

United Nations

Nations Unies

UNRESTRICTED

TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL

CONSEIL  
DE TUTELLE

T/P.V. 155  
15 March 1949  
English 43

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Fourth Session

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

Lake Success, New York  
Tuesday, 15 March 1949, at 2.30 p.m.

President:

Mr. LIU CHIEH

China

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

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO EAST AFRICA;  
TANGANYIKA (T/218, T/218/Corr.1, T/273)

The PRESIDENT: The agenda for this afternoon is the examination and consideration of the report of the Visiting Mission to East Africa concerning the Trust Territory of Tanganyika.

The Secretariat has prepared a paper (document T/273 under date of 14 March) in which are classified the various petitions which were received through the Visiting Mission and which raised problems of a general and public character. This paper has summarized and classified these petitions in accordance with the nature of the subject in relation to the various chapters of the Visiting Mission's report.

I would suggest that in discussing the Visiting Mission's report, representatives on the Council should also take up the questions raised in the petitions so that these problems will be discussed together.

I think the Council, in accordance with the usual procedure, would like to invite the chairman of the Visiting Mission to sit at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Laurentie, Chairman of the Visiting Mission to East Africa and Sir George Sandford, Special Representative for Tanganyika, took their seats at the Council table.

CHAPTER I - POLITICAL ADVANCEMENT

The PRESIDENT: We are now taking the Visiting Mission's report chapter by chapter. Are there any observations on Chapter I, Political Advancement?

/Mr. SOLDATOV:

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)  
(Interpretation from Russian): I should like to ask a question regarding the participation of the indigenous population in legislative, executive and judicial organs of government in the Trust Territory.

The report of the Visiting Mission on pages 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and following, refers to the Executive Council which assists the Governor of the Trust Territory; it also refers to the Legislative Council.

The report notes that the Governor's Executive Council does not comprise any Africans, any representatives of the indigenous population of the Territory.

The report goes on to say that the Executive Council has an exclusively advisory character, since the Governor has the final say on all matters.

Now when the report goes on to speak about the Legislative Council, we are advised that in fact the Legislative Council is also an advisory body which transmits its advice to the Governor.

In 1945 there were no representatives of the indigenous population at all in that Council either. The functions of the non-official members of the Legislative Council, as stated in the report, are basically to ask questions.

In this connexion, I should like to elicit a clarification from the Special Representative or from the Chairman of the Visiting Mission -- whichever one has the appropriate information.

/In the first place

In the first place, how is it possible to explain the situation where the indigenous population is only represented in the Legislative Council since 1945? What was the reason which prevented representation of the indigenous population in the Council prior to 1945?

Further, in connexion with the fact that the representatives of the indigenous population have only four members in the Legislative Council, it would seem that the indigenous population is precluded from any effective influence on the legislative organs of the Trust Territory because of the small number of such representatives in that Council. Is that correct?

Thirdly, does the Administering Authority contemplate any concrete measures with a view to ensuring the participation of the indigenous population in legislative, executive and judicial organs in the Trust Territory?

I have asked all these questions together so as to make it easier to reply to them together. If the Chairman of the Visiting Mission or the special representative find any difficulty in replying to all the questions together, I shall be of course prepared to ask them again seriatim, if they so wish.

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): I wonder whether it might not be possible to answer all three questions asked by the representative of the USSR together.

The Visiting Mission got the general impression that <sup>the</sup> British authorities in Tanganyika had not sought to establish a government which would comprise important participation on the part of the indigenous population in the Territory as a whole. Our impression was rather that <sup>the</sup> British authorities had endeavoured, by promoting the advancement and the progress of the tribal organizations and regional or provincial organizations, to set up within each administrative entity some self-governing organs which would encourage political and administrative advancement or development.

Following the progress which is to be expected from such a procedure and from the establishment of such institutions, there should arise in the long run the necessary staff to take part in the work of the central administrative organs.

I believe that in general our Visiting Mission felt that very  
/serious

serious, steadfast efforts were being exerted, in particular as regards two localities which we visited: namely, the Sukumaland Federation and the province of the Chagga. As I say, very strenuous efforts were being exerted in these regions so as to foster education towards political and administrative responsibility so that the indigenous inhabitants could take an active and responsible part in such organs.

The participation of indigenous inhabitants in the central organs of government would be, therefore, the result of the progress which can be counted on due to the progress which at present is being made. This, I believe, was the general impression of our Visiting Mission throughout the trips which we made and the various investigations which we carried out on the spot.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): In reply to the first question asked by the representative of the USSR, it is a fact that African members were first appointed to the Legislative Council in Tanganyika towards the end of 1945.

Members will realize that the end of 1945 followed a period of six years in which war had been taking place and there were no constitutional changes in Tanganyika during that period.

I was in Tanganyika at that time and I remember the discussions which led to this change, and I would like to inform the Council that this change was originated by the Government; it was not a change which had been pressed for by public demand; it originated in the minds of the Government of the Territory and <sup>was</sup> pressed to a conclusion in that year.

Up to that time consistently there has been one <sup>European</sup> member of the Legislative Council appointed to represent native interests. That gentleman for many years past has been Cannon Gibbons, <sup>the</sup> head of a mission at Makarere under the auspices of the University Mission to Central Africa, who has very great interest in African affairs and has contributed very valuable services to the Councils of the Territory.

With regard to the second question asked by the representative of the USSR, there is a reference on pages 11 and 12 of the Mission's Report about the intentions of the Tanganyika Government in relation to the number of African members of the Legislative Council. It says:

"The administration hoped that it would be possible to increase the African representation within the next four or five  
/years

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."

It is a fact that one of the difficulties in increasing the number of African members is the difficulty of finding people with sufficient knowledge of affairs to be suitable for participation in debates on policy in the Legislative Council and so on. That difficulty is a very real difficulty which will, of course, in time be overcome with the spread of education, but at the present moment it is one that causes the Government of Tanganyika considerable concern.

The representative of the USSR also mentioned the possibility of an African being appointed to the Executive Council. That is a matter which the Tanganyika Government is not overlooking, but there are certain qualifications required of any member of the Executive Council. That Council meets in Dar-es-Salaam at fairly frequent intervals and each member must study the questions coming before the Council. It is therefore necessary in practice that each member of the Council should live in or near Dar-es-Salaam. That in itself is a limiting factor in dealing with representation by Africans in the Council.

In the Executive Council also, Cannon Gibbons, to whom I have previously referred, represents African interests.

The representative of the USSR also asked whether there were any concrete measures for participation by the indigenous inhabitants in the executive, legislative and judicial work in the Territory. That, as I understand the matter, is a very broad question. Insofar as executive work is concerned, there are several references in the Report of the Mission to the part which Africans are playing and will continue to play in an expanded way in the executive work of the Territory.

Insofar as legislative work is concerned, I have already mentioned the intention of the Government of Tanganyika to add to the number of African members of the Legislative Council.

/Insofar as judicial

Insofar as judicial work is concerned, I am not aware of any proposals which would enable Africans to take part in judicial work in the Territory at the present time, although I should have little hesitation in saying that when Africans are qualified in that work, the possibility of so employing them would undoubtedly be considered by the Government.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I should like to know what are the results expected by the Administration from the participation of the indigenous inhabitants in the Legislative Council.

We note that in the three years during which the Legislative Council has comprised native representatives, these have made observations or comments which have not been echoed or which have been rejected outright by the Administrative Authority. I hardly think it is necessary to refer to all these specific instances, which are found on pages 10, 11, and so on, of the document at present before us.

The proposals made or suggestions advanced by the African or indigenous representatives appear to be systematically refused, because personally I see no single instance of any native suggestion which has been accepted and thereafter implemented. I would therefore like to ask the special representative whether this policy vis-a-vis the African representatives is justified, especially when the African suggestions are often guided by commonsense. Would not such a policy lead to the indigenous inhabitants' losing interest in participating in the work of the Legislative Council?

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): I cannot answer that question from recent knowledge. I was present in the Tanganyika Legislative Council when the first two members took their seats and participated in the debate referred to here, but I have not seen them in operation during the past three years, and cannot say how they are progressing in their work.

It is obviously the desire of the Tanganyika Government that by experience they should acquire weight in the arguments they produce before the Legislative Council, and that they should be valuable members of that Council. That is obviously the intention.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I have also noted, while perusing the report of the Visiting Mission, that one of the /difficulties or

difficulties or obstacles to increasing the number of representatives in the Legislative Council is that so few really know the English language.

I consider that there would be no difficulty whatsoever if it were possible to accept also as an official language the native tongue. I should therefore like to know whether the Administering Authority finds any insuperable or very important obstacle to such a procedure, since it is sufficient not to know English to be precluded from participating in the work of the Legislative Council, or, rather, to be appointed to take part in the work of the Council.

The same natives, despite the fact that they do not know the English language, must also have a vast fund of knowledge in other fields. Would not the Administering Authority, therefore, consider it possible to include the native language as an official language in the Legislative Council?

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): The view taken in Tanganyika is that the official language in the Legislative Council should be confined to English, and that for several reasons.

One is that the Swahili language, although it plays a useful part in ordinary conversation in the Territory, is not a language which has been developed in such a way that it could readily be used in dealing with the somewhat complicated matters of the Legislative Council. It is, for instance, short in abstract terms, and there would have to be imported into it so many words that are strange to the language at present, that virtually a new language would have to be built up, which would be difficult to understand.

As I say, it is useful in the process of trade and in ordinary conversation throughout the Territory, but it is not a precise language and also it is not the indigenous language of most of the inhabitants. It is a second language to them.

The PRESIDENT: In this connexion perhaps I may invite the attention of the Council to the observations of the Visiting Mission contained on page 35 of document T/218, that is, the Visiting Mission's report.

