

United Nations

Nations Unies

UNRESTRICTED

T/P.V. 156
16 March 1949

TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL 4

CONSEIL
DE TUTELLE

English

ANALYST'S FILE

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Fourth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FORTIETH MEETING
(Transcription from sound recording)

Lake Success, New York
Wednesday, 16 March 1949, at 2.30 p.m.

President:

Mr. LIU CHIEH

China

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the fortieth 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)

The PRESIDENT: The Council will this afternoon continue the consideration of the Report of the Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of Tanganyika under British Administration.

I think the Council completed yesterday the consideration of Chapter I on Political Advancement.

I would suggest that the Council proceed now to Chapter II.

CHAPTER II -- INTER-TERRITORIAL ORGANIZATION.

The PRESIDENT: Chapter II deals with Inter-Territorial Organization. I believe that question has been fairly exhaustively discussed in connexion with the question of administrative union. I would therefore ask that the attention of the representatives on the Council be confined to the questions raised in the Visiting Mission's Report, without diverting attention to the question of administrative union as such, because that question has been discussed only a few days ago with some thoroughness.

Mr. CRAW (New Zealand): It seems to me that since the Committee on Administrative Unions has been and will be going into the full details of inter-territorial organization, there is not much point in the Council taking it up at this moment, and therefore I suggest we might go straight on to Chapter III - Economic Advancement.

The PRESIDENT: As I remarked, the Council has already discussed the question of administrative union with Sir George Sandford answering many questions addressed to him, and also there is a small Committee of the Council studying
/further

further into this question. I do not believe that chapter calls for renewed discussion unless members wish to make observations on the Report of the Visiting Mission itself in regard to this question. If there are no such observations, I would ask the Council to proceed with Chapter III.

I notice that the Chairman of the Visiting Mission has not taken his seat at the Council table. Perhaps he wishes me to renew the invitation of the Council to do so: also Sir George Sandford has been sitting with us, and unless the United Kingdom representative confirms his desire --

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I am in the hands of the Council. If the Council wishes Sir George Sandford to come to the table I shall be glad to ask him to do so.

The PRESIDENT: He has been sitting with us, and I would welcome Sir George Sandford to be with us here, to offer us any assistance he can with regard to questions connected with Tanganyika.

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.

The PRESIDENT: As there seems to be no observation on Chapter II, I would therefore suggest that the Council should proceed at once to Chapter III - Economic Advancement.

CHAPTER III -- ECONOMIC ADVANCEMENT

The PRESIDENT: As I said yesterday, this is the Visiting Mission's Report and it should not be examined in the same way as the report of the Administering Authority on the

/Trust Territory;

Trust Territory; therefore the questions should be asked not so much for detailed information as to offer some points of view so far as the observations of the Visiting Mission may call for them.

/Mr. NORIEGA:

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): In this part of the Report, my delegation is pleased to be able to congratulate anew the Visiting Mission for the form in which it has presented the data and information, and with the system it has used in expounding the various problems.

I think it would help members of the Council if we could get some remarks from the Administering Authority on the part reserved to observations in this connexion, because perhaps these comments from the Administering Authority would help us avoid having to ask questions of the special representative or the Chairman of the Visiting Mission. This would be a gain of time for the Council.

The PRESIDENT: That would be the proper thing to do.

May I ask the special representative whether he has any observations or comments to make?

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I would like to make a few remarks, if it would help the Council at all, in regard to Chapter III.

First of all, in the matter of agriculture, the Administering Authority is keenly alive to the problems and dangers created by the primitive nature of African agriculture, and, of course, of animal husbandry and the consequent soil deterioration and erosion.

It is, however, only in certain districts of the inhabited area of the Territory that soil erosion has reached dangerous proportions, and in these districts steps are being taken to cope with the very serious menace by the introduction of ridged cultivation, the construction of dams, the storage of water and so on.

A senior officer of the Agriculture Department recently spent a year in the United States, studying anti-erosion measures.

An anti-erosion service is being built up with the assistance of a grant from the Colonial Development and Welfare Fund, and this service will be expanded as experience in local techniques is increased.

The indigenous population is being continuously instructed in improved methods of agriculture, and the Administering Authority fully realizes the desirability of pushing on more rapidly with the measures for raising the standard of living of the peasant population.

One of the main factors limiting progress at the present time is
/the shortage

the shortage of professionally trained officers. We must remember that the normal university courses were practically suspended during the war years, and it is only now that the universities are beginning to turn out qualified scientists in sufficient numbers to man the various services.

The Administering Authority does not accept the statement that under the Mandate the Territory was on a care and maintenance basis. Although development was inevitably held up by uncertainty as to the future and the revenues of the Government were consequently limited, very substantial progress was made in the field of administration and in the development of social services during the years between 1920 and 1939.

If I may turn to the question of lands, as regards ^{sub-}paragraph 4 (a) on page 103, a committee recently appointed by the Tanganyika Government to advise on the re-allocation of mission lands in the Moshi and Arusha districts has recommended that as long as the missions continue to render medical and educational services to the African population, which would otherwise have to be maintained by the Government at much greater cost, they should be permitted to retain land for revenue-earning purposes, provided that such land is properly and beneficially utilized in addition to the actual land required for churches, schools, hospitals, etc.

This recommendation was supported by the Tanganyika Government and has been accepted in principle by the Administering Authority.

As regards mines, it is difficult to form any accurate estimate of the indirect revenue accruing to the Government from mining enterprises as distinct from the direct revenue from royalties and companies' income tax. To be comprehensive, such items as income tax and poll tax on the companies' employees, customs duties on all contraband imports, licences for traders setting up retail shops in mining areas etc., should be included. Consideration is being given to the practicability of furnishing estimates sufficiently accurate to be of value in accordance with the Mission's recommendations.

Finally, as regards finance and trade, I should like to point out that the ten per cent surcharge on cotton piece goods has already been removed. The Administering Authority is alive to the desirability of establishing economically sound industries in the Territory and is confident that neither the Customs Union nor the Industrial Licensing Ordinance will hinder sound economic development.

/The Mission's

The Mission's recommendations regarding additional information to be included in the Annual Report have been noted, and I hope that steps will be taken to meet them.

The Administering Authority fully recognizes the importance of training the African population to participate in industry and commerce. This must depend, of course, first on the raising of the standard of African education which will result from the Ten-Year Educational Plan, and secondly, since no African is yet in possession of any considerably readily-realizable capital on the development of co-operative associations on the lines of the very successful Kilimanjara Coffee Growers' Union and Transport Association, assisted where necessary by Government loans.

These are some points on Chapter III which I hope will be of some use to the Council.

The PRESIDENT: The information and observations given by the representative of the United Kingdom have been very helpful, and have given us the point of view of the Administering Authority.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): It seems to me that in principle the effort that is being made by the Administering Authority and the plans that it has for improving agricultural cultivation in Africa -- I think it has about thirty projects under way -- are to be appreciated and commended, for any effort that is made to improve cultivation and intensify production is good.

Naturally, we of course have to consider the human results and effects that this would have, and the benefits that it would confer upon the native population. I noted in the Report of the Visiting Mission that a special emphasis is given to land ownership, that is, to the problem that exists and that is indicated by the Report of the Visiting Mission.

In some areas the indigenous population lacks sufficient land for purposes of subsistence. While we can commend the policy of the Administering Authority in connexion with land conservation, inasmuch as it avoids the harm caused by soil-erosion, we think that the conservation of the soil as it could be undertaken by the indigenous population itself, should be considered as a serious possibility by the Administering Authority.

We see that the Overseas ^{Food} Corporation has over two million acres. Perhaps amongst the other projects of agricultural development, we will

/have to estimate

have to estimate the amount of land that would have to be controlled, that it would be possible to submit to mechanize cultivation. Such cultivation would require large areas to be economically feasible and productive.

My delegation wonders whether these agricultural developments do not involve a change in the circumstances of the indigenous population. Is not the population made to move off its land? Are they not converted into mere labourers ^{for} and dependants upon these great projects and development.

With the development of these plans, does not the indigenous population run the risk of becoming directly dependent upon the developments, with very little benefit to itself? This would, of course, also involve their families.

This would give rise to the paradox that an admirable idea, a good project for agricultural development, would become in effect harmful to the indigenous population, and would give them, in return, no benefits.

For this reason I should like to know, in as much detail as possible, from the Administering Authority, what measures have been taken and what provisions made to prevent harmful economic effects upon the indigenous population by the institution of these agricultural development programmes.

I understand that provision is made to pay for the land that belonged to the indigenous population, but I would like to know who evaluates this land.

In accordance with the Trusteeship Agreement, we know that the consent of the native population is required for the transfer of land. You can find in document T/218 that the Chiefs of the Tribes are often prepared to agree to a request from an officer of the Administering Authority, in order not to lose their friendship with these officers, or their prestige with them. This may not be the case with individual members of the tribe. They might object. That is to say, the legal requirement of consent of the indigenous population would seem to have been fulfilled once the assent of the Chief of the tribe had been obtained, but I was sure, in fact, that it would be so.

On the point of land ownership, we must remember that the Trusteeship Council should exercise the greatest care, and if we know that the natives are not in a position to decide upon these questions themselves, and since the Administering Authority is the directly interested party in this scheme.
/since these schemes -

since these schemes depend upon the economic machinery of the metropolis, then it would follow that the trusteeship system would have been inhibited.

Who is protecting the indigenous population in operations involving transfer of land, and also the leases of land if the system followed should be that of leasing? I would like the representative of the Administering Authority to give us some information in that connexion for the purpose of dissipating my doubts -- as extensive a reply as possible in order to avoid future questions.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): Very full information about the process followed on the alienation of land was given in the Report on Tanganyika in 1947. I would particularly invite attention to pages 79 and 80, from which perhaps I might read certain extracts. On page 79 it is written:

"In pursuance of the policy of protecting the interests of the indigenous inhabitants a detailed procedure has been laid down for the consideration of applications for rights of occupancy. If, on the advice tendered to him by the responsible administrative officers, the Governor decides that consideration can be given to the alienation of the land in question, an administrative officer visits the land and discusses the application with the local native authorities and people. If there is no opposition to the application he prepares an inspection report in which are included particulars of the indigenous inhabitants, if any, living, cultivating or grazing stock on the land; the tribal claim to the land; the nature of the water supplies, and timber, if any, on the land; its distance from rail and motor road communications, etc. In preparing his report the administrative officer must bear in mind that although the land may not be immediately required for the actual needs of the tribe, it may be required in the future. If satisfied on this point he must include with his report a certificate to the effect that the land is not now required and, as far as can be foreseen, will not be required for the future needs of the tribe."

