto its own budget many items which,

/in Tanganyika

in Tanganyika and possibly elsewhere, have been carried on <sup>heads of</sup> estimates other than Posts and Telegraphs.

For instance, in Tanganyika I should expect to find that provisions for passages of people going overseas was provided under one head for all the Government departments. In so far as passage of postal officials is concerned, that will be taken from the Miscellaneous Services Vote in Tanganyika and transferred to the Posts and Telegraphs Department accounts.

There are other items, all of which are detailed in the report of the Board which went into the question of detailed proposals for turning this Department into a self-contained department.

On the other side you have items such as services rendered by the Department to the Government itself which, in some cases, have not been paid for before but which will be paid for in the future.

I also emphasized yesterday that the people who deployed this scheme found very great difficulty in assessing what the financial effect of this scheme would be. But I will say this in relation to the flexibility of budget: that the Governments concerned will be receiving new items of revenue in relation to the assets they have already constructed or purchased for Posts and Telegraphs and that there will be a fairly complicated adjustment which must be worked out in time before we can ascertain whether, on balance, the budgets are better or worse off than they were before.

But ultimately, if after a number of years experience it is found that the Posts and Telegraphs services are operating at a profit, it will still be open to the Government -- and this has been specifically reserved in this field -- to decide whether any part of that profit should be paid to the Government as revenue or whether it should be used for other purposes such as Posts and Telegraphs extensions or reductions in rates.

/The President: May I ask

The PRESIDENT: May I ask, if there are common revenue and common profits in excess of what is necessary to pay for the services and capital investments of the Territory, how are you to determine the share of the Territory in such common revenues and profits? Is there any ratio fixed, or is any other method followed?

Sir George SANFORD (Special representative): Hitherto post and telegraph revenues have been determined having regard to the office of origin where the revenue accrues and statistics are worked out every year indicating what the position is.

It is given in the estimates for 1948 as Kenya: 61% of the revenue, Uganda: 15% and Tanganyika: 24%. That is based on the actual receipts in the Territories concerned, and I assume that on any division of revenue in the contingency we are talking about a similar sort of proportion would be regarded as reasonable -- based, that is to say, on the revenue accruing in the various post offices in the three territories.

The PRESIDENT: Question 33: "The Central Development Commission of Tanganyika has observed that the secondary industries in Tanganyika are not well developed and that the existence of customs agreements has tended to hinder the development of secondary industries in Tanganyika. In Kenya these are more developed. At the same time it has been observed that because of existing customs unions Tanganyika has lost much revenue. It has also stated that economic union cannot exist without political union. Will the special representative clarify this and give figures concerning secondary industries in Kenya and Tanganyika in order to show that the customs union does or does not tend to discourage the development of secondary industries in Tanganyika? Are there measures the Government of Tanganyika itself may take for the protection of secondary industries in Tanganyika?"

Sir George SANFORD (Special representative): It cannot be said that secondary industries are as yet well developed in any part of East Africa, but I regret to say that I am unable to give figures concerning secondary industries in Kenya and Tanganyika as asked for: they are not available.

The PRESIDENT: I presume that the Committee would like to have some fuller details. May I ask the representative of the United Kingdom if such further information would be forthcoming?

/Sir Alan BURNS

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): If it is possible to get it, of course it will be provided.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I wonder if I could have some additional information from the special representative in connexion with the information contained in the Report of the Visiting Mission, document T/218, page 62, Section 3.

First, if the President will allow me, I would like to read this, so that my question will be clearer. The report of the Visiting Mission states: "By letter received on 15 September 1948, the President and four members of the Indian Association in Dar-es-Salaam requested an interview with the members of the Visiting Mission. Attached to the letter was a memorandum containing notes on matters the members of the Association wished to raise with the Mission. The paragraph on Inter-Territorial Organization reads:

'3. Closer Union. Even though the Trusteeship Agreement provides for this Territory to join in with neighbouring territories for economic purposes, we are very apprehensive of the ultimate effect on Tanganyika (which is a Trust Territory) of this economic fusion. It will not be out of place to state here that with all the superior natural resources at the command of this Territory, interested parties are bound to keep Tanganyika a mere tail-piece or playing the part of a second fiddle in preference to the much vociferous and influential Kenya which may ultimately prove to be highly detrimental to this Trust Territory.'

The members of the Visiting Mission met with representatives of the Indian Association on 17 September 1948. The Indian Association representatives stressed especially with regard to the above-quoted paragraph, that they opposed the scheme for Inter-Territorial Organization because they feared the extent to which the Kenya European settlers would be able to exercise their influence in Tanganyika both politically and economically. They claimed that the whole scheme had originated in the desire of these settlers for union with Tanganyika and Uganda and that the general economic political policies for East Africa were shaped in Kenya. It was pointed out that the Central Legislative Assembly, its offices and Secretariat were all to be located in Nairobi, Kenya.