At the bottom of page 35 it is stated that:

"The Mission suggests for consideration that Kiswahili be adopted as a second official and working language of the

/Legislative Council



Legislative Council in order that African members would not be penalized for lack of proficiency in English."

The Council will also note that in document T/273, that is, the summary prepared by the Secretariat, there are set forth several petitions concerning this question which has just been discussed, namely, native participation in the legislative and administrative functions of the Government.

On pages 2, 3 and 4 there are set forth petitions from twenty-two Shinyanga Township Africans, from the Tanganyika Bahaya Union, from the Chagga Council, and from the Tanganyika African Association, which raise the question of participation by the indigenous population.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I should like to ask the special representative whether there has been any campaign against learning the English language. Has there been any such campaign in the Territory, that is to say, a campaign on the part of the natives or a kind of crusade against learning English?

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): My information is that the indigenous inhabitants of Tanganyika are very anxious to acquire a knowledge of the English language.

There are, so far as my memory goes, several references in these petitions to the importance of speaking English. The Administration is also anxious that English should be taught, and it is taught in schools at standard 5 and becomes a medium of instruction at standard 7.

/My very strong

My very strong recollection of work in Tanganyika is that the people are very anxious to learn English.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I should like to ask another question. I should like to know whether the statistics at the disposal of the Administering Authority comprise any figures as to the number of natives who speak correct English.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): I do not know.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): Let us suppose that after a number of years of British administration there must be hundreds of natives who can speak correct English. Further, among these hundreds of English speaking natives who must exist in the Territory it would be possible to find staff competent to participate in the Legislative Council and other representative organs.

I have asked all these questions because it seems that these questions lead us to this fact: that it is not because the natives do not speak adequate English that they do not have more representation in the Legislative Council. Such argumentation is really not very valid. It has no leg on which to stand unless, naturally, they are required to speak Oxford or Cambridge English.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): The special representative stated -- and his statement is confirmed by the Report of the Visiting Mission on page 11 of document T/216, in the penultimate paragraph -- that the goal of African representation would be to have

"...one African from each province which, in turn, might lead to a majority of non-official members in the Legislative Council."

I notice, however, that the Legislative Council is composed of the Governor and twenty-nine members. Of these twenty-nine members, fifteen are official members and fourteen are non-official members. Therefore, if the goal of one African representative for each of the eight provinces is achieved there will be only eight Africans in the Legislative Council which is composed of thirty members including the Governor.

Does the special representative consider this a sufficiently democratic goal, considering that the overwhelming majority of the population of Tanganyika is composed of Africans and that the other members of the Council represent a very insignificant portion of the population, in comparison to the African population?

/Sir George SANDFORD

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): The representative of the Philippines has referred to the present number of members of the Legislative Council, namely, the fifteen official members and fourteen unofficial members. But the instrument under which the Tanganyika Legislative Council is formed has, in fact, no limitation of numbers. Those numbers are therefore nothing more than a statement of the present position.

With regard to the ultimate constitution of the Legislative Council, I fear I am not in a position to speak, not having any recent information of the intentions of the Government of Tanganyika.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): As the special representative observed, there is no limit placed on the number of members of the Legislative Council. Why then is the limit for African members set at eight?

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): That is a question which the special representative could not possibly answer. We have received no comments on the subject from the Administering Authority and it is a matter of future policy which the special representative is not empowered to answer.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): Coming back to the replies of the special representative to the questions propounded by the representative of Mexico, I should like to make an observation in connexion with the use of the English language in the proceedings of the Legislative Council.

For example, I remember that in the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under French Administration, the official language of the Legislative Assembly is French and that there is a sufficient number of African members of the French Cameroons Legislative Assembly who speak French. That means that a sufficient number of the population is qualified to participate in the deliberations of the Legislative Assembly in the French Cameroons because of their knowledge of French.

Considering the parallel position in which the Territory of Tanganyika is situated, I am <sup>wondering</sup> whether the lack of a sufficient number of the population being able to speak English is due to less effort on the part of the Administering Authority to propagate the English language in comparison to the efforts of the Administering Authority of the French Cameroons to educate the population of the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under French Administration.

I should like to ask the special representative if a similar plan or effort on the part of the Administering Authority is envisaged so that a sufficient number of the population of Tanganyika might be able to

/learn the

learn the English language and therefore be able to participate in the deliberations of the Legislative Council.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): I can only reply by reference to the educational programme. As I said in any earlier reply, the teaching of English is begun in Standard Five -- that is the sixth year of the primary school -- for those pupils who are going to secondary schools. It becomes the medium of instruction in the first year -- that is Standard Seven -- of the secondary schools.

/The efforts of the

The efforts of the Tanganyika Government to promote the teaching of English will be found concentrated in the educational curriculum and I have no doubt that the decision to begin the teaching of English in the fifth year has been taken with full regard to the facts of the case and the desirability of working out a satisfactory educational course.

I think it is admitted by the Government of Tanganyika in several documents and also in its Development Plan that primary education requires very considerable expansion. The expansion of education under that plan should lead to the result which the representative of the Philippines is so anxious to obtain. That anxiety, I feel sure, is fully shared by the Government of Tanganyika.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): As Sir George Sandford has indicated, this is very largely a question of education. The Administering Authority is fully alive to the contribution which education can make to the political advancement of the people, and the Tanganyika Government, incurs the maximum expenditure practicable from the Territory's revenues on the expansion of the education services. This amounts to approximately ten percent of the Government's annual expenditure on all services, and I should like to remind the Council that this ten percent is reinforced by a substantial contribution from the United Kingdom taxpayer under the Colonial Development and Welfare Fund.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): In view of the fact that this difficulty of language is precisely one of the obstacles to membership of Africans in the Legislative Council of Tanganyika, I should like to ask if it would be difficult, taking into <sup>account</sup> the recommendation of the Visiting Mission that Kiswahili should be made an additional working language in the Legislative Council, to obtain competent interpreters, for example, from Kiswahili to the English language and from the English language into Kiswahili for the purpose of keeping the official records of the Legislative Council.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special representative): I think no difficulty would be experienced. It is a feature of the High Court work that you have to have interpretation from Swahili into English: the judges of the Court work, of course, in English and would not normally have sufficient mastery of Swahili to be able to get on without interpretation, as, of course, magistrates do. Magistrates in the Districts are

/supposed to know

supposed to know Swahili, but Judges of the High Court are not, so that there should be no difficulty in procuring men qualified to interpret between English and Swahili.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): If there is no difficulty in procuring competent interpreters, does not the special representative think that there is then no obstacle to Kiswahili as an official working language in the Legislative Council for the purpose of enabling a greater number of Africans to sit in the Council?

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I would like to ask something here, if Sir George Sanford will excuse me.

Would it not be wise to wait and hear the comments of the Administering Authority on these points that have been raised by the Visiting Mission? I have no comments on the Visiting Mission; there may be a perfect answer to what the representative of the Philippines has suggested. It might be yes or no: I do not know.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): These questions were asked in view of the fact that the special representative was specially invited to participate in these discussions to see whether he could enlighten the Council on certain aspects of the Report. However, if he is not in a position to furnish the necessary information, we shall, of course, have to await the comments of the Administering Authority.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special representative): As I said before, the Swahili language is not properly suited to this kind of debate. It would be extremely difficult to translate some of the laws into the Swahili language and to have an intelligible document in front of you. There is a further objection to the use of Swahili through interpretation which is, of course, that the time occupied in the Council is virtually doubled. Thus, on one side you have the use of the English language -- an intelligible proceeding taking up half the time; on the other, with the use of Swahili as well, double the time is spent on matters which may be unintelligible in the end.

The PRESIDENT: There is no simultaneous interpretation system?

/Sir George SANDFORD

Sir George SANDFORD (Special representative): There is no simultaneous interpretation. That would be quite impossible.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): We should not confine ourselves to making criticisms here, and my delegation would like to take this opportunity to congratulate and pay tribute to the Administering Authority for the policy followed by that Authority: a policy which has entrusted very responsible posts to indigenous inhabitants.

We note that, even when the Administering Authority expresses the wish to increase the number of such responsible posts granted to indigenous inhabitants, the local government explains that there is one obstacle in the path of such achievement -- namely, the absence or scarcity of natives competent to occupy such posts. I should like to know whether, since the Administering Authority has in this way inaugurated a very happy and propitious policy in this field, it could not now provide for, say an administrative school to train the most qualified and gifted natives so that they can attain very high and responsible posts in local government or administration.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special representative): Every step is being taken to improve the facilities for bringing Africans up to a standard of education and attainment to enable them to play their proper part in the higher services of the Territory. There is a reference on page 15 of the Report of the Visiting Mission to certain branches of that work, and it is said that the numbers coming forward are disappointingly small in certain branches -- particularly in the veterinary branch. Here opportunities are available for East Africans to take the diploma in veterinary services, but I think the number of students offering at the present moment is two.

/Insofar as

In so far as training for administrative work is concerned, the first step is to enable the person to take the course at Makerere and I can assure the Council that there is such competition for Africans who have taken the various courses at Makerere that the trouble is to place them in a spot where they will do the most advantageous work.

But all East African territories have vacancies for people with the qualifications which Makerere can give, including the administrative service, the agricultural, medical and veterinary services.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): It might be of interest to my Mexican colleague if I told him that I do not know what the position is in East Africa, but in West Africa it is our practice where a suitable African is available to give him a scholarship and give him a university education in England. Having done that, he is accepted for the colonial service and receives the same training as a young English official gets before he goes out to Africa, going through the same special courses at Oxford or Cambridge before going to his own country again as a public servant in a senior position.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): As regards the students for which we have figures for 1947, it would seem, if I remember correctly, that I read a few days ago in a New York newspaper that if an announcement or an advertisement were put in the newspaper -- this is not a local case or a local instance; the same occurrences take place in all the world and I am just taking this as an abstract example -- to the effect that there were employment opportunities, the same employment opportunities given to a teacher in a primary school, in any country in the world the picture painted would be so somber that no one would accept this type of work which involves very onerous duties and very little pay.