/I can assure the Council

I can assure the Council that the administrative officer in each district in Tanganyika takes his duties in relation to land alienation extremely seriously. Consultation takes place not only with the Native Authority but with people resident on the land which is the subject of the enquiry.

The representative of Mexico referred specifically to large schemes such as the scheme being operated by the Overseas Food Corporation in Tanganyika at the present time. Considerable amount of information is given in the Report of the Visiting Mission on this subject and it is a fact that the preliminary enquiries in relation to the Corporation's operations in Tanganyika took the density of the indigenous population into account in each area. The desire was to select areas which might be suitable for cultivation but which were, at the same time, holding a very small population.

It has been stated in the Report of the Visiting Mission that there is serious maldistribution of population in Tanganyika. I think there is a quotation that two-thirds of the population reside on one-tenth of the area. That is, anyhow, frequently said in Tanganyika. The meaning of that, translated into figures, is that of the population of Tanganyika, on approximately 36,000 square miles of Tanganyika, there is a density of population of more than 100 per square mile. Of the balance of the land, which comes to 324,000 square miles, the density of the population is an average of 6 per square mile which is a very small density of population indeed.

I have seen the Overseas Food Corporation's land at Kongwa. I do not carry in my head the number of Africans who were living there or cultivating there but I have seen the reservation which the Overseas Food Corporation made for the accommodation of those people who are on the land. The number involved was not great. I think there is a reference in the Report to 500 families on an area which would be something like 500 square miles when the full series of units at Kongwa are brought under cultivation. That is roughly one family per square mile.

/I should like

I should like to emphasize that the greatest care is used in dealing with this matter of land alienation both in small and in large units and that the interests of the indigenous population are very close to the hearts of the administrative officers and other Government officers concerned.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I, of course, do not question the fact of the administration's policy on the alienation of land being an integral one but I wonder whether, as a question of internal policy and as a question of external prestige, the Administering Authority would not have to be most careful to proceed duly in all these matters? I wonder whether we could not have this question of land alienation revised and inspected by the local Legislative Assembly.

Whatever the constitution of the local Legislative Assembly they at least have so far shown sufficient civic spirit to be able to advise the Administering Authority well on these questions of alienation of land and, in connexion with this division of the alienation of land -- land that was previously owned by Germans, land that is now not being used, land that was formerly property of missions, etc. -- could these matters not be studied by indigenous elements. That is, could we not have some kind of joint responsibility for these matters as, on the one hand, the Administering Authority and on the other, the existing indigenous authorities?

This, of course, is merely a suggestion of my delegation. Perhaps the Administering Authority has so far not thought of this possibility but I would like it to be taken note of and to have the Council informed about the perspectives in the sense of carrying through this suggestion.

The PRESIDENT: The Report of the Visiting Mission makes some references to this question of land alienation on page 86. It gives the comments of some African chiefs through the African Association of Arusha. It is alleged that the procedure which was reiterated just now by Sir George Sandford does not fully safeguard their interests and on page 103 the Visiting Mission is of the opinion that:

"(a) All mission lands not now directly required for churches, hospitals, schools or other necessary social or religious services should be returned to the Africans.

"(b) European colonization should be curtailed and the strictest control exercised to keep it at the barest minimum consistent with the development of the Territory and the present and long-range needs and interests of the African inhabitants.

/It also

It also has an observation on the ex-German estates.

Has Mr. Laurentie anything to add? May I say, Mr. Laurentie, that anytime you wish to make any observation you are free to do so without waiting to be called on.

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): As far as this question of land is concerned, I must say that the Mission's impression has been that the shortage of land which has been referred to repeatedly in the Report seems to relate to rich land in the northern provinces and in the Arusha and Moshi districts. That is where it might be said that land was insufficient for the great population which is supposed to live off that land. It is in that region, with the exception of Tanga province where there are sisal plantations, that the Mission received complaints or other communications with respect to the properties of religious missions and with respect to ex-enemy owned land.

/The Mission has been

The Mission has been unable to proceed to a complete study of the entire problem because this would have required a complete inventory of lands that were and were not available, but it has a general impression, as we set it forth in our conclusions, that, while the complaints of the indigenous population seem to be equitable in themselves, nevertheless the very fact of transferring to such people any lands that might become vacant or available, such as lands of missions or ex-enemy lands, would not suffice in the near future to settle the economic problems that are arising in the region. Such transfer would not be a solution.

We have to consider an extension of these regions which are relatively over-populated toward the prairies which offer possibilities for considerable expansion.

As regards the lands involved in the ^{Development} Groundnut Scheme, the question is a different one. These lands were, so to speak, vacant. The population there was very small and their agriculture was rather poorly conducted. Therefore, the economic problem in this case was on a different basis altogether.

There might be, of course, -- and the Mission looked into that -- the question of equity involved in the possible displacement of population or the possible re-employment of people in connexion with the Groundnut Development Scheme, but in this case it was not a question of land shortage per se. I might say that there is no land shortage problem that arises as a direct result of the undertaking of the Groundnut Development Scheme.

These are two points, I think, which we ought to look at distinctly in order to clear the ground. I might say that the Visiting Mission has set forth some conclusions at the end of Chapter I, and these conclusions are the sum of our comments and of our research on the subject.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): In passing, I wish to make a correction, if the Visiting Mission thinks it appropriate, on page 72, where reference is made to the principal foodstuffs that are consumed in Africa. Mention is made of European potatoes: I simply wish to state that there is no such thing as a European potato. The potato originated in Ecuador and Peru; it was brought to the European Continent by Spanish merchants; from Europe it went to the United States -- Sir Walter Raleigh cultivated it in Virginia -- and then it went to Iceland.

This is just a detail.

/I have a special

I have a special interest in knowing why the indigenous population has not been encouraged to cultivate sisal. Sisal was originally to be found in Yucatan in Mexico, but it says here that the cultivation of this product is "complex". The cultivation of sisal is not a complicated affair, so that I do not understand why the 142 cultivators of this product are all Europeans.

The same Report informs us how in Chagga, for example, and in some other places the natives have managed to produce good coffee. Since the cultivation of coffee is more difficult than the cultivation of sisal, I do not understand this explanation that was given in connexion with the cultivation of sisal.

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of Visiting Mission): As far as the Visiting Mission has been able to look into this question, it was told on the one hand that the population of Tanga Province, where the soil is cultivated, is one whose intellectual level may be described as being lower than that of the Chagga tribe. It has been difficult for us, of course to measure the intellectual level of Tanga Province to check up on that, but we have been made aware of the real superiority, intellectually speaking, of the Chaggas. There is no question about that and there must, therefore, be some truth in this argument. Furthermore, we must realize that it is not the very cultivation that entails the true difficulties, although there are, of course, difficulties involved there. It has to be taken into account, for instance, that few parasites or vegetable pests infect this particular kind of crop. On the other hand, it is necessary to have a small industrial plant near the plantation, which costs money.

Next to the plantations we visited there were usually factories where sisal is processed and transformed into industrial fibres. This kind of factory has to be installed -- usually next to the plantation -- and this requires money.

I do not think that, in the present state of affairs, the African population of Tanga is able to raise the capital required for the setting up of these factories. This might have been conceivable when the cultivation of sisal was first undertaken in Tanga Province, and if things had been begun that way from the beginning, it might have happened otherwise. Sisal then might have been cultivated by indigenous co-operatives who might have been able to get the required capital in their labour force, but this is not the way it happened and today, of course

/the situation

the situation is very different from what might have been desired by the representative of Mexico.

The fact of the matter is that the cultivation of sisal and ancillary industries is controlled not only by Europeans -- it is also controlled by Asians, some Asians also owning that kind of plantation. As a matter of fact, I might add that there are some Africans too who own sisal plantations, but generally speaking I might say that sisal plantations are not in the hands of the African population.

At Tanga, the Mission had a conversation with local notables of African extraction, and the Visiting Mission members were asked whether they could not intervene to see that ex-enemy properties in Tanga Province where the soil was being cultivated were restored to the indigenous population. This is the request that was made to the Visiting Mission; our intercession was requested to that end. The Mission took up this matter; it took up the form in which such a request could be made, because we, of course, could not decide on the matter. What might have been envisaged was exploitation of that crop with European capital and local manpower, with the indigenous population sharing in the profits. This is one way in which we looked at it.

/Mr. EYCKMANS

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from Belgium): I might add something to these explanations by the Chairman of the Visiting Mission. I might add an explanation of a general character.

It is considered that to be profitable a sisal factory must draw upon the production of 1,000 to 1,500 hectares, which is a lot of land. I know of some attempts to set up a European-owned factory -- European-owned I say because the natives usually do not have the required textiles. Considerable machinery and lorries are required because of the heaviness of the crop.

But the point is that the factory has to be sure of getting a break in the procurement of raw materials, but with indigenous planters the factory can never be sure of getting sufficient raw materials.

Even where the factories count largely on indigenous production, they must always, nevertheless, take as a basis a sufficient quantity of fruit, the supply of which must be ensured to keep the factory running.

I repeat, to set up a sisal factory is very costly, and to set up such a factory and then to see that the indigenous population does not take up that cultivation and does not bring any raw materials or sisal to the factory would be ruinous to the factory. If that happened, such an occurrence would not be likely to encourage the setting-up of additional factories.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): The reality of the fact is that if there were indigenous plantations, it would not involve any expense for the same cultivators of these plantations to take the pulp from the sisal and thus reduce the cost of transporting the fiber by about fifty per cent. Therefore, any factory you had would benefit by this procedure correspondingly.

The process of taking the pulp out of the sisal plant does not cost more than ten cents on a dollar. All you need is a piece of wood with a nail and that is the end of it. I do not think you need a very large installation for this purpose.

I should like to the President to invite the representative of China, who was also a member of the Visiting Mission, when he has a remark to make to co-operate with his information on such subjects, and to give us his view on the matter we have been discussing.

/Mr. LIN

Mr. LIN (China): I have no additional information on this matter other than that which is contained in the Report.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I do not know whether other representatives wish to make remarks about this question of land. If we are going to go to the question of mines, I have something to say on that.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): My question deals precisely with the land problem.