"Those in favour of the scheme for Inter-Territorial Organization say that the economic union would produce economy in the running of the economic services and Tanganyika would benefit thereby. But the Indian Association was of the opinion that Tanganyika would be kept as a market for Kenya produce. The sugar, flour, tea, bacon, ham and butter industries were located in Kenya and Tanganyika would be forced to buy these goods from that Territory."

In another part of the report reference is made to Ordinance No. 16 of 1930, but the impression is that the Ordinance does not exhaust the question of those fears which have been expressed by the Indian Association on this question.

I would like to ask the special representative if he has any concrete data as to the extent to which statistical data could be supplied to refute or support the fears expressed by the Indian Association -- that is, the Indian population of Tanganyika.

I would be interested in data regarding the goods and amount of money involved which are transported from Kenya into Uganda, from Tanganyika into Kenya and from Kenya into Tanganyika.

Secondly, I would like to know what branches of commerce are centred in the main in Kenya, having only associated or affiliated branches in Tanganyika, as well as any other information which would make it possible for us to see clearly the economic inter-relationships between Kenya and Tanganyika not only in respect to those branches of the economy which are at the present time completely fused and are now under the administration of the High Commission, but also regarding those branches of the Territory's economy in which private enterprise is concerned as the main factor. Of course, if the special representative does not have such data on hand at the moment, it might perhaps be possible to get this information subsequently.

Sir George SANFORD (Special representative): I regret that I did not quite finish the answer I was about to give to Question 33, but I will revert to that during the course of answering this and other questions.

I did not bring with me the Trade Report of Tanganyika which is now available for 1948 and which would have answered in some detail the representative's request for information about the kind of goods and the value and quantity of goods moving over the Tanganyika boundary northwards and coming from Kenya and Uganda southwards into Tanganyika.

/I have here a quotation.



I have here a quotation from the Trade Report for 1947 which indicates the character of interterritorial trade with Tanganyika but does not give the comparable values.

In the Trade Report for 1947, the following is shown: "In normal years, in exchange for the sugar, wheat flour, cigarettes, tea, butter and other Kenya and Uganda products consumed in Tanganyika, this Territory finds a convenient market for her surplus production of rice, cocoanut oil, tobacco, pulses and other products, besides making greater use of the more direct communications via Mombasa for the export and transit of the coffee and other products of the Northern and Lake Provinces."

That short statement indicates the character, in general terms, of interterritorial trade, which in itself, as far as my recollection goes, has quite considerable value year by year.

With regard to the second question asked, the tendency has been for businesses which operate in the three Territories to establish their main headquarters in Kenya rather than in Uganda -- there are exceptions -- largely, I think, because British enterprise had been established in Kenya before the confusion of the first world war. It was also found convenient to operate branches from an existing base when Tanganyika came under mandate to His Majesty.

Naturally this would apply to the main banks, the National Bank of India, the Standard Bank of South Africa, Barclay's Bank, Dominion, Colonial and Overseas Bank.

There are in Nairobi superintendents or inspectors of those banks who supervise the operation of the branches all over East Africa. There is one other bank operating in East Africa, the Bank of Congo Belge, which has no branches in Kenya or Uganda, but has a branch at Dar-es-Salaam and another branch. That bank, of course, has other affiliations and is not one which is in any way associated with head offices in Kenya.

Then again, there are certain commercial firms which have main regional offices in Kenya -- shipping companies who would have their principal representative at the principal port in East Africa. There are certain enterprises of which branches are established in Tanganyika. The Kenya Farmers' Association is a case in point. This is an association of Kenya farmers which deals largely with cereal produce, and with pyrethrum. That association operates in Tanganyika in order to give the people who grow wheat and pyrethrum in Tanganyika the services which have been based on a fairly wide basis in the handling of those commodities in Kenya.

/On the other

On the other hand, when you get to mining, you find that the mining companies, generally speaking, operating in Tanganyika are Tanganyika companies operating from London or with head offices in Tanganyika.

It would depend upon the kind of commodity or product in question.

In relation to coffee, there is the biggest African co-operative society in East Africa engaged in dealing with coffee on Kilimanjaro and there are no affiliations in any other part of East Africa. It is entirely a Tanganyika co-operative association.

The sisal companies have no head offices in Kenya. Sisal is grown more in Tanganyika than in any other part of East Africa, and the companies growing sisal are either located and registered in Tanganyika or are administered from head offices in London. I know of no instance where the head office of a sisal company, operating in Tanganyika, is located in Kenya.

So that, generally speaking, apart from the banks and the commercial concerns dealing with shipping and perhaps one or two other business concerns I think that Tanganyika people stand on their own legs just as much as those of Uganda or those of Kenya.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I would like to ask the special representative for the following information. Is it possible to obtain comparable data regarding the financial situation of the European, the Indian and the indigenous population in Tanganyika in the industry and agriculture of Tanganyika for each group separately?