We know that some teachers feel that they are carrying out an apostolate; they have their vocation and they dedicate themselves to this very arduous work without really considering the economic factors.

Since I feel that the question on the true issue was not answered very concretely, namely whether the Administering Authority would prefer to set up a training centre for administrative experts, I should like to ask whether this scarcity of candidates for posts is not due to the fact

/that the salaries



that the salaries offered to natives are much too low and not high enough to elicit interest.

I find that there are more than a thousand students in secondary schools. This would tend to indicate that these students are very gifted natives and that they would be ambitious enough to go further. If the Government had a plan to offer an educational programme and then later a secure post in the administration, I believe that a post such as veterinarian teacher, dispensary aid, or administrator might well be sought by natives if it were accompanied by the offer of a substantial wage.

Does the Administering Authority then consider that it would be possible, independent of setting up a training centre, to offer some more important jobs which would entail more favourable economic conditions? Naturally, this may seem to be looking very far ahead, but some system must be established if the participation of the indigenous inhabitants is to be encouraged in the local administration of the Territory. Otherwise, we shall certainly never attain these ends.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): I do not know what steps are being taken in Tanganyika for the training of African administrative officers. I do know that in another East African territory there is a training centre for African administrative officers and there may be one in Tanganyika of which I have not heard.

With regard to salaries offered, I should tell the Council that a complete revision of salaries has been carried out during the past year and when a representative of Tanganyika arrives, he will be able to give the Council full information.

Mr. BAKR (Iraq): I understand from this Report that the inhabitants of Tanganyika have been divided into three groups: Europeans, Asians and Africans. I should like to ask the Chairman of the Visiting Mission what citizenship do these three groups hold. Are they of the same citizenship or different citizenships?

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): I think that, from the point of view of the Trusteeship Agreement, all the inhabitants of the Territory are placed on an identical legal footing. I do not think that any fundamental distinction

/is found

is found among the various groups of inhabitants in the Territory. What does exist is varying modality to ensure the participation of the respective group in the Legislative Council or in the administration of the township of Dar-es-Salaam.

But from the general legal point of view, I do not think that there is any question of any such differentiation.

Mr. LIN (China): I might say that the inhabitants of Tanganyika are known as "British Protected Persons". Of course, the officials from the United Kingdom are citizens of the United Kingdom.

There remains one question: the status of Asians, mostly Indians and Arabs, in Tanganyika. I am afraid the status of those people will eventually have to be defined more precisely, especially in relation to the trusteeship system, because the Indians and Arabs there are not exactly natives, but many of them were born there.

Thus, they are inhabitants in the sense that they are indigenous because many of them have lived there for generations. So when the Trusteeship Council speaks of natives or indigenous inhabitants, what does the Trusteeship Council precisely mean?

This is a question which remains to be more precisely defined in the future. Perhaps it will be well for the Trusteeship Council to try to co-operate with all the Administering Authorities concerned to define more precisely the status of those people who are not exactly natives of the Trust Territories, but who at the same time have been living there for many generations.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): I understand the legal position to be as stated by the representative of China. The African inhabitants of Tanganyika are "British Protected Persons" and I believe the children of immigrants retain the nationality of their parents, grandparents, and so back. I believe that is the present legal position.

/Mr. BAKR

Mr. BAKR (Iraq): Would it not be more natural and to the benefit of the inhabitants and of the country in general, for a person who has been born in a country or has been in that country for a number of years, to have the same status as the indigenous population of that country?

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): As far as I know they have the same status.

Mr. BAKR (Iraq): If that is the case, I should like to ask why is there this grouping, then, to have different treatment for the same citizens of the same country?

The PRESIDENT: Sir George has stated that people of Asian origin retain the nationality of their forefathers.

It seems to me that that is one of those questions that will have to be resolved not so much by the Council, but perhaps an indication by the Council that it requires some study and remedy will produce some effect on the local administration or legislature to look into the matter.

Mr. BAKR (Iraq): I am raising this question because in examining one of the petitions I have seen that certain Somalis, for example, wanted to be treated as Asians, considering Asians to be superior to Africans, when in my opinion there is nothing of that sort; when Asians, Europeans and Africans should be treated on the same basis.

Why should this be considered? I do not know.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I should like to elicit a clarification in connexion with the question asked by the representative of Mexico regarding the training of indigenous inhabitants for governing the country.

As the special representative has already told us, there are no suitable persons in Tanganyika who could be entrusted with governing the country, and one of the reasons therefor is the inadequacy of the educational system. There is an absence of trained personnel.

Whatever people are there have not received sufficient education and training and therefore are unable to govern the country.

/ However, we have already

However, we have already looked into the question of the ways and means in which officials can be trained from among the indigenous inhabitants. We were told that there was a possibility of indigenous inhabitants joining the British Colonial Service. However, we have not heard any examples of this happening among the indigenous inhabitants of Tanganyika.

One other point, nevertheless, remains unclear. The question is whether the Administering Authority is taking any measures, or whether the Administering Authority is contemplating any measures, with a view to training the indigenous population for participation in governing the country.

Are any measures being elaborated or contemplated with a view to preparing the population of the Trust Territory as such, for the consummation of independence or self-government. Not necessarily through training people for the British Colonial Service, but through preparing and training people for political leadership, for political activities; training indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territory for political leadership?

Are Africans being sent to other countries for educational purposes so as to enable them to study, for example, the constitution of the United Kingdom, or the constitution of territories neighbouring upon the Trust Territory? Are any indigenous inhabitants being sent for training, for instance, to the Union of South Africa, so as to study government there? Or if this is not being done, does the Administering Authority contemplate any measures to that end?

Such information would be most valuable, and if any information is available on that point I would appreciate if it could be supplied to us in concrete form, including the figures, numbers of people sent overseas, where they have been sent, and what is their status now in the life of the Trust Territory. What are they doing now in the Trust Territory after receiving education in the United Kingdom or in the Union of South Africa, or in Southern or Northern Rhodesia or anywhere else. What are they doing now in the Trust Territory?

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission): I could give one example for the benefit of the representative of the Soviet Union.

When the Mission was <sup>near</sup> Shinyanga, it met one of the African members of the Legislative Council of Tanganyika. That African member had a very interesting conversation with me regarding French colonial

/ policy which he

policy, which he criticized in a very lively manner, utilizing arguments which differed from the arguments that are usually brought forth from this Council, but nevertheless the arguments were most interesting ones.

We had a lengthy conversation on technical matters regarding African colonial policy and African colonial administration.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): I think the information asked for can only be obtained from the Government of Tanganyika, and I suggest that the Government might be told what information is requested.

There have, for some years past, been Africans sent to England for special courses, by means of fellowships and conventions given from public funds in Tanganyika, and to take up two of these people who went to England in 1945, the work they were expected to do on return was social service work, and I believe they are at that work now.

One of those people was called Marshall, and it may, I think, be the gentleman who is now in charge of the division of the Chagga Tribe; his name is the same but it may not be the same man. If that is so, then his social service work has become very definitely administrative work in his own area.

/ Mr. SOLDATOV

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Before proceeding to the question of local self-government I should like to elicit the following bit of information from the Special Representative.

I am referring now to the official and non-official members of the Legislative Council who are referred to in this Report. I am interested in the four representatives of the indigenous inhabitants of the Territory. I should like to know specifically how they were named to the Council and who they are in point of status, educationally speaking and otherwise. I should like to know also what exactly is the difference between official and non-official members of the Legislative Council inasmuch as most categories of members -- official and non-official -- are appointed.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): I know personally Chief Abdiel Shangali, one of the African members of the Legislative Council. He is a Chief of one of the sections of the Chagga tribe. You will find him mentioned on page 21 of document T/218/Add.1 as Chairman of the Chagga Council. He is a man of about forty-five years and has been an important member of the Chagga community all his life. He is well-educated, speaks English and is an extremely valuable member of the community.

Another is Chief Kidaha Makwaia who succeeded his father about four years ago as one of the Chiefs in Sukumaland about which we read in the Visiting Mission's Report. Sukumaland is <sup>to the</sup> south of Lake Victoria where development plans are taking place and where federation is also taking place. Chief Kidaha Makwaia will be one of the principal chiefs in that area.

There is also Chief Adam whom I do not know so well. He is a Chief in the Iringa District of the Southern Highlands Province. I cannot remember who the fourth member is.

With regard to the second part of the question--the difference between official and non-official members of the Legislative Council -- the official members may be ex-officio or may be nominated by the Governor. In either event the official member is a member of the public Service and is responsible for the administration of the services committed to his charge and in so far as an ex-officio member may also be a member of the Executive Council he is one of the Governor's principal advisers in the

/Executive Council

Executive Council.

A non-official member is a person who does not hold office in the public services. A non-official member may not occupy an office paid for from public funds. He therefore has no responsibility for the administration of the department and his function is to give advice on the various matters which come before the Legislative Council and to communicate to the Council the views of himself and those with whom he has come into contact on the wisdom of the measure in relation to the affairs of the Territory.