My delegation would like to be enlightened by the Chairman of the Visiting Mission or the members of the Visiting Mission as well as by the special representative as to what actually is the proportion of the total area of Tanganyika which is habitable or arable.

Our attention has been drawn to the fact that two-thirds of the population is concentrated in one-tenth ^{of} the area of the Territory, and the special representative has alluded to the density of the population referring to the total area of Tanganyika.

In the Report it is also said that 39 per cent of the area of the Territory is actually inhabited and cultivated because, apparently, outside that area there is a lack of water and a prevalence of tsetse.

I should like to be informed, therefore, just exactly what is the total proportion of the area of the Territory which is habitable or arable -- whether this 39 per cent represents the limit of the area in the Territory which is cultivated or inhabited by the people of the Territory.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): Roughly, 70 per cent of the land area of the Territory has kept its life of one kind or another. There is a population in many areas where tsetse flies exist, but that population cannot keep cattle and therefore rich farming is impossible.

It is a big problem in Tanganyika to seek to secure development in areas which suffer from this pest, and a great deal of work is being done with a view to attaining the possibility of development in those areas.

There are areas which suffer from a lack of well-distributed water, but it would not be true to say that any part of Tanganyika is a desert. Tanganyika is grassed in ^{the} middle where the rainfall is from 20 to 25 inches a year. In many parts of that centre of Tanganyika, there are no tsetse /flies and there

flies and there is a big stock population. That breeds problems of its own, because the character of the soil accompanied by the low rainfall leads to over-stock population and erosion.

Around the centre, there are areas with a higher rainfall, sometimes very heavy rainfall. Where there is a heavy rainfall, you will also find a dense population. However, of the roughly 250,000 square miles of Tanganyika which is covered by tsetse flies, the great majority has a rainfall of over 30 inches a year, and should therefore be capable of supporting life if the country could be cleared of the risk of tsetse flies and if cattle could be introduced into those areas.

That is the great problem of the future -- to make land which at present carries no population and no development available to relieve the agrarian problem which is affecting so much of Central Africa at the moment.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): I should like to find out the average area of the land-holdings of the indigenous inhabitants in the Territory, if information on the subject is available.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): I can do no more than to refer, as I did yesterday, to one area for which the figures are available, the Sukuma Federation, where it is stated that 1,000,000 people are living on 20,000 square miles.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): The question was in reference to the average individual land-holders.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): If you take a family of $3\frac{1}{2}$, that would be roughly 15 families to a square mile.

/Mr. RYCKMANS

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): There might be a misunderstanding here. In most of the African tribes you cannot talk of land holding. You may talk of ^{average} cultivation, but as a rule, in most of tribes individuals do not hold land. They have a right to cultivate tribal land, and a study might be made of how much land an average family cultivates.

But there is no question of land holding. If they want to cultivate more they can take more. They very often shift after having cultivated land for a few years and go and cultivate tribal land elsewhere.

Mr. LIN (China): I have here some figures on this point. The total area of land under cultivation is 6,334,000 acres; that is, total land under cultivation both by indigenous, and non-indigenous inhabitants; there are all together 1, 00,000 acres alienated; of course not all those alienated acres are cultivated.

So roughly I would guess about 4,800,000 of land are being cultivated by the indigenous population.

The total population there is 5,500,000, but in so far as the natives are concerned there is no lack of land at the present time, because they can always cultivate more. There is a lot of land - bushland, forest land and tsetse fly-infested land.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): I was referring to the arable land and I wanted to find out exactly what was the average area of land cultivated by an indigenous inhabitant, and the average area cultivated by a European. I just wanted to get a basis of comparison between the areas under the control of a native and a non-native.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): It would not be possible, from the information I have here, to give an answer to that question. I think it will have to be referred to the Tanganyika authorities.

But working on the information already given to the Council we have roughly a cultivated area of about two and a half acres per family. To that, of course, must be added land which is required for stock in stock carrying areas.

/ I do not suppose

I do not suppose there are any statistics covering the total land required in any area of Tanganyika for one family, except detail by detail in areas where these problems have been very carefully studied. But the figures that have been given to the Council this afternoon indicate that in Sukumaland a family would occupy about 40 acres; that is to say, as the representative of Belgium said, would have usufructuary rights over about 40 acres, of which roughly a twelfth or a fifteenth would be arable from time to time.

There would naturally be a rotation - it would be necessary to have a rotation - but I think that gives the best picture available to us from the information in this room now.

The PRESIDENT On this question, on page 82 of the Visiting Mission's Report, there was this statement: "No statistics were available to compare the proportion of land cultivated by non-natives to that cultivated by natives."

Then it goes on to say: "Nor does a comparison between the total area of the Territory and the alienated area give a realistic picture of the relative significance of non-indigenous alienation since the greater proportion of the area of the Territory is unproductive."

The representative of China has given a figure of areas under cultivation, and he also seemed to give the impression that there is a considerable amount of land available for extension of cultivation.

But the Report on that page goes on to say: "During interviews with Africans, the Mission was told that European land settlement in some areas, particularly in the Northern Province, was resulting in a shortage of land for African uses.

Is the representative for China sure, when he says that there is land available, that it is arable land. Is there water and other necessary accompanying qualities for cultivation?

I want to raise that question because the representative for China has made a statement that seems to contradict part of the report.

Mr. LIN (China): I was thinking of the Territory as a whole. There is a good deal of ^{bush land,} virgin land that has not been cultivated. It could be, in time.

The Groundnut Scheme will eventually cover an area of 2,400,000 acres, and that you may consider, was in a sense alienated land.

/ Of course there

Of course, there is a shortage of land in certain areas, where the population pressure is very great, as pointed out by the Chairman of the Visiting Mission.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): There is:
another problem -- a problem of politics. Each tribe has a right to its own tribal land.

If there is a shortage of land in the Chagga area. the Chagga would not be entitled, without a permit from the Administering Authority, to go on the tribal lands of the next ^{areas} tribe. Each district is self-contained, and in some tribal/there is a big pressure of population on the land and it may be that in the next tribal area there is a very large amount of land absolutely free. But it belongs to another tribe, and many prejudices will have to be overcome before the surplus population of one tribe may be settled on the tribal land of another tribe.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): In order to arrive at the average area, perhaps it would help to refer to the data furnished on page 102 of document T/218. That reads, as ^{also} referred to by the representative of China: "There are 6,334,000 acres under cultivation by both indigenous and non-indigenous inhabitants, and of this area, 1,846,278 acres are held by non-natives."

So you see, if you will subtract, there are roughly 4,500,000 acres under cultivation by indigenous inhabitants. And in as much as the population of the Territory is composed of 5,500,000 Africans, we now arrive at an average of less than one acre per African. I am talking about the average.

/ If we go further

If we go further into the population of the Territory consisting of non-natives we find that there are 55,000 Asians and 7,500 Europeans. On the basis of 1,846,000 acres -- assuming that they are held by Europeans -- there will be an average of 276 acres per European. I have made this calculation in view of the lack of statistics on the actual holdings.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): Might I point out that the figure of 1,846,000 acres is the total land held by non-natives. It must not be inferred that the whole of that area is under cultivation; it is by no means all under cultivation and, as I understand the information given in the Report, no statistics are available to show what proportion of the 1,846,000 acres is in fact under cultivation.

I am mentioning this because one cannot take the whole 1,800,000 acres of the 6,334,000 acres and deduce the amount of land being cultivated by the African population.

Mr. CRAW (New Zealand): Just to save any misunderstanding on this, it seemed to me that the representative of the Philippines assumed that the 1,800,000 odd acres were held entirely by Europeans but I understood that Indians and other Asians also have a considerable amount of land.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): That is so. Several of the sisal estates in Tanganyika are Indian-owned. I think there are some statistics in the Report for 1947.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): I have studied the statement of the Special Representative and also the Report of the Visiting Mission on page 103 in which it states ^{that} the policy followed by the Administering Authority in the alienation of land is:

"....that land should not be allocated for non-native settlement, whether from the enemy estates or other areas, unless it can be shown that the land in question is not required for native occupation and is not likely to be required in the foreseeable future."

Theoretically this injunction against the alienation of land is unassailable but in practice I have ^{doubts} as to its effectiveness

/considering that

considering that there is a limited area ^{of land} in the Territory which is actually arable taking into account the prevalence of tsetse and the lack of water supply.

We have also seen petitions stating that there is a shortage of land particularly in the northern Territories. Considering also the increase of the African population I wonder what criteria, if any, are followed by the Administering Authority in determining whether in a particular case land is not immediately required by the native population or may not likely be required by the native population for a foreseeable length of time?

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): The very severest criteria are applied. I should like to emphasize as has been done by the representative of Belgium that these problems are extremely local problems. We have reference here to the very acute problem in the Northern Province. That problem is known to the Tanganyika Government to be extremely acute and has been known to be such for many years.

Recently, within the last two years, a Commission of Enquiry has been set up by the Tanganyika Government to go into the question of land use in the Northern Province. The Commission was presided over by a Judge of the High Court, Mr. Justice Wilson. I have not seen the report itself but I know that it is under consideration by the Government of Tanganyika now.

In Sukumaland there is pressure of population. The solution there is the development of water supply in the neighbouring area and the making of additional land in that area fit for human and animal use by the elimination of the fly, bush clearing and so on. The problem there has nothing whatever to do with the alienation of land to non-indigenous people. There are no non-indigenous people within miles of the Sukumaland area.

In other parts of Tanganyika the problem is similar to that found in Sukumaland. That is to say, the land is there, the water may be there but the land is not suitable of being used because of the tsetse pest.

I repeat, therefore, that where a shortage of land arises it arises locally and not over the Territory as a whole. The Territory can support a much larger population than it has now if this tsetse pest can be dealt with. The problem then will be,
/as indeed it is now

as indeed it is now, the provision of ^{better and} better-distributed water supply in areas not now carrying the population.

The Administration, in dealing with an application for the alienation of land, may be relied upon to adopt the most severe standards in assessing the immediate requirement of the African inhabitants and their requirements for the foreseeable future.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): My question is that in allocating land to a non-native which -- the Report shows -- is usually for large areas, for individuals not to exceed 5,000 acres, and for terms which range for ninety-nine years, how can we justify such alienation on the ground that such land would not be needed in the immediate future by the African population precisely because of the limited area of cultivable land available and precisely because of the pressure of the increase of population?