Also, regarding the investment of the European, the Indian and the indigenous populations living in Tanganyika in the industry and agriculture of Uganda and Kenya, and vice versa, the investment of these three groups of the population living in Uganda and Kenya respectively, and their investment in the agriculture and industry of Tanganyika, again giving these figures for each group of the population separately.

In this connexion, it would be very interesting to have figures on the comparative investment of foreign companies, including the English companies in the industry and agriculture of Tanganyika, and to have the relative data regarding this information in Kenya and Uganda. I am taking Kenya and Uganda here only because they are part of the interterritorial organization in which Tanganyika is included.

Without such data, it would be difficult to get a clear picture of the rights and powers of Tanganyika, as well of the entire subject as a whole.

If the representative of the United Kingdom objects to my including Kenya and Uganda in my request, then of course I shall not insist on it.

/Sir George SANFORD

Sir George SANFORD (Special Representative): I can only answer that I will do my best to get this information on my return.

One of the High Commission services is statistics, but in fact it has been found extremely difficult to get<sup>a</sup> staff of trained statisticians and the service being rendered by the statistical department, which should, I think, contain information on the points raised by the representative of the Soviet Union - is not sufficiently complete to give all the information which we wish to have, particularly as its efforts during the past year have been devoted to carrying out the first census of the population in East Africa, a work which has taken a very considerable time with the extremely small staff available for the purpose.

The information asked for seems to me to be of a kind which, when properly equipped, the department should be able to provide, and it could be provided in a published document.

I shall therefore be prepared to try and get this information when I get back if it is available. If not I shall see that the Trusteeship Council gets it when it is produced.

The PRESIDENT: It is now six o'clock. I think I will leave the rest of this section on Tanganyika until to-morrow when I think we can finish it.

We will then take up the rest of the Committee's paper. I think the Committee has asked the Council for direction on one or two points. After that I think we should revert back to the petitions on Ruanda-Urundi.

The Drafting Committee will meet in Room 5 at 11 a.m. to-morrow.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I would like to ask you something regarding the petitions. We have constantly been delayed in our work and it has been necessary for us to keep putting off the consideration of the petitions. You will recall there are a number of petitions. Certain additional questions arose because the Administering Authorities had not submitted their comments and observations on these petitions.

I remember there was a petition from a Mr. Siggins, and the question is still not clear to us because that gentleman had asked for permission to appear at the meeting of the Trusteeship Council. It is now the 9th March and we do not know what we have to do about this petition. We are going to consider it I think we should decide as to whether it

/ is possible for this

is possible for this gentleman to come to this session of the Trusteeship Council, whether he would have time to get here.

I ask this question to clarify the situation, because we have relatively little time left and it will be necessary for us to work very energetically and effectively.

Now I think that this petition, which is a very important one, should be considered at this session of the Council. It is on our agenda and something will have to be done about it.

The PRESIDENT: I have already proposed that as soon as we have completed this paper on Administrative Union we come back to the petitions, that is the petitions on which certain general problems were raised and which the Council decided to consider in conjunction with the Visiting Mission's Report. And the rest of the petitions will be considered, including the petition from Siggins, which was originally scheduled for March 2nd but has been deferred because the Council wants to keep to the time-table on Administrative Union questions.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I asked this question because the petition states that the petitioner promised to submit additional information to the Trusteeship Council while it was in session, when he would be here. It seems to me that this additional information is important for the consideration of that particular petition in as much as I understand its nature.

That is what I want to know and that is why I ask this question. When is Mr. Siggins going to come here? What is the situation in that regard?

The PRESIDENT: The Council will have to give its decision, when it examines the petition, <sup>as to</sup> whether it is justifiable to summon Mr. Siggins. I understand he is in England and I think he will come if it is necessary. If the Council feels his presence is warranted then I think he will be informed. But I propose that we consider that question immediately after the data from the Committee on Administrative Union has been completed.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I would like to note here that the following could happen

/ We could decide that



We could decide that Mr. Siggins should come but he will not have sufficient time to come here in time for the session of the Council. I think in doing this we should be simply adding difficulties to our work.

The reason that I have raised the question at this time is that it is the only petition that we have at this session in which the petitioner has asked for permission to appear before the Council and submit additional information. This is the 9th March, we are approaching the end of our work and we have not decided as to whether this gentleman is going to come here or not. That may be owing to transportation difficulties.

The PRESIDENT: The Council is not ready to give any decision until it comes to consider that petition.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I told the Secretariat two weeks ago that I was willing to proceed with the Siggins petition and the Garas petition, Kudililwa and one other petition that I cannot remember - Ruppel I think it is - which was actually down on our time-table two or three days ago but owing to the fact that we took longer to discuss a certain matter than we anticipated it has been postponed. I have been ready for a couple of weeks.

The PRESIDENT: I am sure we can not decide on this question now. It will only mean another day's delay. If we can finish the Administrative Union paper to-morrow we will come to consider that petition - and it comes first on the list of petitions that have been studied.

The Council is adjourned until to-morrow afternoon at 2.30.

The meeting rose at 6.08 p.m.