The difference in effect is that the official member is paid from public funds and the non-official member is not. The official member has responsibility for some branch of administration or for some <sup>public</sup> work in the Territory while the non-official member is a person not in the public service.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): But how are these non-official members appointed? In Tanganyika, after all, there are numerous tribes, numerous Tribal Councils. However four specific non-official members to the Legislative Council were selected. Now how were they selected? What was the principle of selection among numerous possibilities? How did the Governor decide that it is these four specific representatives of the indigenous population who shall be the members of the Legislative Council rather than any four others, or representatives of some other tribes or representatives of some social organization of the Territory. This is another point I should like clarified.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): The Governor would make his nomination after consulting with his advisers both in Dar-es-Salaam and in the provinces. The process would be that the Provincial Commissioner would be asked for information about people who were qualified and suitable as members of the Legislative Council from his province. That would extend to each province. He would consider the matter with the people in his province and would let the Governor know whether or not there were people suitable. He would also make his recommendation about the selection of a nomination.

/Mr. SOLDATOV

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): In the Report of the Visiting Mission on page 16 there is a passage which refers to possible provincial local self-government -- the possibility of Provincial Councils, I believe. Does the Special Representative or does the United Kingdom representative have any information in addition to the information contained in the Visiting Mission's Report regarding the contemplated structure of provincial organs of self-government? How does the Administering Authority contemplate the participation of the indigenous population in these Councils if and when they are established? How will such representation of the indigenous population be organized? Will the members of these Provincial Councils be appointive or elective. If appointive who will be the appointing authority? If elective how will the franchise be organized and how will the elections be organized for such Provincial Councils and who will participate therein?

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): I have not received any information about the most recent intention of the Tanganyika Government in relation to the appointment of Provincial Councils except for the fact that the plans are to appoint a Provincial Council in the Lake Province in the first instance, which I understand is imminent, but I have not been told what the constitution of that Council is likely to be nor how the members would be appointed. I think I am correct, however, in assuming that appointment to that Council would be done in close consultation with the native authorities in the area.

I cannot give detailed information because it has not come to my notice.

/Mr. BAKR (Iraq)



Mr. BAKR (Iraq): On page 24 of the Report of the Visiting Mission, reference is made to the Sukumaland Federation. I would like to ask the special representative whether there is any tendency in the country to develop such federation in other parts of Tanganyika.

On page 25 of the report, in commenting on this Federation, the Visiting Mission states, at the end of the fourth paragraph, that "The Sukumaland Federal Council is essentially a federation of Chiefs, not a federation of federations."

Is there any tendency towards developing that federation into a real federation and not to remain as a federation of chiefs only?

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): In reply to the first question, I think it has been made clear in the Visiting Mission's Report and in the report by the Administering Authority on Tanganyika that the conditions in Sukumaland are rather special conditions which lend themselves to a form of federation such as is being worked out now.

There may well be other instances in Tanganyika where a similar form of federation or something on the same lines may prove practicable, but just in a rapid review of the Territory as I know it, I cannot at the moment think of any area where conditions so clearly indicate the desirability of a federation of this kind.

The conditions in Sukumaland, as I have said, are particularly suitable to this development. There is a dense population occupying a comparatively small area; so far as my recollection goes, the area is about 20,000 square miles and the population about 1,000,000. I can safely say that there is no part of Tanganyika which has 1,000,000 people on 20,000 square miles. There is no other part of Tanganyika which has those precise conditions.

With regard to the second question, I am not quite clear what this differentiation means. It is a fact that in Sukumaland the native authority has tended to be, as it were, an individual who consulted whom he wished on such matters as he wished; and to that extent I think it is true to say

/that the

that the Sukumaland Federal Council is essentially a federation of chiefs, that is to say it is a federation of native authorities. I am not quite so clear what a federation of federations would be.

The fact of the matter is that in Sukumaland the arrangements being made are arrangements under which the affairs of the Wasukuma can be viewed as a whole in a federation, as well as being examined as it has been in the past by each native authority in respect of the sphere of jurisdiction of that native authority.

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission):

I quite agree that these terms may be somewhat obscure, that is, when we read that the Federal Council of Sukumaland is not a federation of federations. This simply means that the Federation of Sukumaland rests on the territorial units which are governed by chiefs.

The basic unit of the Federation of Sukumaland is not, therefore, organizations which would already be established on a popular or on a federated basis. Nonetheless, according to the plans of the Administering Authority, the rather arbitrary or authoritative character underlying the federative system would be corrected or remedied by consultation which would cover the villages as a whole and which would therefore set up -- quite aside from the executive Council of Chiefs -- a sort of popular chamber which would represent the populations of the federation as a whole.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish):

I know that I am now going to speak on a subject which has already been discussed to some extent at least in the Council and on which unfortunately no agreement was reached.

I am referring to this policy of retaining the tribal system and of developing through and by this system some sort of governmental organs -- a policy which has been followed by the Administering Authority in the past.

/According to

According to the Report of the Visiting Mission it would seem that under native administration the tribal chiefs can dispose of unused public funds and can furthermore be magistrates and act in the courts.

It would seem to us that such a system may well seem a very felicitous one when the man who has such authority is a veritable patriarch, such as often occurred in the Bible and at times in history and in actual fact; that is to say, the leader takes care of his people as he would take care of his children and promote the welfare of all.

However, history and practical experience would show that the tribal system cannot lead to anything but a more or less happy feudal system, since it necessarily entails the abuse of power and other inherent vices. That is to say, we cannot have in any Territory such a situation in which some single men have complete control and authority and are really simply exercising police powers.

I would not be so brazen as to apply this general reflection to the situation prevailing in Tanganyika. If we are here in this Council sponsoring the aims of the Trusteeship System, namely, self-government, then this system may well rest as the basis of the Government itself if this possibility is contemplated -- namely, that the native administration is to be the basis for the local development of such governmental organs.

If I have outlined the present defect of the tribal system and the native administration, I should like to know, in reply, what sort of control is in the hands of the Administering Authority to prevent abuses on the part of tribal chiefs. If the tribal chiefs are empowered to handle public funds and to handle local justice, it would be extremely easy for these <sup>chiefs</sup> /under one guise or another, to imprison an individual, for instance, quite arbitrarily and so in this way to eliminate any opponent of the tribal chief's policy.

What I should like to know is, what is the policy followed by the Administering Authority to preserve this tribal system and to prevent the abuses which might well arise in this feudal system.

/Sir Alan BURNS:

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I am afraid I must join issue with the representative of Mexico on the merits of the tribal organization. He is perfectly correct in saying that if the chiefs are allowed a free hand in the administration of the native authorities' finances and in the control of the courts, there might be corruption.

But it is precisely the function of the officers of the Administering Authority to see that that corruption does not exist, to keep a constant watch on the native authorities and to see that they do their job honestly and without in any way oppressing the people. No doubt certain chiefs will abuse their positions, but they cannot go very far without an efficient official, who is watching the situation, knowing what is going on <sup>and</sup> putting a stop to it.

The real problem before us in this question of tribal authorities is to democratize the native administrations, and the Government is taking steps to do so. Measures have been taken which, in the opinion of the Administering Authority, represent the maximum advance for which we can formulate plans at the present time. The method and direction of further advance in this matter has largely to be determined by experience gained in actual working, and the Council can be assured that as opportunities offer for a further advance, those opportunities will be taken.

There is one thing I think we have got to be careful about: we must be careful in developing self-government (local or any other form) not to move too far ahead of the people. If we go so far ahead that the people do not understand what is going on, it is going to lead to much worse confusion and much more abuse than is possible today.

I may say that I am convinced that if the Visiting Mission had been able to see more of the Territory and the astonishing variety of its peoples -- a variety which exists in all African territories -- they would have appreciated more clearly the extreme difficulty of securing at this stage representation of the masses of the people of a kind which would be at once effective and satisfactory to them, and would have appreciated that a gradual approach to these questions is inevitable. We cannot bring the people of tropical Africa in a few minutes to the stage of democracy which countries in other parts of the world have already reached.

The PRESIDENT: I think, in this connexion, it would be of  
/interest

interest for the Council to note the observation of the Visiting Mission which appears on page 33 of its Report. There it is stated:

"It is also the view of the Mission that the present dual system of Central Government and Native Administration should at some point merge into one along the road of political advancement."

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the latter statement of the representative of the United Kingdom, I should like to know what concrete measures have been taken by the Administering Authority toward the democratization of the tribal system, as he called it. Could the actual facts of such measures be listed, and could we learn what have been the results of such measures, wherever taken, so that we might learn what has been done, where, how and what have been the results of such action?

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I know that steps have been taken, but I am afraid I am not in a position to give the details. I do not know whether the special representative can.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): I suggest that should be referred to the Government of Tanganyika also.

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): As was made quite clear in the Report, the Visiting Mission studied particularly and was in very close contact with the Sukumaland Federation and with the Chagga Council.

As regards the Chagga Council, we already had there some very comprehensive and exhaustive discussions which take place among the various members of this organ. Certain members of the Visiting Mission had some very long conversations and exchanged their views with the Chagga Council, which left members of the Mission with the impression that this was a very strong organization which was perfectly well adapted to the powers entrusted to it; that is to say, to the administration of local matters and to the settlement of local issues.

It would seem, therefore, that very little would need to be done; that simple evolution should be followed to make of the Chagga Council

/a truly

a truly democratic organization, since even today it is quite clear that this Council fully reflects the deep-seated interests of the country.

As regards the Sukumaland Federation, the Visiting Mission dealt particularly with the Executive Council of this Federation -- a Council which comprises personalities who are usually inspired with a good deal of common sense and who usually have some store of wit at their disposal. It is probable, and I even believe that it is necessary, that new measures will have to be added in the future, particularly that measure which it would seem has been contemplated by the Administering Authority, namely, election by villages. Such measures would have to be taken if the Sukumaland Federation is to become something which would really be called a democratic, popular organ, properly speaking.

These are the two instances which were studied with particular care. We also got in touch with the Arusha Council, but unfortunately, we only had some very brief conversations with members of that Council, and so we are not able to have any very clear-cut views on this subject as we had as regards the Sukumaland Federation and the Chagga Council.