/Sir George SANDFORD

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): I should like to emphasize again that this problem is essentially a local problem.

I have in mind one district in Tanganyika which covers 6,000 square miles and which has a population of 90,000 people; that is, 15 to the square mile, spread more or less evenly over the whole 6,000 square miles. Pressure of population does not exist in that area. It is worse than that. The distribution of population is so sparse that you cannot effectively introduce educational systems or health systems in that area. The density of population does not enable you to do so with any effect.

In that area, which is not one that attracts settlement -- very largely because it is very remote -- there could be, generally speaking, no question of immediate population pressure coming to bear over the district as a whole. But the land applied for might, nevertheless, be such as would be wanted by the local inhabitants for immediate or ultimate expansion and the Administration would nevertheless take that into account, in spite of the fact that over the district as a whole the population is, as I say, only fifteen per square mile.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): In order to calm the fears of the representative of the Philippines, it might suffice to make a very simple calculation.

Naturally, the British standards of measurement are such that it is very difficult to translate acres into square kilometres or even into square miles for that matter -- they do not believe in the decimal system. But I think there are about 600 acres per square mile.

Now this means that there are 64,000,000 acres; the population now cultivates 4,000,000 of them. In other words, they could cultivate ten times more. The population could be increased ten-fold and it would then cultivate only 100,000 square miles. But there are 300,000 square miles in that territory. In other words, ~~the territory could support a~~ population that would be ten-fold the present population.

/As long

As long as this is true there is no fear as to the shortage of lands for the territory as a whole; there might be local shortages in a specific province, but there is no fear of any large shortage for the whole Territory for quite a while -- for more than a century.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): I think we should not take into account ~~the~~ the total area available in the Territory because, as already stated by the special representative, not all of this is available for cultivation because of the lack of water and the prevalence of tsetse. That is why I limited my question only to the area of cultivable land which could be cultivated and not the total area of the Territory which cannot be cultivated because of the prevalence of tsetse and the lack of water supply.

Mr. LIN (China): May I clarify the situation by making a few remarks?

There is, to be sure, no fear of immediate shortage of land on the part of the inhabitants for the time being when we see the country as a whole, so much land is uncultivated.

However, there is fear, there is apprehension, on the part of the natives of possible large-scale alienation of land by Europeans. I think that is the real fear.

At the present time there are 1,800,000 acres which have already been alienated and when the Groundnut Scheme is completed, 2,500,000 acres more will be alienated for 99 years or so, although the ground nuts scheme is presumably to be returned to the natives or to the Tanganyika Government in due course of time.

But there is, ^{and} I think Mr. Laurentie will agree with me, apprehension and concern on the part of the inhabitants for fear that -- as they put it -- what has taken place in Kenya may take place in Tanganyika.

As I understand it, there has been large-scale alienation of land in Kenya. I think that is the real situation. Immediately the natives are not worried about their lack of land, although in some particular areas there is a very
/strong

population question.

The Visiting Mission did press the several members of the Tanganyika Government for clarification or a final statement of land policy. So far we have not been able to understand precisely what that policy is.

With respect to ex-enemy lands under the custodian's control, the natives in certain parts want to have these lands returned to them, and the Administering Authority apparently feel that those sisal estates and large plantations should be taken care of by Europeans who are able to manage those estates. So that is one question.

Another question is the future further alienation of land, in addition to the keeping of the ex-enemy lands by Europeans. There is established a Land Settlement Board which is to decide which applicants -- European applicants or Asian applicants -- are to be given land; and there is established a Land Bank which presumably is to help finance the cultivation of land by Europeans or Asians, I am not sure.

The policy of the Land Settlement Board and the policy of the Land Bank have not been clearly or definitively indicated to the Mission.

The PRESIDENT: In this connexion, ^{there was} a petition from the Chagga people -- the Chagga Council -- where the complaint was that the Chagga people inhabiting the slopes of the Kilimanjaro mountains have inadequate land to meet the needs of an already dense and expanding population of 200,000.

It is stated that 11,000 adult males are already in desperate need of plots of land and that this figure will increase to 81,400 in ten years. And then it is part of the complaint to propose certain remedies and the Visiting Mission states that the question of returning alienated lands and of future alienation are dealt with in the Report and suggests that a policy somewhat similar to that advocated by the petitioners -- that is, the Federal Council -- should be envisaged by the Administering Authority.

/I wanted

I wanted to point this out to give the other point of view, but I would suggest that the Council should defer this question until it comes to consider the petition from the Chagga Council. I believe that the representative of China has given a picture which is again on the lines of some of the petitioners' statements and also ... some parts of the Visiting Mission's Report.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
(Interpretation from Russian): The Report of the Visiting Mission notes that in their conversations with Africans the latter told the members of the Mission that the colonization of Europeans in certain regions has had a result of shortage of land available to the indigenous inhabitants.

There is a petition of the Tanganyika African Association which says that the Africans have the impression that pretty soon they will have no^{free} land available at all.

The same petition says that lands which formerly belonged to Africans and were expropriated by the Germans were returned not to the indigenous inhabitants but to other Europeans without trouble having been taken to obtain the acquiescence of the Africans.

/The same

The same facts, approximately, were told us in other petitions.

I should like to elicit a clarification as to ^{what} percentage of formerly expropriated lands have been restored to the indigenous inhabitants, and under what conditions.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): I cannot give the information. It would only be obtainable from the Tanganyika Government source.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Perhaps the Chairman of the Visiting Mission or one of the members of the Mission has that information, because I think it is most interesting in order to cast some light on this whole problem.

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): All the information at the disposal of the Visiting Mission was incorporated in extenso in the Report. We did not keep any information confidential.

As regards the specific question asked by the representative of the USSR, I am not in a position to reply fully. In the course of our visit to the Northern Province, we got the impression that the question was being discussed, as the representative of China has explained. No crystallized policy has been set as regards disposal of ex-enemy properties. This was the impression which I garnered from various conversations which members of the Mission had with government officials in Dar-es-Salaam and with other persons of authority in the Northern Province.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): From what the Chairman of the Visiting Mission has said, does it follow that the Visiting Mission has had no possibility or was not able to study this question? Or does it consider that the impression created in the mind of the Chairman of the Visiting Mission was sufficient for clarifying all the aspects of the matter?

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): I am afraid that my words have been somewhat
/misinterpreted

misinterpreted. I did not intimate that we did not have time to study the question; I said that we had looked into it.

The representative of China has said before that we had asked the question; we had looked into it; we asked about the matter in Dar-es-Salaam; we did it also in the Northern Provinces. We got, therefore, information from various sources.

What I am unable to say in the name of the Mission -- incidentally, we do not necessarily have to distinguish the opinion of the Chairman of the Mission from the other members, because our Report was unanimous, but this is beside the point -- what I wanted to say was that the policy of the British administration with respect to ex-enemy lands did not appear to us to have as yet been fully crystallized. What the representative of China said previously is exactly what I am repeating now. This was, however, our impression, and that is all that I said.

I do not want my statement to be interpreted in a way that I did not mean to give to it.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I do not know how I was interpreted in the French, but I did not mean to say that the Mission did not have time. I say, perhaps the Mission did not have a possibility or opportunity of doing something. I request that this be made quite clear in the text of the French translation of my statement.

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): The Visiting Mission did have an opportunity of looking into the question, and it did so. This is one of the subjects which the Mission constantly took under consideration, particularly when we visited the Northern Provinces where there is a question of local land shortage and where the population is particularly active and intelligent according to the standards of agriculture, and the Mission there could not fail to take into account this whole problem. But indeed the only conclusion which we drew from the matter was that the policy of the United Kingdom Government with respect to ex-enemy properties has not precisely registered by the Mission for the good and sufficient reason that the British authorities did not seem
/yet to have

yet to have crystallized this policy, at least in their statements to the members of the Visiting Mission.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): How about this fact referred to in the petition, which is noted also in the Report of the Visiting Mission -- that part of ex-enemy lands is being restored not to the natives but to Europeans without the bother of obtaining the acquiescence of the Africans themselves? The Mission seems to have verified this fact. Are they being denied, or is this statement being taken into account?

Mr. LAURENTE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): I shall ask the representative of the USSR to point out to me what paragraph of the Report he is referring to, because I think I have lost my place.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I think it is on page 86 of the Report, or it might be mentioned in the petition itself, that is, the petition of the Tanganyika African Association, which is on page 14 of document T/218/Add.1.

The PRESIDENT: There is some reference to the question on pages 87 and 88 of document T/218.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): It is page 86 at the bottom of the page, under paragraph 5.

"It is public knowledge that African land is being given over to non-natives in some districts without the prior approval of the Africans themselves".

That is one aspect of the land in general, but there is another fact which I cannot locate which deals with the restoration of land which had formerly been expropriated from the Africans and which now is being restored not to the natives themselves but to Europeans.

The PRESIDENT: I believe that there is another reference on pages 87 and 88 of the Report. At the bottom of page 87 it is stated:

/"The arguments

"The arguments of the Chagga concerning land in this area were presented in a memorandum to the Commission" -- that is, the Arusha-Moshi Lands Commission -- "also appears as a part of their petition. The Report of the Commission expresses the opinion that a 'Source of land for further non-native settlement is the ex-enemy farms in both districts which have not been recommended for reversion to native or public use?'"

There I would like to draw the attention of the Council to the next paragraph:

"The Report (that is, the Arusha-Moshi Lands Commission Report) recommends that relief should be accorded to the 'congested native populations' of this area by handing over to them certain ex-enemy mission and other alienated lands, as a short-term remedy, and that, as a long-term remedy, the lower areas in both districts and contiguous areas in the Masai district should be developed."

Mr. LAUREVILLE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): I wonder whether this does not entail some confusion. There may be some confusion in the reading of the Report, and I think I see this confusion in the statement of the representative of the USSR.

The African Association of Arusha referred to what the representative of China spoke about. It refers to this general fear lest it happen that lands be alienated, because the Government might decide to follow a general policy of land expropriation or dispossession. In such a contingency, the Arusha African Association declares that the procedure now followed for concessions would not be sufficient to protect local landholders against the policy of land expropriation, if such a policy were adopted.

This petition does not, however, refer to present facts. It refers to a contingency, to a possible policy that the Government of Tanganyika might intend to adopt. It refers to general fears that the natives of the region might entertain.

On the other hand, as I pointed out, unless my memory fails me, there has not been any resale of ex-enemy owned lands and therefore the question of ex-enemy properties in the Northern Province remains in abeyance. It remains quite open.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I have a note in connexion with the petition from the Tanganyika African Association, regarding this matter of the feeding on land. My note is to this effect: that the statements contained in this section of the petition are misleading and exaggerated.

Only in a few areas is there any justification for the statement that shortage of land for African occupation is due to alienation to non-natives.

/The outstanding

The outstanding case is that found in the Kilimanjaro and Meru mountains in the Northern Provinces, and measures for remedying the position in that area are under consideration.

Full details in regard to land conditions of tenure, alienation and population pressure, are given on pages 78 to 81 of the Annual Report for 1947. Agricultural leases are now limited to thirty-three years. As the date of expiration approaches the question^{of} renewing the leases will be examined in each case in the light of the position then obtaining, and of all relevant factors affecting the general economy and needs of the Territory at the time.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Should the explanation of the Chairman of the Visiting Mission be interpreted to mean that the Mission is not aware of any cases where alienated land was restored, not to the indigenous population, but to European settlers? Is that a correct interpretation of what he has said?

Page 87 of the Report of the Visiting Mission says that:

"Source of land for further non-native settlement is the ex-enemy farms in both districts which have not been recommended for reversion to native or public use".

Are the two statements compatible? This statement at the bottom of page 87 may lead to the conclusion that it is not proposed to return some of this ex-enemy land to the^{indigenous} population. That might be a valid interpretation of the sentence at the bottom of page 87, and, as the Chairman has indicated, the same thing is included in the petition.

The PRESIDENT: I believe this question of land will come up during the consideration of the petitions. I think enough questions have been asked about the disposition of land.

I would like to ask the Council to adjourn for twenty minutes and meet here at 4.40 p.m.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): Would the President allow me to make a suggestion to the Council?

The work that is really holding us up now is the work of the Committee which is trying to draft the reports on the various reports
/now before the

now before the Council. I would to suggest that we should consider the question of the Council not meeting tomorrow and Friday, with a view to allowing the Committee to work all day on Thursday and Friday.

If it is the wish of the Council that that should be done, I would make a formal motion to that effect after the recess.

The PRESIDENT: Let us all think about that during the recess.

Let us resume our work at 4.40 p.m.

The meeting was suspended at 4.18 p.m. and was resumed at 4.48 p.m.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: The meeting is called to order.

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): I merely want to clarify the point which was referred to a while ago.

I said that as far as I could remember, no ex-enemy lands had been expropriated in the Northern Provinces. However, as the Report indicates on page 88 in the next to the last paragraph, there have been, not alienations or sales but, according to the telegram received from London by the Government of Tanganyika, there have been some -- I cannot tell exactly how many -- short-term leases which were given to Europeans in the northwestern section of the Northern Province.

The northwestern part of the Northern Province is very far-removed from the lands occupied by the Chagga tribe and from the relatively over-populated Kilimanjaro area. This refers to a rather broad plateau in which the Chagga tribe is not particularly interested.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any further observations on this chapter? If not we will proceed to the next chapter on the Groundnut Scheme.

CHAPTER IV -- GROUNDNUT SCHEME

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I have a question regarding the Groundnut Scheme but I find it rather difficult to ask this question right now since I am getting the impression that we are not receiving any answers to a number of questions which are designed to obtain some clarification on the Report of the Visiting Mission. I should like to ask the following question: What is the capital of the Overseas Food Corporation and what is the capital which that Corporation intends to invest in Tanganyika for that Scheme? Is there any information as to the income being received or to be received by that Corporation? What part of such income is channeled through taxation or otherwise into the development of the Trust Territory of Tanganyika? There are a number of related questions bearing upon this Corporation but before I proceed I should like to have some replies to the questions I have just asked.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): The capital of the Overseas Food Corporation is 50,000,000 pounds. My recollection is that the allocation for the Groundnut Scheme in Tanganyika, Rhodesia and Kenya is 25,000,000 pounds.

/Whether that

Whether that allocation has been reviewed or not, I do not know. So far, no income that I know of has been received by the Corporation. It will be understood that the Corporation's activities are still in a very early stage.

In reply to the fourth question, the Council has, I think, been told that the Corporation will be liable to taxation under Tanganyika law in the same way as any other commercial undertaking. The Corporation has, of course, already contributed to Tanganyika revenues through customs duties and other charges levied on their operations there in the ordinary course of events.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I think if I made a few remarks in regard to the Groundnut Scheme it might be of some help to the members of the Council.

I want to point out that any lease granted to or any agreement made with the Corporation would contain a clause providing that the lease or agreement may be terminated or revised at any time by agreement between His Majesty's Government and the Tanganyika Government.

I can also give an assurance that a copy of the report by the Corporation, which must by law be laid annually before Parliament, will be supplied to members of the Trusteeship Council and the remaining information, provision of which is recommended by the Visiting Mission, will be provided by the Administering Authority as far as is practicable.

I feel that I must impress upon the members of the Council that this Scheme must, now and for some time to come, be regarded as ⁱⁿ the experimental stage and no question of handing over the enterprise to African co-operative associations can be seriously considered until its economic success has been proved and established.

It would, in any case, be quite impossible at this stage to persuade Africans to migrate in large numbers from their tribal areas and settle permanently in the new areas now being opened up. This would be the first requirement if an attempt were to be made to carry out the suggestion referred to in sub-paragraph (d) 2 on page 117 of the Visiting Mission's Report.

It should be noted that the inauguration of this Scheme does not affect the continued and increasing cultivation of groundnuts by African individuals in all parts of the Territory where this crop can be grown.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I was just ^{about} to ask whether there would be information about the Groundnut Scheme in the annual report but what the representative of the United Kingdom just said replies to that

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I do not know whether I correctly understood the explanation of the representative of the United Kingdom.

In the last part of his statement where he said that it is possible for the Africans to emigrate to other zones, I wish to know whether I understood correctly.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I did not quite follow that. I said that it would be quite impossible, at this stage, to persuade Africans to migrate in large numbers to the new areas now being opened up. Is that what was meant?

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I wonder how it is possible that a great number of workers of Ruanda-Urundi can pass over into Tanganyika to work there? I do not know whether such a possibility is not existent in other areas.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): They come back. They come back. They work for six months to earn bride money or something of that sort whereas if you have to start a large co-operative scheme along the lines of the Groundnut Scheme that would mean permanent settlement of new farmers coming from tribal centres and settling down on a large collective farm and adopting an altogether different kind of life from what they have had in their tribal areas. They certainly could not be persuaded to do that on their own.

When these people see that the Scheme is a success and that they can make a good living, they probably may be persuaded to do so. But now they will not go unless they are sure of having a given wage and know that they earn so much a week which they would not know if they were on a co-operative farm, farming groundnuts.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I should like to ask the following question: In what way did the Administering Authority obtain the views of the indigenous population regarding this whole Groundnut Scheme and regarding the allocation of 2,500,000 acres of land for that Scheme?

/If the opinion of the

If the opinion of the indigenous population was elicited, how was that done and what was the reaction of the indigenous population to this plan for the expropriation of land from among the public lands of the Territory and their allocation to the Groundnut Development Scheme?

Sir George SANDFORD (Special representative): I have not sufficient detailed information on the steps taken to be able to give a full reply to that question, but the consultation would take place with the native authorities and with the inhabitants of all the areas concerned. That would apply to all three areas in Tanganyika.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I have not yet heard any reply to my question.

The PRESIDENT: Sir George said that he has no detailed information enabling him to give a full account.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I cannot understand how it is that there is no information on such a basic question. I think this is a basic point in this whole Groundnut Development Scheme. If the special representative does not have that information, and if the representative of the United Kingdom does not have that information, then who does have it? Perhaps the representative of the United Kingdom can contribute something on this point.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I cannot give any information today, but at the next session of the Council I hope to be able to give the representative of the USSR the information he asks for.

Mr. CRAW (New Zealand): There is just one point here which rather interests me. I had received the impression from the minority report filed last session by the representative of the Soviet Union, that he must be in possession of full information since he stated in that minority report that the USSR delegation was of the opinion that the plans, that refers to the Groundnut Scheme, and the Sukumaland Scheme are not based on the freely expressed will of the indigenous people of the Territory. Therefore, I cannot see why he asks this question.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: I think the representative of the Soviet Union is asking a question of a different kind from that just referred to.

Sir George SANFORD (Special representative): Might I refer to the written statement provided by the Administration in Tanganyika which is reproduced on pages 108 to 110 of the Report of the Visiting Mission.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Perhaps the special representative might wish to show me the passages to which he would like to draw my attention. I did peruse this document; nevertheless, this perusal did not elicit all the information which I considered desirable.

The PRESIDENT: Could Sir George Sanford give the specific references?

Sir George SANFORD (Special representative): In the passage quoted, which was written in relation to occupancy of land by the Groundnut Scheme, the procedure laid down by the Government of Tanganyika was described.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): It is the eighth line from the bottom of the page: "The attitude of the local Native Authority to the proposed alienation must also be ascertained. . ."

The PRESIDENT: This reference is to page 108 of document T/218.

Sir George SANFORD (Special representative): Might I refer to the last line but eight on page 109, which says: "schedules of compensation were drawn up for the different areas; these were approved by the Native Authorities and by the Africans whose individual interests were affected".

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): This is not what I asked. I referred to the attitude of the population of Tanganyika. You cannot reduce the matter to saying that you elicited the opinions of one or two tribal chiefs.

/We have heard

We have heard that there might be a possibility - that is that some tribal chiefs agree to some requests made persuasively by the Administering Authority, for ends not necessarily quite altruistic.

I did not ask either about any schedules of compensation. I asked whether the Administering Authority obtained the opinion of the local indigenous population regarding the Groundnut Development Scheme, and if so, how it obtained it and what was the reaction of the indigenous population of Tanganyika to this whole Scheme.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I will now refer -- I am reading the document as I go along -- to the middle of page 110: "In any area selected by the Overseas Food Corporation, the Administrative Officer concerned interviews the local Native Authority and the individual natives affected".

I want to say that I cannot accept the insinuation that whenever a native chief says anything he is not to be trusted to look after the welfare of his own people. My experience of Africa is that a chief who behaved like that would not last very long as chief.