Finally, near Tabora members of the Mission also met two members of a regional organization, and their impression was not particularly deep. It seemed to members of the Mission as a matter of fact made clear in the Report that much would still have to be done, many steps ahead yet taken until such an organization could reflect and meet the interests of the indigenous population and reflect popular opinion in any genuine fashion.

The PRESIDENT: I think the Council may also note on this point the paraphrase that appears on page 34 of the Visiting Mission's Report giving a quotation of a memorandum by the local administration in which the Secretary for African Affairs states:

"The general direction of development will undoubtedly be towards aggregation of smaller into larger units and increasing democratization, but cannot be expected to extend beyond tribal limits for some <sup>time</sup> yet."

It seems to me that answers the question just now asked by the representative of the USSR.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Inter-  
/-pretation from

pretation from Russian): I have the following questions to ask of the Chairman of the Visiting Mission. How is the Chagga Council formed? What is its membership? What is the membership of the Chagga Native Authority Council? Does that Council proceed to any consultation with the indigenous population of that province? Could the Chairman of the Visiting Mission tell us whether it can be said that any particular decision of the Council enjoyed the approval of any section of the population of that province at least, and if so, in what form was such approval expressed?

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: Without prejudicing any reply which the Chairman of the Visiting Mission may wish to give, I would like to refer the Council and the representative of the USSR to page 26 of the Visiting Mission's Report. There the reorganization of the Chagga Native Authority Council is discussed fairly fully.

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): The President has really taken the words out of my mouth. I was going to say, as he did, that the composition of the Chagga Native Authority Council is referred to in clear-cut terms on page 26 of our Report, and I must say I see very little to add to what is already embodied in this Report.

As a matter of fact I do not want to trust my memory in this respect. The Council has before it the Report which was drawn up according to the notes taken on the spot, and therefore the risk of errors or omissions is far less, in the case of the Report.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): It seems to me that the fears of the Chairman of the Visiting Mission are not well taken, because I do not request him to read the Report again. I was asking for additional information.

If he cannot tell us anything else regarding the membership of the Chagga Native Authority Council, then he might still be able to give us some information as to the consultation of the indigenous population by that Council before any decisions are taken. There is no reason to dread any mistake if such information is available. If the information, of course, is not available, then that is just too bad, because it would have been quite useful to clarify this particular issue.

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): If the question is not aimed at the composition of the Chagga Native Authority Council, but simply asks what was the impression of members of the Visiting Mission when they got in touch with this Council, I am quite ready to dwell upon this latter subject.

Members of the Visiting Mission did have a rather lengthy conversation, which lasted several hours, with members of the Council.

/During this



During this conversation we noted that in general, whenever we asked members of the Council questions relating to their own interests -- that is, not only the interests of the Chagga area but of the northern area of Tanganyika as a whole -- we were faced with very competent answers. Members of the Council were extremely well informed and were fully conversant with all these matters, and at times they would bring to their consideration of these various problems and issues the sort of mentality that is found in a country lawyer; that is to say, a very acute critical spirit and a great deal of memory, to boot.

On the other hand, when the Visiting Mission endeavoured to bring up entirely general issues which went far beyond the boundaries of Tanganyika Territory itself, then, in these cases, we found that the members of this Council were not accustomed to discussing problems of this nature.

We felt therefore that we should not note very great progress on such points. Certainly, the way in which questions are put, the way in which issues are tackled, and the way in which, as I say, these points were raised by the Visiting Mission, was entirely alien to the views of members of the Chagga Native Authority Council. We would have risked very serious misunderstanding if we had continued to discuss this type of subject matter.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Apparently we must understand the reply of the Chairman of the Visiting Mission as meaning that he does not have any information as to whether or how the Council consults with the indigenous population in adopting any decision with respect to any issue within its competence.

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): On the contrary, we had a very clear-cut impression that members of the Chagga Native Authority Council were very deeply entrenched, if I may use the term, in their local customs. There was not a single gesture on their part which did not result directly from consultation with their population.

This is the impression which was felt by all members of the Visiting Mission and which impressed them very deeply, namely, that there was a complete community of ideas between members of the Chagga

/Native Authority

Native Authority Council and the population of the country as a whole -- the despite the fact that the consultative procedure was perhaps not organized according to very strictly laid down rules. This, however, is immaterial. The fact remains that as it stands the Council certainly would seem to reflect the views of the country's population extremely accurately, and to synthesize the views held by inhabitants of that region. That was the general impression gained by members of the Visiting Mission, and, as I said previously, this was the result of a very long conversation with members of the Council.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I should like to refer to what I said yesterday. I think that the Council will agree that the exchange of views this afternoon were very interesting, but that such exchanges of view might have been more useful if we had been discussing the Annual Report on Tanganyika Territory. It would have been very interesting to compare that Report with the Report of the Visiting Mission.

What are we doing here today? Are we not just wasting time? All of these discussions will resume in exactly the same form when we take up the Annual Report on Tangayika. What is the scope of this discussion now? That is what I ask.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): It seems to me that there is a clear-cut difference between discussing a report of the Administering Authority and the Report of the Visiting Mission: that difference is exactly the same as the difference between discussing the auto-biography of a man, or an interview made by a neutral interviewer.

When we discuss the report of the Administering Authority, we are really confronted only with the views of that Administering Authority. On the other hand, when we <sup>are</sup> discussing a report such as this -- and I should very much like to congratulate the Chairman and members of the Visiting Mission for the remarkable documents in the Report -- in this latter case we have facts, we have documentation, we have impartial observations which could never be included in the report of the Administering Authority, however generous and impartial that Administrative Authority's Report may endeavour to be.

We find, for instance, that there is a separate conclusion on the part of the Visiting Mission as regards petitions, and we are then in a /position to

position to judge on these petitions, especially because we have the views expressed by members of the Visiting Mission on these points.

I believe that if the Council is to act in equity, if it is to act concretely and separately when it is undertaking the discussion of a Visiting Mission, it takes a decision on the petitions which were submitted to members of that Mission in the light of such a report and the clarifications sent in by members of that Mission.

/I do not believe

I therefore do not believe that we are wasting our time. Rather are we at present doing the most effective work which has ever been carried out by any organ or Council of the United Nations.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I quite agree with the representative of Mexico as regards the value and importance and also the significance of the Report of the Visiting Mission. What I aver is that we ought to discuss the annual report on the Trust Territory of Tanganyika in the light of the observations and findings of the Visiting Mission. In that case the observations and findings of the Visiting Mission might enlighten the facts given in the report of the Administering Authority and perhaps rectify those facts and, in that case, additional information might usefully be requested of the members of the Visiting Mission in order to cast some light on both the Report of the Visiting Mission and the report of the Administering Authority.

However, as we are proceeding now we will simply have to repeat the whole of today's discussion when we take up the annual report of the Administering Authority of the Trust Territory of Tanganyika. I simply say that we could do both things together. We should consider the annual report in the light of the Report of the Visiting Mission.

The PRESIDENT: I think the members of the Council recall what I stated several times when we were discussing the Report of the Visiting Mission on Ruanda-Urundi. I emphasized the difference between the Report of the Visiting Mission and the report of the Administering Authority and urged the representatives to confine their observations, so far as possible to the consideration of the findings of the Visiting Mission's Report in order to see whether the Council agrees with the observations and questions raised in the findings of the Visiting Mission.

It seems to me that we are receiving a report from the Visiting Mission and it would not be as useful as it might be if we were to examine it in the same manner as we would examine the annual report; that is, by asking detailed questions of the special representative. As I see it, Sir George Sandford is here as the special representative, not so much to answer questions in regard to information, but more to present the Administering Authority's comments on the report in the course of the discussion. The rules of procedure do not provide for a special representative to give detailed replies in regard to the conditions of the Territory. I am not saying that he cannot do so but...

/Sir Alan BURNS

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I should like to correct a misapprehension. Sir George Sandford is certainly not here because the Administering Authority wants him here. I thought that, as an act of courtesy to the Council, I should ask him to come here and serve. We did not receive the same courtesy when we asked that the matter be deferred until we were in a position to reply. Sir George Sandford, if anything, is here in the form of a "coal of fire".

The PRESIDENT: That is what I was trying to explain; that Sir George is here to assist the Council in its examination of the Report of the Visiting Mission and that is the exact position of the special representative in the examination of any report from the Administering Authority.

Therefore it seems to me that it would not be quite fair to address questions regarding statistics or other detailed information in connexion with that Territory.

I have called the attention of the representatives to the paper prepared by the Secretariat classifying the various petitions which raise a general problem in connexion with the various chapters of the report. During the discussion, although the questions seem to have a bearing on the general questions raised in the petitions, no reference has been made to these petitions. I can only presume that the representatives already have in mind the general issues and have asked questions in regard to them. I am not asking that the Council take any decision in regard to the petitions but I believe that the discussion in regard to those issues was merged in the discussion of relevant chapters of the report.

The meeting will now recess until 5:00 p.m.

The meeting recessed at 4:35 p.m. and resumed at 5:05

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: We will continue to consider Chapter I of the Report of the Visiting Mission.

Again I think the representative of Belgium quite rightly pointed out that there is a difference between the Report of the Visiting Mission and the Annual Report of the Administering Authority, and I think that in considering this Report it would be well for representatives to confine their attention as far as possible to the study and consideration of the observations and findings of the Visiting Mission.

Mr. SCLEROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): My question relates to Chapter II, so perhaps I should wait until all the questions are asked with respect to Chapter I.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any further observations on Chapter I on political advancement or any question in connexion with the petitions which are related to problems contained in that Chapter?