Moreover, it is not confined to a few people to be honest in their conduct on life generally.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): We base ourselves on the information available in the Report of the Visiting Mission. We do not inject any new element; no insinuation is being attempted at all. We are merely referring to the document and to the facts that are given in the Report.

As regards the opinions of the indigenous population of the Trust Territory, apparently the representative of the Administering Authority is unable to give us a full reply because what is in the Report and what was referred to by the representative of the United Kingdom and by the special representative is in no way an exhaustive answer to the question that was asked. Therefore, I can only observe as a general comment that it is apparently impossible to draw any final conclusion on this plan because we lack the most basic elements of information, including such a vital item as the attitude of the indigenous population as a whole to this entire plan of expropriating 2,550,000 acres of land for the benefit of the Scheme.

/Sir Alan BURNS

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I am at a loss to understand the arguments of the representative of the USSR because this is a quotation from the Administering Authority's own statement. I cannot understand what he is getting at in this matter, but I would like, if I may, to ask the special representative whether he can tell us if this matter was discussed in the Legislative Council, and if so, whether the African members of that Council expressed any opinion.

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

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): My impression is that they were consulted and were enthusiastically in favour of it.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I think that was exactly the question asked by the representative of the USSR -- what was the point of view of the native population towards the whole scheme, not of the people who are getting indemnities for their houses or their trees, but of the native population generally. There I believe it would be very difficult to ask the native population to pass judgment on a scheme when even the Europeans do not know what is going to happen with that scheme. They are going to risk 25,000,000 pounds on it but we do not even know if it is going to work, so how could the natives judge whether or not it will be good for the country.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Perchance the views of the indigenous population regarding the Groundnut Development Scheme were expressed through social, cultural or educational organizations or through the press, or perhaps they were expressed through the intermediary of the members of the indigenous population who were able to understand the scope of that scheme and were able to understand the meaning of the expropriation of 2,550,000 acres of land belonging to the native population of Tanganyika.

The question, I think, is quite clear. I do not really understand why the question is not understood.

The PRESIDENT: The question has been asked, and has been replied to.

/Mr. NORIEGA

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico)(Interpretation from Spanish): If there are no more remarks to be made on this problem of land and this scheme, I should like to know when we are going to take up the subject of mines because I have two questions in this connexion.

The PRESIDENT: Actually we are not going to sub-divide the headings. If you have any questions on mines, we can go back to it. Actually we are on Chapter IV now, but since the Groundnut Scheme is also concerned with economic development, I think it would not be improper to deal with the question of mines. I am not going to divide the Chapter into sub-headings.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico)(Interpretation from Spanish): I wish to ask the representative of the Administering Authority for what reason the mining ordinance which is in effect now and which was published in 1929 says:

"The entire property in and control of all minerals in, under or upon any lands in the Territory are and shall be vested in the Governor in trust for His Majesty as Sovereign for the Mandatory Power..."

I wish to know whether this legal text corresponds only to a precedent or tradition in the drafting of ordinances upon mining, because it seems to disagree with the provisions of the trusteeship agreement. We could not concede the point that these mines and what is contained therein belongs to His Majesty, and not to the Territory.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): It is usual in all British colonies -- and in England too-- to refer to any public property as the property of the King. For instance, the Royal Navy is considered to be His Majesty's Navy, but nobody thinks that those ships are the King's private yachts.

If there is any technical difficulty in this matter, I can only suggest that "His Majesty, the King," is referred to in this case as the Administering Authority and, as such, is owner of the property as trustee for the people of the Territory. That is all that is intended. It is in no way intended that His Majesty should take possession of the mines of the products of the mines.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico)(Interpretation from Spanish): My point was merely a point of legal curiosity. The reply has been satisfactory.

/I would like

I would like to know now whether ^{under} this standard which is applied to all colonial or trust territories the quotas of royalties that are paid for gold mines and diamond mines ^{in Tanganyika} -- I am referring to what is derived from them as products of the mining industry -- are exactly the same as those in effect in other territories under the British Crown or whether they are different quotas, because it is said in the Report of the Visiting Mission that they would seem to be rather low.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): So far as I know, there is no uniformity in the rate of royalty on gold in the various parts of the colonial empire. I should add that the question of royalties on gold is a matter of considerable complexity at the moment because the price obtainable for gold is regarded as less favourable than the price obtainable for other commodities.

Consequently, the gold miners in the Territory are finding very great difficulty in bringing their costs within their receipts. The gold royalty in Tanganyika used to be 5 per cent of the gold won. I believe that that figure has been reduced. I believe further that the Tanganyika Government is considering a completely different system of royalties to relate the royalty payable to the net earnings of the miner.

With regard to diamonds, the royalty is 15 per cent. There again I do not know how that compares with the royalties charged in other territories.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): In so far as I understand it, the representative of Mexico was asking about the quotas regarding diamonds, the suggestion being that the quota allotted to Tanganyika for the sale of diamonds is low. I would not say that.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): The reply given by the special representative corresponds to the question that I made.

The quota for production however, I understand, is a private arrangement and in this, of course, it would be desirable for the Administering Authority to participate because if we think that the production of diamonds is to be under the control of those in power in the diamond market, then a most important branch of industry would be subject to private rather than public interests.

/In this connexion

In this connexion I would say that the economic basis of the Territory in an important connexion should be brought under the responsibility of the Administering Authority and not left to a private-property regime.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): That is what I was going to explain. The Administering Authority intervened in this matter and was able to secure a quota which was regarded as extremely favourable to the interests of Tanganyika.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico)(Interpretation from Spanish): I have one last question in connexion with this chapter which refers to Observation 6 of the Visiting Mission to the effect that the industry and commerce of the Territory are mostly in the hands of non-natives.

I have noticed that one product, coffee, which is very important, and cotton which is mentioned also, were bought directly ^{by} the British Government. I would like to know what the criterion has been for fixing the purchase prices on the part of the British Government for these products. What scale is in existence for the purpose of determining the purchase prices of these native products by the British Government and its offices?

/Sir George

The price is determined by Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative):/ agreement between the British Government and the producer. fairly generally, over East Africa. That refers to a proportion of the coffee crop.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): Perhaps my question was not entirely clear.

The British Government buys certain agricultural products. In fact, it exercises a kind of consumers' monopoly since it is the only purchaser of this product. I would like to know, what is the basis for fixing the prices?

So far, according to Sir George, it is an agreement between the purchaser and the seller.

I am sure that the proposal of the British Government, which is going to purchase, must be worked out on some equitable basis. Now what is the thought behind the purchase price suggested? What is this basis?

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): I said that the British Government buys a portion of the coffee crop, fairly generally through East Africa. The rest of the crop is sold on the free market.

The price, as I said before, is negotiated between the buyer, that is the British Government, and the seller, that is the producer in East Africa, and it changes from time to time.

I should add that this does not only apply to coffee. There are other commodities such as sisal, which has been under similar agreement between the buyer and the seller.

The PRESIDENT: In reference to the fixing of prices by agreement, cotton is cited on page 81 of the Visiting Mission's Report.

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): In relation to cotton, other arrangements are in force. Generally speaking, cotton has been sold to India, and those prices again have been negotiated between representatives of East African cotton producers and the Indian buyers - that is the Government of India - who have been buying.

But that system again is under revision, and I believe that at the present moment free market operations are more general.

/ Mr. BAKR

Mr. BAKR (Iraq): I would like to ask a question about tribal land ownership. Does ownership belong to the chief or to the individuals of the tribe?

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): All over Africa, so far as I know, the chief holds the land as trustee for the people, and it is no way the chief's private property.

Mr. BAKR (Iraq): Is there any possibility of allotting the land in small properties to the individuals of the tribe, not to keep it as a whole? Is it better for the tribe to keep it as it is? Which is better for the settlement and development? ^{Or} / that every individual in the tribe should cultivate his own land and property? Which is better?

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): ^{Might I invite attention} / ^{to a very full} description of land tenure among the indigenous inhabitants contained in pages 76 and subsequent pages of the Report on Tanganyika for 1947. This gives very full information of the system of land tenure among the indigenous inhabitants.

Generally speaking, as the representative of the United Kingdom has said, the land is held on behalf of the tribe, and arrangements are made for the use of land, depending on the need of the members of the tribe

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): As far as coffee is concerned I think the representative of Mexico may rest assured that the great coffee merchants are Europeans from Kenya. They will talk prices with the ministry, and they are very hard ^{off} bargainers, and the better the bargain they drive the better/the natives will be.

As regards the statement of the representative of Iraq I might say that the present system, in my opinion, is preferable.

Generally speaking, in the British colonies, I believe, or in the British Trust Territories and in French Trust Territories and Belgian Trust Territories, there is one absolute principle that prevails.

As far as real estate is concerned, actual possession means right to own that land. If a man plants a tree on such land, it is his land, and he cannot be dispossessed. / If this customary

If this customary system were replaced with the regular European system, according to which you have to have title to the land, then during the transformation, whoever would not have such an actual title would find his right jeopardized. He may be told that ^{ownership} only of those lands is guaranteed in respect of which titles are in possession of the people, while the others are not guaranteed.

Right now, however, the native is fully protected. The land where he builds his house is his land and it cannot be taken away; the place where he planted a tree is his, and it cannot be taken away from him.

If land is owned by the tribe it cannot be expropriated. Nothing can be taken away from the native once he has made some use of the land.

If private property were introduced on the European basis, with written title for everything, that would also entail the possibility of mortgaging, of alienability, of loans with land collateral, and all those possibilities which would lead to unfortunate consequences, and have led to unfortunate consequences in other regions where such systems have been introduced.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): As regards the question of title - claim to land - by natives, I should like to ask a question.

As the tribal system develops, the authority of the chief may be limited by the authority of the tribal assembly. In subsequent stages of the development of the tribal system the tribal chieftain concentrates authority in his hands.

A chief is wont to decide questions directly affecting the destiny of the tribe, including land questions, by his own authority, with the help of a small group of so-called native notables.

The Report of the Visiting Mission leads us to judge that the tribal system in Tanganyika is now at that stage of development where the great part of the population of the tribe does not play any decisive part in settling such questions as the land question and related questions.

I should like to have some clarification on this particular point from the Special Representative or from the Chairman of the Visiting Mission. What is their impression of that point, because if the tribal system of Tanganyika is at a certain stage of development, then the question of land utilization is clear cut,

/ because there are

because there are specific rules as to the possibility of land disposal which are settled by the tribal system.

However, if the Special representative and the Chairman of the Visiting Mission have more information than we have I should like them to explain this point to the members of the Council, and to tell us what exactly is the situation.

/ Mr. LAURENTIE

Mr. LAURENTIE (Chairman of the Visiting Mission) (Interpretation from French): In his last statement the representative of the Soviet Union referred to an opinion which he previously had expressed more precisely and in this connexion we might perhaps make things clear.

He told us that the Report of the Visiting Mission made it clear that the tribal chiefs consulted during the procedure that was set up by the Administering Authority might neglect the interests of their tribe, that they might perhaps let themselves be influenced in favour of alienation for Europeans. However, I do not think that the Report of the Visiting Mission lends itself to that interpretation. The Report of the Visiting Mission indicates that the Mission received a petition by some Africans who complained that such a thing might occur but they do not give any examples.

The Mission merely reproduced that opinion without verification. We did not have any opportunity to verify that point. We simply drew the question to the attention of the Administering Authority and we were told in all cases that the present procedure gave all necessary guarantees and that there was no possibility of any surprise dispossession of native-owned land in favour of Europeans under the present circumstances.

Furthermore, it seems that the representative of the Soviet Union wants to know what is the ^{economic} position of native-owned lands or, rather, what claim actually do natives have to land which they possess? What are the titles through which the natives own their land? Now the Visiting Mission did get some information on that point in various parts of Tanganyika.

If I may express the consensus of my colleagues I might say that in the Lake Province and in Sukumaland Federation the sense of collective security is very highly developed. The bulk of the population is very much interested in what is being done for increasing the amount of land available -- as, of course, lands are made available -- through the extermination of the tsetse fly.

As regards the Chagga tribe region, I think I told the Council yesterday that the Chieftain of the Chagga tribe and the members of the Chagga Native Authority Council very carefully represent and defend the interests of their constituents, their compatriots. They could not carry out any real estate operation which would be contrary to the interests of the ^{present} holders of the land. This would be utterly inconceivable at the present moment.

/As regards the other

As regards the other regions visited by the Mission, regions which are poor, which are usually tsetse-infested and which are very indifferently cultivated, there it was impossible to learn what exactly was the property-feeling, the property titles or the property claims as far as the natives were concerned. It seems, however, that the situation was the same as everywhere else. After all, land always has considerable value for such people and the people are attached to their land. They are attached to it legally, also, as explained by the representative of Belgium. I cannot quote any specific example to the Council which would cast some light on this problem as it relates to the large plateau region in the centre of Tangan-

yika. However, in view of the poverty of the land or rather the indifferent quality of land cultivation and of the present inhospitable character of the region, it might be said that this feeling of attachment to the land is less developed than it is in the other regions. But of course this feeling of attachment to the land does become more highly developed as lands are relieved of the tsetse fly infestation.

The PRESIDENT: I understand that Sir George Sandford is leaving tomorrow. If the members of the Council would like to ask him further questions I think that this is the last opportunity.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): Given this circumstance I think it would be of value to the Council if Sir George, as the Special Representative, would offer remarks on those parts of the Report which we have not yet discussed. I am sure these would be of value if he would want to make them.

The PRESIDENT: I think that is a very good idea. If the Special Representative has any observation to make on the remaining parts of the Report which have not been discussed by the Council I think the Council would be very happy to hear it.

CHAPTER V SOCIAL ADVANCEMENT

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): I shall first refer to page 124. In the middle of the page at the end of paragraph 5 it should read: "...to perform the duties in which they were engaged, although not beyond 30 September 1946." and not "1948".

/Turning now to the

Turning now to the observations and conclusions on page 147, the wages in Tanganyika are tending to rise. My impression is that there is no real difficulty with skilled or semi-skilled labour. People who are driving tractors and motor cars and so on, engaged on machinery, use their skill, but their task, as a task, is relatively light.

The trouble in East Africa, as I see it, arises primarily out of the unskilled labour^{-or} who is required to do continuous work of the heavy kind and his physique does not respond sufficiently to those continuous rather heavy tasks.

The solution will come by general measures of improvement of physique and of course education and other social services which will help him^{to} carry out heavier tasks than he is able to now.

But with that condition, I suggest to the Council that while wages may be described generally as low for unskilled labour, the solution lies in the treatment of the body rather than in the wage structure.

There are many points raised in other sections of the observations and conclusions which to my mind are entirely sound and where further investigation and action is required I feel sure that the Administering Authority will wish to discuss them with the Tanganyika Government.

Among those are the suggestion that representatives of African labour should be appointed to the Labour Board and possibly the application of minimum wages provisions in the Territory. But I should like to state that conditions in the Territory are by no means uniform. The Visiting Mission gives ample evidence of that, and the application of minimum wages provision is by no means a simple matter in the circumstances of Tanganyika.

With regard to paragraph 8 of the conclusions on page 149, the operations of this new Ordinance will certainly be watched by the Administering Authority and the local Government. The object of this Ordinance is to improve the supply and conditions of labour -- to improve the conditions in which Africans who volunteer for work outside their own districts may go to the place they choose for labour and be properly looked after on the way.

/The Ordinance

The Ordinance itself is a very recent Ordinance and it must still be regarded as experimental, but it is at least an attempt to smooth the way of those who wish to work away from their homes.

I should like to make one point clear and that is that nothing in the Ordinance prevents a person from finding his own way to the place where he wants to be employed and offering himself direct to an employer. This is not a canalization of all labour through an organization; it is merely an effort to smooth the way for those who wish to make use of it and who are working outside their own districts.

With regard to paragraph 9, the suggestion will, I feel sure, be discussed between the Administering Authority and the Tanganyika Government and, so far as I can see, there should be no difficulty in Tanganyika applying the insurance provisions mentioned independently of what happens in any other country.

With regard to "Medical Health Services", I believe that the general resources of Tanganyika have been very fully stretched in the development plan which they have produced. In fact, I believe it to be the case that the plan at present goes further than the resources which seem to be available. I do not think that they have yet found how to finance the whole plan. A considerable amount of money is being made available for the expansion of health services and I myself doubt whether the resources available to the Tanganyika Government will enable them to do much more during the period covered by the plan.

I have no comments on paragraphs 3, 4 and 5.

With regard to paragraph 6, I am informed that in 1947 out of a total of 20,000 admissions to prison, six prisoners were awarded corporal punishment, that is caning, in all cases for assaulting a prison officer.

I also understand that it is not considered practicable to abolish corporal punishment in prisons for crimes of violence.

CHAPTER VI -- EDUCATIONAL ADVANCEMENT

Sir George SANDFORD (Special Representative): Here again I believe that under the proposals in the Tanganyika Development Plan the maximum effort is being made for educational advancement; in fact, the plans in relation to education were very considerably expanded from the earlier proposals put forward. It may be, as the Mission says, that by 1956 only 250,000 children will be achieving a primary four-year education and that only 200 students will be receiving higher education at Makerere College. But the maximum effort is being made, and it must inevitably be a long process to bring the benefits of education to the whole widespread population of Tanganyika.

/I notice that

I notice that the Report suggests that the establishment of a college in Tanganyika might be seriously considered. There is, of course, nothing to stop that, but the establishment of a college for higher education of this kind is an exceptionally expensive thing to do, and the general policy in East Africa for the last fifteen years has been in recognition of the expense involved in providing the facilities for this higher education to concentrate in one place. That does not mean to say that Makerere will be able to provide for all the people who require this kind of education in East Africa, but the plans affecting Makerere do contemplate an expansion until 600, 800 or 1,000 people will be able to receive education there. In the interests of the Tanganyika Government no less than East Africa as a whole, I feel sure that it will be of advantage to deal with Makerere as the college for Eastern Africa until the need is obvious for more colleges, in which case the whole subject might be placed on a Territorial and not an inter-Territorial basis.

Finally, my personal opinion on paragraph 6 on page 167 is that there are such great differences of the approach to education among the different races, their background, their language difficulties and so on, that a combination inter-racial primary education would not be practical politics. Inter-racial secondary education may also present difficulties. Of course, it is understood that combined inter-racial higher education is perfectly feasible, because by that time they have got the common language, the common basis of education. It is in the primary stage where you are dealing with people whose only knowledge of language may be the vernacular that it is extremely difficult to combine different races.

The PRESIDENT: I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of the Council to tender the special representative a very sincere appreciation for his coming over especially in connexion with the discussion on the question of administrative union, and secondly, for helping us in discussing matters relating to Tanganyika arising from the Visiting Mission's Report. We wish him God-speed.

Sir George Sandford, special representative for Tanganyika under British Administration, withdrew from the Council table.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: I understand that the representative of the International Labour Office has a communication to make to the Council.

Mr. Evans (ILO): In a section of the recommendations of the Report of the Visiting Mission which the ILO has read with the greatest of interest, there is the suggestion that the Trusteeship Council may wish to avail itself of the assistance of the ILO in connexion with certain reports mentioned in paragraph 4 of page 118 of the Report.

It may be of interest to members of the Council to know that the Director-General of the ILO drew the attention of the governing body to the passages of the Report dealing with labour conditions-- both the Reports dealing with Ruanda-Urundi and Tanganyika--and that the governing body took note of these passages of the Report. In particular the governing body has authorized the Director-General to furnish all possible assistance to the Trusteeship Council in regard to these matters, and has authorized him to inform the Trusteeship Council that the ILO welcomes the suggestion in the Report on Tanganyika that the Council should avail itself of the assistance of the ILO when considering certain reports on the Groundnuts Scheme.

The PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mr. Evans.

I think the representative of the United Kingdom was about to make a proposal in regard to the work of the Council. Would he like to make any formal motion now?

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): If it is the general wish of the Council, I would suggest that instead of meeting tomorrow and Friday, we should allow the Committee to work both morning and afternoon on Thursday and Friday, and adjourn the Council until Monday afternoon, by which time we hope that the Committee will have been able to get on with such an extent of its work that we would be able to deal with some of the matters now before that Committee.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: May I ask the Chairmen of the Drafting Committee whether that Committee requires the extra time for its work? I am told that the petitions have to be completed as soon as possible in order to enable the Drafting Committee to formulate its draft in regard to petitions.

(China)
Mr. LIN/(Chairman of the Drafting Committee): I shall inform the Council of the present status of the Committee's work.