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I believe that the text of the petitions which we have here relating to political advancement is quite clear, and we have already discussed this matter sufficient length so that it is not necessary to dwell upon it any

I should like to suggest, therefore, that the Council either verbatim or with a few slight changes, all that part which relates to observations and conclusions reached by the Visiting Mission in respect, and that this be therefore referred to the Administering

The PRESIDENT: Do I understand then that the representative of Mexico moves that the Council approve the observations of the Visiting Mission in connexion with the petitions as set forth by pages in document T/273? Is that his motion?

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I am referring to this: I suggest that the Council adopt the observations and conclusions in those paragraphs which are relevant of document T/273, pages 32, 33, 34, 35, etc. I would suggest that we should take from document D, entitled "Observations and Conclusions", those parts which refer to the petitions relating to political advancement. It seems to me that

/there can be

there can be no clearer recommendation to the Administering Authority than these recommendations, observations and conclusions sent on to us by members of the Visiting Mission.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: It has been moved by the representative of Mexico that the Council, in connexion with the petitions, approves the observations and recommendations of the Visiting Mission as set forth on pages 32-37 of its Report.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I have observations to make on the various petitions that are before us and I really cannot accept that an ex parte statement like this should be approved by the Council without any opportunity for the Administering Authority to make comments on it.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think that I have indicated that there is no such opportunity.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): What are the proposals? I do not know to which parts of the petitions reference is made.

The PRESIDENT: The parts referred to were contained in document T/273. The Council will recall that the representative of Belgium suggested yesterday that we should consider the petitions in conjunction with the relevant chapters of the Visiting Mission's Report.

The Secretariat has prepared this document setting forth the issues raised in the petitions. In Chapter I of the Report, Political Advancement, the petition from twenty-two Shinyanga Township Africans stated that the native authorities should be given more power to conduct their own affairs. The Visiting Mission's observations are contained on pages 32 to 37 of the Visiting Mission's Report.

The second petition is the petition from the Tanganyika Bahaya Union, which stated that in order that the native administration of the Territory as a whole might be better integrated they should be provided with a provisional high court and a central treasury. The Visiting Mission's observations are on pages 33 to 35 of its Report.

The proposal of the representative of Mexico was that, in regard to these general problems raised in the petitions, the Council approve the relevant passages of the Report of the Visiting Mission.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): We have not received the observations of the Administering Authority, have we?

(The PRESIDENT)



The PRESIDENT: The observations of the Administering Authority in regard to these petitions? Rule 86 of our rules of procedure states:

"Any observations on petitions which the Administering Authority desires to have circulated to members of the Trusteeship Council should, wherever possible, be transmitted to the Secretary-General not less than fourteen days before the opening of the session at which such petitions will be considered."

Mr. HINGLES (Philippines): Perhaps the matter may be further clarified if information is requested from the Secretary-General as to when these petitions were sent to the Administering Authority.

The PRESIDENT: Some of these petitions were received through the Visiting Mission and I believe these petitions were contained in document T/218/Add.1, dated 8 November 1948.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I am perfectly prepared to discuss any petition as a whole, but it is quite impossible for me to jump from this paper to another paper and then back again to the petition and be expected to give any coherent reply.

I have here the petition from the Shinyanga Township Africans which deals with several subjects. But if I have to jump from the paper which has just been put before us, document T/273, to the Report of the Visiting Mission and then to this petition, it is quite impossible for me to deal with it effectively.

The PRESIDENT: May I ask if the Council recalls the procedure adopted in regard to the petitions raised in connexion with the Visiting Mission's Report on Ruanda-Urundi?

This present paper is not intended to substitute for the original petitions. It was prepared by the Secretariat to help the Council by using it for purposes of reference; to give the Council in a condensed form the subject raised, the observations of the local administrations if any, and the observations of the Visiting Mission--to tell the Council where it can find the relevant observations of the Visiting Mission. This paper certainly does not substitute for the original petitions.

/Therefore,

Therefore, if any observations are called for, the observations should be in reference to those petitions, and if the representative of the United Kingdom would like to refer to those petitions, he can call the Council's attention to them.

I am not laying down any fast rule. If the representative of the United Kingdom would like to take up the petitions individually, I am quite prepared to do so.

The proposal emanated yesterday from the representative of Belgium, and I also agreed with him that these questions could be properly and conveniently taken up in conjunction with the relevant chapters of the Report because they refer to matters of general and public concern. But, in forming its conclusions, the Council should properly consider the individual petitions.

The representative of Mexico moved, and I repeat his proposal for the convenience of the Council, that if matters have been discussed this afternoon and if no further discussion is necessary, the Council may give general approval to the relevant observations of the Visiting Mission. That is the proposition before the Council.

I do not think it would be relevant to impeach the Chair for the procedural part of it.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): As regards the observations of the Visiting Mission, it seems to me that in general these observations are very well taken and very judicious. I therefore agree that such observations should be transmitted to the Administering Authority, and that the Administering Authority should be requested to give due consideration to these observations.

As far as I am concerned, I would fervently hope that the Administering Authority will advise us as to what measures it deemed necessary to take following the observations and suggestions sent to it by the Visiting Mission. I would not be prepared today, however, to assume responsibility for saying that I wholeheartedly agree to and endorse all the suggestions put forward by the Visiting Mission.

The Visiting Mission also invites the Administering Authority to comply with these observations and implies that if the Administering Authority does not abide by such conclusions, it is coming into conflict with the Trusteeship Council. These would be the general implications of endorsing, without any reservations whatsoever, the observations of the Visiting Mission. This is a very heavy responsibility which I personally am not prepared to take because I do not know what the Administering Authority may have to reply.

/At first

At first I thought that all these comments and observations seemed quite commonsensical, but I should like first of all to have the views of the Administering Authority before endorsing all these observations.

I therefore feel that the Trusteeship Council would act advisably in thanking the Visiting Mission for the admirable work it has carried out, by transmitting these comments to the Administering Authority, by inviting the Administering Authority to give due consideration to these observations and to reply to us at a later stage as to what measures have been taken to comply with these suggestions. Where the Administering Authority sees fit to comply with these suggestions it will certainly do so.

Wherever this may not be the case we will certainly be informed as to the reasons therefor.

We can therefore take a decision as between the suggestions of the Visiting Mission and the objections of the Administering Authority, and we may then say, perhaps, that despite the objections raised by the Administering Authority we wish to maintain and stress the views advanced by the Visiting Mission.

However I believe it would be very premature to do this at this stage.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I do not wish here to offend either Sir Alan or Sir George, both of whom represent the Administering Authority here, and we are here at this session to hear their views as regards the conclusions and observations reached by the Visiting Mission.

I believe that we have departed from our usual procedure when we discussed the annual report of the Administering Authority. Here rather we have followed the procedure of asking questions of the special representative.

What we should really do here is this: the Chair should ask the Administering Authority and the special representative what are their observations and comments on the report of the Visiting Mission. That is what is proper and appropriate here.

If there are no comments or observations on the part of the representatives of the Administering Authority - and we have two representatives of that Authority here - then there is no problem, and the objection referred to by the representative of Belgium would be / done away with.

done away with.

Since some members of the Council had some questions on the observations and conclusions and on the documentation sent down to by the Visiting Mission, <sup>such</sup> questions may clarify our conclusions.

All this is very well, but I believe that first of all we should ask the Administering Authority what are their comments as regards Chapter I of the Report of the Visiting Mission to Tanganyika. After this has been done, we can then, and only then, embark upon a discussion of the petitions referring to Chapter I.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I do not believe that the representative of Mexico is quite aware of the position.

If I understood correctly, Sir George Sandford is here, and he consented, very generously, to enlighten us on some points on which his views might be of service to the Council.

But if you ask him whether or not the government of Tanganyika Territory or the government of the United Kingdom are in agreement with any particular suggestion of the Visiting Mission, then he can reply in one way, that he has no instructions in that respect.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I have never understood that we were here, plenipotentiaries, to decide whether the government is in agreement or is not in agreement with any point which may be raised in the Council.

What is perfectly clear is that this document was distributed in November - it is dated 8 November 1948. We were perfectly well aware that we were going to deal with this document at this session and we are doing just that now.

I do not believe that the observations and conclusions reached by the Visiting Mission in this chapter are of such a nature that Sir Alan or Sir George cannot give us the views of the Administering Authority there upon. I am sure they are empowered to do so.

This is not a question of whether we accept or agree to these conclusions or not. Perhaps none of the points raised here are really agreeable to or acceptable to the Administering Authority. The Administering Authority can tell us this in the near or the more distant future. But I do not believe that we have received any affirmative answers here. I have rarely heard the Administering Authority answer / affirmatively.

affirmatively. Usually they reserve their position. We should, however, hope for some approval. What we would like to have, I think, is comments, not necessarily approval or disapproval at this stage.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I am not trying to hold up any discussion. I am most anxious we should get on with the job. But I really do not understand what is proposed now.

Let me take the first item here, a petition from the Shinyanga Township Africans.

This petition is quoted in paper T/273 page 2. It is stated that native authorities should be given power to conduct their own affairs.

That remark is extracted from a sort of aside in the petition T/Pet.2/51. They say: "While we are on this point - that is the point of education - we wish the whole African public and not the few as at present, to be allowed a fair part in the administration of their country."

That is the comment. We then find the observations of the Visiting Mission, paragraph 2. The petitioners ask that the native authorities be given more power to run their own affairs and that African opinion be consulted by the Administrations

General observations of the Visiting Mission on that subject will be found in the report in the chapter on Political Advancement.

We have now gone to three different papers. I have not got the time now to say whether I agree with all the particulars recommended in Chapter I.

The Visiting Mission has made a specific comment on the petition that is before us, the Shinyanga petition. How can I accept a motion now that everything that is said in Chapter I should be endorsed?

The PRESIDENT: From the point of view of conducting the consideration of petitions, it is true there are three papers involved, but actually there is only one petition which raises the issue, and the Visiting Mission's Report, which makes comments on it.

The third paper is prepared by the Secretariat only for the convenience of the members. If they do not like to refer to that document, they still have the petition and the Visiting Mission's Report. In other words they can go through the Report and they can find the relevant passages in reference to the petition.

/ If the Council feels

If the Council feels that there are too many papers, I would like to say that if we do have to wait for the observations of the Administering Authority, we will have a fourth paper.

At the moment it seems to me that the situation before the Council is this: each petition raises several questions. How are you going to consider that petition. / <sup>Part of</sup> the petitioner refers to political matter and Chapter I of the Visiting Mission's Report refers to political advancement.

Therefore, as I think the representative of Belgium rightly pointed out, it is convenient, as well as relevant, to consider that part of the petition in conjunction with that Chapter which deals with the same problem.

/ Therefore the Council

Therefore the Council can form its opinion or fail to form its opinion on political matters. Then the next part of a petition may deal with education and that part can be decided on by the Council when it considers the chapter of the Visiting Mission's Report dealing with education.

When these decisions are taken together they reflect the Council's opinion on the petition as a whole. Now it seems to me that the situation is not as complicated as it may appear to be.

Mr. SAKRE (United States): As I see the situation it is not a question of having too many documents before us but rather a much simpler issue. I am not too clear in my own mind whether -- as I read on the agenda "Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to East Africa; Tanganyika" -- we are now considering document T/218, T/218/Corr.1 or T/273 or a combination of all. I imagine that we should determine clearly -- and it seems to me there is a little confusion in our minds -- whether we are considering the Report of the Visiting Mission or whether we are considering the petitions received by the Visiting Mission.

As to the Report of the Visiting Mission I take it that we agree, although I am not quite sure, that we will handle that question as we handled the Report of the Visiting Mission on Ruanda-Urundi, namely that we will not reach definite and final conclusions on the recommendations of the Report until we have heard the comments of the Administering Authority. I think we all agree on that; in other words that we defer taking action on the Report until next session as we have agreed to do with regard to Ruanda-Urundi.

If that be true it seems to me that it would follow that we would defer taking action on parts of the Report. If I correctly understood the motion of my colleague from Mexico it was that we answer this first petition mentioned in document T/273, namely the petition from twenty-two Shinyanga Township Africans (T/PET.2/51), with the reply that we endorse the recommendations contained in pages 32 to 37 of the Report. That seems to me to be confusing the issue if we have not yet determined how we are going to deal with the Report. If we have decided to defer consideration of the Report until the June session this would not seem like the time for us to endorse pages 32 to 37 of the Report because those recommendations are among the more important -- if not the most important -- recommendations in the Report. I am wondering why we do not handle  
/this question

this question as we handled the question of the petitions received with regard to Ruanda-Urundi; that is to say, it would seem as though this is not the time to determine whether we endorse or do not endorse these recommendations.

Parenthetically I might say that the recommendations seem to me to be good and when the time comes I expect to vote in favour of most of them. On the other hand, it does not seem to me that the time has yet come to endorse either the Report or parts of the Report. The Report is not before us now for definitive consideration.

Why can we not answer these petitioners that so far as the public issues are concerned we are discussing them, we are considering them and that we have not yet and will not reach decisions with regard to those recommendations until our June session.

In other words, can we not follow the same proceeding that we decided to follow in the case of Ruanda-Urundi in which case I would find great difficulty in voting for the motion proposed by the representative of Mexico. That is the way the situation would seem to me procedurally to be before us and I merely declare my views for what they are worth.

The PRESIDENT: Before I call upon other representatives may I say that procedurally the Chair also not only has quite a clear conception of this but also has a very open mind.

The procedure in regard to <sup>the Report on</sup> Ruanda-Urundi and petitions may be followed in this case but I would like to remind the Council that in the case of petitions relating to Ruanda-Urundi there was a resolution, for instance, on racial discrimination. Because that issue was raised in certain petitions the Council saw fit to adopt a resolution independently of any endorsement of the observations of the Visiting Mission.

It seems to me, therefore, that the Council may -- I am not saying that the Council should -- in regard to this issue raised in these petitions, namely the question of participation by the indigenous population in the political and administrative organs of the Trust Territory, d e s i r e to endorse or to adopt the same view as the Visiting Mission. That is for the Council to decide.

On the other hand, the Council may want to decide to reply to the petitioners as was suggested by the representative of the United States ~~that~~ these questions have been raised in the petitions and /have been discussed



have been discussed by the Council in conjunction with the Visiting Mission's Report and that no definite conclusions have been arrived at and will not be until the Council shall have a further opportunity to examine the Report at its next session. That is another way of replying to the petition.

It is entirely for the Council to decide but eventually I think the procedure would be the same as we have followed in regard to Ruanda-Urundi.

Now, I cannot understand why, procedurally, the Council feels confused. Yesterday at this time the representative of Belgium, recalling the experience of the Council in relation to the petitions regarding Ruanda-Urundi, suggested that <sup>these</sup> issues should be considered in conjunction with relevant chapters of the Mission's Report. I agree with him because I also recall that when the petitions relating to Ruanda-Urundi were discussed the Council was already some days away from the discussion of the relevant parts of the Report and there was great difficulty and confusion.

/It seems to me that

It seems to me that these issues can be discussed as issues and not as petitions. That is why I believe the representative of Belgium -- and I agree with him -- proposed that procedure. And when the representative of the Soviet Union proposed that instead of following that procedure -- instead of discussing the petitions in conjunction with the relevant chapters of the Visiting Mission's Report -- the Council should defer consideration of the petitions until after the whole Report was examined (and precisely twenty-four hours ago the Council did not seem to support that opinion of the representative of the Soviet Union), that was how the question of procedure arose.

I only say that to clarify the situation.

Sir Alan BUTTS (United Kingdom): I want to make my own position quite clear if I can.

I have told the Council that I have not got the comments of His Majesty's Government on the Visiting Mission's Report. I am therefore not prepared to do more than we have been doing to-day -- helping where I can without making any comments on the Mission's Report.

But I have got the material to deal with the various petitions as they come along, and I am prepared to do so at any time the President likes. But when the representative of Mexico moves a resolution to sweep all of these petitions insofar as they relate to political advancement into one bag and to deal with them by saying that we endorse everything that has been said by the Visiting Mission in Chapter I, then I find myself unable to deal with the situation and I do not think that is the proper way to deal with it.

I cannot see any reason why I should be expected to agree to a general endorsement of a long chapter in the Visiting Mission's Report before my Government has had any opportunity to put forward its observations.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico): I believe that it is quite logical for the Mexican delegation, when we deal with petitions relating to political advancement, to refer to the very  
/authoritative

authoritative views advanced by a Visiting Mission which was composed in such a way as to guarantee complete impartiality and objectivity to the Administering Authority.

Certainly the Administering Authority cannot suspect that the manner in which this Report was drawn up and the terms of this Report comprise anything to which the Administering Authority could take exception since, after all, there was a representative of the Administering Authority on the Visiting Mission. Therefore the general conclusions reached by the Visiting Mission would necessarily be in some conformity with the policies followed by the Administering Authority in the Trust Territory.

The Mexican delegation, therefore, upon dealing with the petitions relating to political advancement, takes as a basis for the reply to be given to the petitioners, the conclusions of the Visiting Mission and this, as I said before, is quite logical it seems to me.

I consider that the views voiced by the representative of the United States and his suggestion to settle the question of petitions would result in our really not discharging our responsibilities -- we would be simply washing our hands of the whole matter.

What is the position of the Council as regards the petitioners, <sup>and</sup> as regards their petitions relating to some matters falling within the purview of the Administering Authority? I believe the Council must give some view to the Administering Authority, and what better views do we have than these conclusions which are the result of a compromise among the various members represented on the Visiting Mission? I do not believe there is any serious objection to such a procedure. I believe that we should try to get out of this vicious circle and we should not overlook the precedents which we have established in the past.

Let us be a little more practical, and let us work in a little greater haste. If we postpone the study of this matter until the next session, then this will simply mean that we have much more work before us and will be much more burdened with work at the next session, and that will simply complicate

/the life

the life of those members who not only sit here but must sit during the General Assembly.

Since we have time for this, I believe that we should try to settle these matters now and not postpone them until a later session. I do not believe that there are any points on this report to which the United Kingdom Government could take exception, because months have elapsed during which the relevant departments of the United Kingdom Government, had they found anything extraneous or anything erroneous or inaccurate, could immediately have communicated such facts to their representative at Lake Success. This, however, has not occurred, and this, it seems to me, means that we can approve the conclusions here.

Certainly the representatives of the Administering Authority know what comments they can make as regards this Report.

As regards the petitions, I must insist that the best basis for us to refer to these matters of political advancement are certainly the very observations and conclusions made by the Visiting Mission. I do not believe that we can use a magic wand and simply make this entire document disappear into thin air. We cannot therefore consider that this document simply does not exist.

If that were the case, I could simply take up this document as a resolution of my own and get this resolution approved by this Council. We cannot consider that this Report, if it has not as yet been approved by the Council, cannot be used as a basis for discussion by the Council and a basis for recommendation as regards the various petitions.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): May I make one observation? It is not correct to say that there was a representative of the Administering Authority on the Visiting Mission.

The PRESIDENT: I think the representative of Mexico had in mind that during the visit of the Visiting Mission there were representatives of the local administration who were in constant contact with the Visiting Mission and therefore could have given their observations.

/Sir Alan BURNS:

Sir Alan BURNS: I do not think they took any part in the drafting of the Report.