The Committee has finished its/draft report on Western Samoa, and is about to finish its draft report on the Cameroons under French Administration, with the exception of its last part on educational advancement. We have finished political, social and economic advancement.

As soon as educational advancement is finished in the case of the Cameroons, we will deal with Togoland under French Administration. The recommendations concerning Togoland will be very similar to those with respect to the Cameroons. If we should have a full day tomorrow, we will be able to finish both of the Territories under French administration. Additional time would be welcomed.

Then on Friday we perhaps might be able to finish our draft reports on both the British Trust Territories. We may be able to finish both of them.

I feel the Committee would welcome such an opportunity, but that depends on the schedule of the Council. If the Council can give the Committee time, I think the Committee would welcome the opportunity.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I think there is virtue in the suggestion, but I am wondering whether the suggestion need be quite so drastic. I feel a little concerned at our own work. If we do not convene again until next Monday, we will be quite a little behind our own schedule. I have been asking myself whether it would not be possible for us to meet tomorrow afternoon as usual and then abstain from meeting Friday afternoon, so that the Drafting Committee would have all of Friday afternoon to work. If, in spite of that, they cannot catch up, there would be perhaps the possibility for the Committee to meet Saturday morning.

What I have in mind is that it is almost necessary for us as a Council to complete our work by the end of next week. I am perfectly agreeable to whatever arrangement is best calculated to meet this end.

/But might

AMH/dg

T/P.V. 156
94/95

But might it not be wise to continue with our own work tomorrow afternoon and see how far we get ahead? Certainly give to the Committee all day Friday to work. The Council, not meeting Friday afternoon, can see what point the Committee reaches -- whether it is possible to do any week end work on the part of the Committee. We could omit our own meeting Monday afternoon if it is vital for the Committee to have more time.

I am merely throwing these ideas out. I have no strong predilection one way or the other.

/The PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: As I see the situation, I think the proposal of the representative of the United Kingdom is prompted by the knowledge that the Council cannot go ahead with its work next week -- or will not have anything to go ahead with next week -- unless it receives the draft reports from the Drafting Committee.

Starting from those premises, if the Committee should finish some of the reports, say, Friday, the texts will not be in the hands of representatives until they meet again on Monday. Then the apprehension is that some members will say they have not had time to read the texts, and they will not be able to discuss them in Council. I think that may be the situation. Am I correct?

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): Yes, and furthermore, if the Council gets in to the position next week when it is behind its schedule, and there are mornings available because the Committee has finished its work, the Council can meet morning and afternoon to catch up. But it cannot do it the other way about.

If the Committee's work is not finished the Council cannot work either morning or afternoon.

The PRESIDENT: In that case, would this be agreeable? let the Committee work tomorrow, and let the Council meet on Friday to receive some of the texts.

Members may then read them during the weekend and will be ready to discuss them when they meet again on Monday.

Would that be agreeable? We will meet on Friday and then we can hear from the Committee how much extra time they need. We can then finish petitions on Friday and then some drafting work can be accelerated along that line.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): When are we going to complete the consideration of the Report on Tanganyika?

The PRESIDENT: On Friday. If that is agreeable then the Council will not meet tomorrow, but the Drafting Committee will meet both morning and afternoon.

It will meet at 10.30 a.m. in Room 5.

/Mr. GARREAU

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): As regards the Report of the Visiting Mission on Tanganyika, we thought that we had wound that up tonight, and that the discussion would be postponed until the next session, as was decided regarding part of the Report on Ruanda-Urundi.

I do not see any need to resume this discussion on Friday. I think we could consider that this was wound up tonight, it being understood that any decisions regarding Tanganyika would be postponed until the next session. This would be a decision similar to what has already been done in the case of the Ruanda-Urundi Report.

The PRESIDENT: It can be so if it is the wish of the Council.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I do not clearly understand whether what is proposed is to the effect of a resolution of the Council on the Report of the Visiting Mission and that the report of the Administering Authority be considered.

Shall we have to wait until we have received the regular report of the Administering Authority before we can approve the Report of the Visiting Mission?

The PRESIDENT: The Council is not prevented from taking any action on the Report, but in the case of the Report on Ruanda-Urundi, that was the Council's decision, that it would wait until the next session before any definitive action is taken.

The rules of procedure did not specify any course of action. It is entirely up to the Council to decide. As I pointed out, the Report on Ruanda-Urundi was treated that way.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I note that one of the virtues of this Report of the Visiting Mission is the care reflected in it taken by the Chairman and its members, to consult with the Colonial Office on concrete matters.

There are texts to be found here which contain the remarks of the Administering Authority in reply to questions and other remarks made by the Visiting Mission.

I think that in this case it can be considered, along with the explanations given by the special representative and the other texts /referred to

referred to, from the Colonial Office, and that it can be inferred that the requirement has been met by the Administering Authority.

This Report contains many passages and many opinions of officials of the Administration upon questions raised by the Visiting Mission. Hence I do not believe that there could be many further substantive remarks that could be made by the Administering Authority upon this Report.

There is one further circumstance. This is a Report of the Mission as a whole. There was no disagreement in connexion with the conclusions and observations contained therein. Therefore we can consider it an impartial Report, both by virtue of its contents and its form, and by virtue of the system followed by the Visiting Mission in reaching its conclusions.

Therefore I do not think that it would be a good precedent, now that we have all these data, for the Council not to reach a conclusion or some kind of a decision about the Report. I do not think we should delay this matter further.

If there is no serious objection I would propose that the Council settle this matter once and for all.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): It should be understood that this would be no precedent at all. The precedent was already established by the Council when it took a decision on Ruanda-Urundi. Final action on the Ruanda-Urundi Report was postponed until the next session on account of the fact that the Administering Authority asked for time to formulate observations which it considered appropriate.

If, in the present case, the representative of the United Kingdom has no objection, then I also would have no objection to final action by the Council being taken now regarding the Tanganyika Report. But I take it that the representative of the United Kingdom asked that his Government should be given time to submit comments and observations regarding the Report of the Visiting Mission.

The same applies to the representative of Belgium. He asked for time so that his Government could present observations on the Report of the Visiting Mission on Ruanda-Urundi.

/That is why we

That is why we postponed final action on Ruanda-Urundi until the next session of the Council. It is by virtue of this precedent which was already set by the Council in the case of Ruanda-Urundi that I suggested that the same be done in the case of the Report on Tanganyika.

The PRESIDENT; I think the Council will also recall that at a previous meeting when this question was discussed the Council did come to agree that in the consideration of this Report it need not arrive at any definitive or final conclusions.

That question was discussed before, and, as I said, the view was that the Council need not come to any final conclusions. In the case of Ruanda-Urundi the Council did decide not to take final action.

I have heard the two views. The representative of France has suggested that the Council defer ^{further} consideration until the next session, when final action will be taken. The representative of Mexico suggests that we take some definitive action in regard to the Report now, in the present session. I have not heard any formal motion.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): We most certainly decided at an early meeting of this session that we would have a preliminary investigation on these two Reports.

I, if you remember, asked that the whole discussion be deferred until the next session. That was not agreed to but it was decided then that we should hold no more than a preliminary discussion.

/ / Since then, in the

Since then, in the case of the Ruanda-Urundi report, it has been decided to postpone a final decision until the next session. In the meantime, my Government has been preparing its comments to send to the Trusteeship Council by 30 May in accordance with the terms of the resolution which, I think, was passed in connexion with Ruanda-Urundi

But if the Council is going to make another change my Government had better stop what it is doing and tear up what it has already prepared.

The PRESIDENT: I thought that I had already explained the situation.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I will not insist further on this particular point as the Council will have to decide what is called for and what would be appropriate.

But the position of the Mexican delegation in connexion with the report on Ruanda-Urundi was in the sense that no precedent was being created by the way in which we dealt with that report. We believe that there is nothing in the rules of procedure to oblige the Council to await the remarks of the Administering Authority before it can deal with a report and it became very clear that we were not creating a precedent.

Therefore I am rather surprised at the fact that now this argument of a precedent having been established is being used for delaying a decision of the Council in connexion with this report. What will happen is that in the next session we will spend as much time in discussing the report as we have spent discussing it at this session. I am quite certain-- and the facts will prove this -- that the remarks of the Administering Authority on the Tanganyika report will not be very different from the many observations already contained in the report from Tanganyika.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I indeed remember very well the reservations advanced by the Mexican delegation. But I had understood that when the representative of Mexico said that the decision taken by the Council in connexion with Ruanda-Urundi was not to be taken as a precedent, I thought that he meant a precedent for next year but that for this year a similar decision would be taken for Tanganyika as for Ruanda-Urundi.

I thought that the Mexican delegation believed that the decision taken this year in connexion with the whole of the report for the two Territories would not be establishing a precedent, but a precedent for next year. Otherwise I do not see how we can discriminate as between Ruanda-Urundi and Tanganyika. It seems to me that in connexion with Tanganyika it would be logical to take the same decision that we took

in connexion with the Report of the Visiting Mission to Ruanda-Urundi.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Before speaking on this matter I should like to ask whether it might not be best to postpone consideration until Friday. But if the Council wishes to continue this discussion on this question now, then I will ask the President to let me have the floor in the order in which I am on the speakers' list.

The PRESIDENT: As in the case of other reports, I think that if it is a question of a resolution or decision by the Council in regard to the report, the correct procedure would be to have the resolution formally proposed.

Mr. LIN (China) (Chairman of the Drafting Committee on Annual Reports): I just want to ask a question of the Secretary concerning the working papers for the Drafting Committee. I wonder if Part II of the draft report on British Togoland and Part III of the draft report on the British Cameroons are already prepared. If they are I would like to have them distributed now so that members can work on them tonight and bring in their recommendations on those reports.

Mr. ALEXANDER (Secretary): Part II of the draft report on the Cameroons under British Administration can be distributed now and Part III of the draft report on British Togoland can be distributed tomorrow morning. The other papers are ready.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the USSR has expressed the wish that the Drafting Committee meet at 11:00 a.m. instead of 10:30 a.m. The committee will meet at 11:00 a.m. in Conference Room 5.

May I ask the representatives of France and Mexico to make any formal resolutions which they wish to make according to the procedure adopted in regard to the report on Ruanda-Urundi.

The meeting is adjourned until Friday at 2:30 p.m.

The meeting rose at 6:18 p.m.