The PRESIDENT: I think in regard to that, without prejudice to any opinion individual representatives may hold, I think it is my duty to take this opportunity to make clear the procedure in regard to the Visiting Mission's Report, inasmuch as I am responsible for certain procedure adopted at this session.

The rules of procedure provide that as soon as the Visiting Mission submits a report to the Council a copy of that report will be transmitted immediately to the Administering Authority. They do not say anything further about the observations or comments except in relation to publication. They say that the observations of the Council, as well as the comments of the Administering Authority, may be published in a certain manner. That is all that is provided there.

The rules of procedure do not provide either for any definition of a special representative in conjunction with the examination of the Visiting Mission's Report.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): Have I the President's permission to withdraw Sir George Sandford? I am quite prepared to do it.

The PRESIDENT: No. I am just trying to explain because the question has been asked of time and also I want to make it quite clear that I myself have welcomed Sir George Sandford to help the Council in this discussion. I still say that I welcome him but I want to say that the rules of procedure do not refer to such a special representative and in the present discussion members have referred to two representatives sitting around the table, and I want to make it quite clear.

I cannot understand why the action I have taken should have been misunderstood by either the Administering or non-administering authorities. Personally, I welcome the

/opportunity

opportunity of having Sir George Sandford here to help the Council, but I want to make it clear that the rules of procedure do not provide for the special representative -- in other words it would not be quite correct to say that there are two representatives here, and I referred to Sir George Sandford before as not being exactly a special representative of the Territory.

Mr. NORIEGA:

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I simply want to make some clarification on that part of my statement which has given rise to some misunderstanding. I refer to the composition of the Visiting Mission, and I said that the composition guaranteed the authority of the Administering Authority as regards the conclusions since France and one other country, as representatives of the Administering Authorities, were on the Visiting Mission, and two other countries represented the non-Administering Authorities. But I was trying to say that this sufficiently guaranteed some objectivity and impartiality.

Mr. BAKR (Iraq): I want simply to ask for clarification. Do I understand that the alternative to the motion of the representative of Mexico is that we postpone consideration of the petitions until after we finish the Report of the Visiting Mission and take them one by one and decide on every one of them; that is to deal with <sup>document</sup> T/218 petition by petition or not?

The PRESIDENT: There are only two proposals before the Council: one is by the representative of Mexico that in regard to the general matters relating to political advancement raised in the petitions, the Council adopts the same view as the Visiting Mission; the second proposal is by the representative of the United States that these petitioners may be replied to to the effect that matters raised in the petitions have been discussed by the Council in conjunction with the Visiting Mission's Report and that they will be considered further at the next session when the Council considers the Visiting Mission's Report again. I do not know whether this is a proposal, but it has been suggested by the representative of the United States.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): The representative of the United Kingdom should be asked what he has to say about the Shinyanga Township Africans petition and should be asked to go on with the work -- otherwise he will have to bring all these big files back with him again tomorrow. He is ready to discuss them.

The PRESIDENT: I have not heard the motion. If the representative of the United Kingdom makes that proposal, it will be /before the Council

before the Council again.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): May I try to help? It seems to me that if the representative of Mexico could substitute another term for his term "endorse" the observations of the Visiting Mission, we might get some approximation to a practical approach to the procedure on this.

What he has in mind, if I may assume to interpret it, is that if the Council decides -- and I take it it has decided -- to consider petitions as they become relevant to the particular sections of the Report, then those petitions should be considered at least in the light of the observations of the Mission, and where the Council feels it can go further, the Council can use the observations of the petitioner as a guide to the answer of those petitions.

But obviously if the representative of the Administering Authority is not in a position to give his unreserved agreement to an endorsement by the Council of all the observations, it would not be proper, I think, for the Council to attempt to endorse all the observations.

But if at this point we take up the petitions which are relevant to this section, Chapter I -- and I understand that the representative of the United Kingdom is perfectly ready to accede to that -- then it will, I think, be possible in some cases to frame a definite reply to a petition (or at least for some parts of it) in the light of the relevant observations of the Mission. In other cases it will not be possible to frame a final reply, and in such cases the Council, I think, would have to do what it has done before and say that the matter has been considered by the Council/ <sup>merely in the light of</sup> the observations of the Mission and will be considered again more conclusively at its next session.

I see no real difficulty in that procedure, especially as the representative of the United Kingdom is, I understand, perfectly prepared to discuss the petitions as they come up, and the Council can use the observations in this Report as a guide -- not necessarily endorsing all of them.

The PRESIDENT: In that case if the representative of Mexico does not press that his motion be decided upon, perhaps tomorrow we can take up the petitions individually insofar as they relate to this chapter on political advancement. The representative of the United Kingdom will give his observations, and the Council will decide what to do then.

/Mr. SOLDATOV



Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Yesterday, of course, no vote was taken on the proposal that had been formulated by the representatives of the USSR and of the United States, and, as I took it, supported by the majority of the Council, as to the way in which we should consider petitions regarding Ruanda-Urundi in particular.

I think that in the present case if we finished the consideration of the report on Tanganyika and then proceeded to the consideration of petitions seriatim, this would get us through our job more rapidly and more efficiently. After all, each petition is a separate entity that stands on its own feet. Most of them raise questions of a political <sup>and</sup> economic character.

Therefore, may I suggest that we consider the report and then look over the petitions one after the other? I think this would facilitate the task of the Administering Authority to submit observations with respect to the various petitions.

I think if we had maintained this procedure, which we applied in the case of Ruanda-Urundi, we would not have wasted the last hour in considering the procedural difficulties.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): <sup>heartily</sup> I agree with what the representative of the USSR has just said.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): It hardly matters to me exactly what procedure we are going to follow. What is important is that we should vouchsafe some reply to these petitions and that we should transmit to the Administering Authority the views of the Council as regards these various petitions. That is what is important. That is why I do not insist upon one method or another. I leave it entirely in the President's hands since he is so able in conducting our debate, and I am quite sure that in this way we will have an adequate solution.

I believe that if we follow the Russo-American system, we will also attain our ends. I really do not see that there are any insuperable obstacles.

Whatever the system which we decide to follow, I still believe that the observations and conclusions of the Visiting Mission should always be kept in mind.

/Mr. SAYRE

0  
Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I also am for the Russo-American system. I think that the representative of the USSR proposed the procedure which we followed in the case of Ruanda-Urundi which seems to me absolutely correct procedure; that is to say, first we reach some decision on the report -- which I presume will be to defer consideration until after we have had a chance to hear the views of the Administering Authority -- and following that, that we take up the petitions, one after the other. It seems to me that that is logical and proper, and I heartily support any suggestions of the representative of the USSR.

The PRESIDENT: Does the representative of the USSR wish to speak any more, because he has overwhelming support?

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I should like to make one comment. My observation as to procedure did not relate to the proposal of the representative of Mexico. I consider that the representative of Mexico, in submitting his proposal, was not submitting it in connexion with our procedural discussion, but with respect to the substance of the matter.

I would therefore request the representative of Mexico not to interpret my observation as to the desirable procedure as being in any way directed at his proposal. I think that his proposal ought to be considered under any procedure that the Council may decide to adopt.

Mr. BAKR (Iraq): I think we have discussed the subject fully and we have several proposals before us. I suggest that we can now vote on them, in order to save time.

The PRESIDENT: Perhaps you will let me disentangle this situation. To me it seems that we are not trying to adopt a different procedure from the way we handled the petitions on Ruanda-Urundi, except that the Council was asked, at the instance of the representative of Belgium, who is as logical as any of the representatives at the table, to consider these general issues in relation to the relevant chapters of the Report.

The Council seems to have indicated that the proposal of the representative of the USSR is the most desirable, and as I have found that the representative of the United Kingdom also agrees with it, I do not think we need to have a vote.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I would have agreed with it, but I thought that the Council had earlier taken another view.

The PRESIDENT: As I said, I do not see too much difference, and I think the representative of Belgium and I did not anticipate any different procedure yesterday. If any time was wasted today, I can only say that I wish the Council had been of the same mind as the representative of the USSR yesterday, and I am glad that we have come to agree with him. We will not take up the petitions until we have completed consideration of the Report of the Visiting Mission.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): The representative of the United Kingdom may take his petitions with him tomorrow. We are going to ask questions and discuss the general policy of the administration a propos  
/of the Report

of the Report of the Visiting Mission. That will finish tomorrow in half an hour, and then we will start the petitions.

The PRESIDENT: That is exactly what we tried to start an hour ago, but now the representative of the USSR, as far as I can understand him, suggests that we do not touch the petitions until we have completed the consideration of the Report. The representative of the United Kingdom whole-heartedly agreed with him, and I do not believe that he wishes to take up the petitions tomorrow.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I will take them up at any time.

We agreed yesterday, if I may remind you, to the USSR delegate's proposal. That we should take the Report and then take the petitions after that. I am surprised at the whole of this discussion.

The PRESIDENT: I thought yesterday that we were agreeing with the representative of Belgium.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): The one difficulty is that we have been losing time discussing the administration of Ruanda-Urundi instead of just reading the Report of the Visiting Mission. I believe that it does not need any discussion.

I, for my part, have read the Report of the Visiting Mission, and I have no questions to ask -- not one.

The PRESIDENT: We are dealing now with the Report on Tanganyika.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): Yes. And I hope we shall finish the examination of the Report of the Visiting Mission on Tanganyika in half an hour's time, and then have two hours to begin discussion of the petitions. That is all I meant to say.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Belgium does not then differ too much from the representative of the USSR, except that in his opinion the consideration of the Report will be completed within  
/half an hour

half an hour.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I hope so.

The PRESIDENT: Then the Council is entirely in agreement with the representative of the USSR, to consider the Report first and the petitions afterwards?

The Drafting Committee will meet at 10.30 a.m. in Room 5 tomorrow.

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

The meeting rose at 6.06 p.m.