

United Nations

Nations Unies

**TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL**

**CONSEIL
DE TUTELLE**

UNRESTRICTED

T/P.V. 158
21 March 1949

English

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Fourth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FORTY-SECOND MEETING
(Transcription from sound recording)

Lake Success, New York
Monday, 21 March 1949, at 2.30 p.m.

President:

Mr. LIU CHIEH

China

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the forty-second meeting of the fourth session of the Trusteeship Council.

The representative of Australia has signified that he has a question to put to the Council.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): I do not want to raise anything which is not in the general discussion, but it would be convenient for my Government to know as soon as possible the approximate date for the discussion of the Report on New Guinea, since various arrangements would have to be made for the attendance of the special representative.

The PRESIDENT: The Report on New Guinea will not be discussed until the next session so the date for that discussion will depend on the date set for the next session.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I think there is virtue in the thought that it would be very helpful to those Administering Authorities whose reports will be considered at the next session to know the probable time and the probable order of discussion.

What the President has said is quite correct: we cannot determine that until we do determine the date of the next session, but when that date is fixed it would certainly prove very helpful to know in advance the probable times of discussion, because each of the Administering Authorities whose territories will be under discussion will have to have special representatives here.

As has been said so often, the time of those special representatives is very valuable and we ought, if possible, to determine the approximate time when their presence will be required. Although we might not want to take any definitive vote at this time, I should think that the general ideas of the Council on this matter would be most helpful when we fix the date of the next session.

The PRESIDENT: When the date of the next session is fixed, it will also be noted that, according to our rules of procedure, the agenda will be circulated to all members four weeks in advance of the beginning of the session. Members of the Council will be able to see, by that agenda, the approximate order in which the various items will be discussed. As to the exact date of the examination of any particular item, that can be easily adjusted as we have had it adjusted during the present session.

/Sir Alan BURNS

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I sympathize with the request that the Administering Authority should know in advance approximately when special representatives will be required here. I should think it would be sufficient, knowing we cannot now say when the session will begin, to say that the Report on New Guinea, for instance, will be taken in the first week of the session, and the report of another territory in the second week and another in the third week.

That would give the Administering Authorities an approximate time as soon as they know the beginning date of the next session.

The PRESIDENT: I think I will try to give some approximate idea toward the end of this session when the date will be determined by the Council. We will also have an idea of what the agenda will be and a date could be given as soon as the date of the next session is determined.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): That will be before the end of this session?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, that is right.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): I have a question concerning today's agenda. I would like a clarification on an item on the agenda.

Among the petitions on the agenda before us, I do not see included the petition of the Bakweri Land Committee. I do not believe we have ended the discussion of that petition, and I should like to know when we shall be discussing that petition again.

The PRESIDENT: As far as I can recall, that petition was discussed and the Council felt that, since the report of the Administering Authority was forthcoming, it might be desirable to wait for that report.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): As I remember the state of affairs, I think we had decided along the following lines concerning this petition of the Bakweri Land Committee. The Council would discuss, in connexion with the report of the Administering Authority, the Cameroons under British Administration. As the Council knows, a number of provisions in that

/petition

petition were dealt with and effected in the Administering Authority's report on the Cameroons under British Administration. But I do not think, by postponing the petition until all the other petitions would be up for consideration again, the Council took any specific and concrete decision.

/I think that was

I think that was the way we decided to act, because when we discussed this problem in February - I think this was in connexion with the resolution of the representative of the United States of America, which resolution was later withdrawn - the Soviet delegation did reserve its right to present its own draft resolution, and therefore that was the point I wanted to clarify. When will I be in a position to submit that draft resolution that I had in mind?

The PRESIDENT: When the Bakweri land question was previously discussed the Council was assured that further information would be forthcoming from the Administering Authority, and it was also felt that the Visiting Mission was going out there towards the end of the year and that the Council may like to wait for its report.

It is correct that the representative of the Soviet Union made certain reservations in regard to the petition in particular, and if the representative of the Soviet Union desires to submit a resolution in connexion with that petition it will be quite in order.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): But when, What is the exact date when I can submit it? May I do it now?

The PRESIDENT: Yes.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I thank you for the clarification and I do reserve the right, after the discussion of the petitions on Tanganyika, to submit my own draft resolution as to the Bakweri Land Committee's petition. I think I shall be able to do it to-day.

The PRESIDENT: I would like to ask the Council to continue with the examination of petitions.

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS LISTED IN THE ANNEX TO THE AGENDA

(T/234, T/273):

PETITIONS FROM MR. D.M. ANJARIA (T/PET.2/54, T/PET.2/57.)

The PRESIDENT: In the first petition the petitioner complains that the conventions of the British Medical Council prevent entry into
/ private medical practi.

private medical practice of Asians recruited for government service as sub-assistant surgeons, in spite of the wide experience acquired after years of service.

It states also that the reason why they are refused recognition is the fear of competition among existing registered practitioners.

The Visiting Mission made its observation in document T/218/Add.1, on page 10.

In the second petition the petitioner claims that the land tenure policy of the Administering Authority has failed to provide for titles granted to Arabs and Asians when the Territory was under the rule of the Sultan of Zanzibar. He asks the United Nations to ensure that the Administering Authority is empowered if need be to recognize these titles.

Again the observations of the Visiting Mission are contained in the Report of the Visiting Mission Addendum 1 on page 13.

I call on the representative of the Administering Authority to make any observations he has to make in regard to these two petitions.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): May I deal first with the petition in T/PET.2/54, that is on the subject of medical qualifications.

The cause of the petition is that it has hitherto been the policy of the medical board in Tanganyika to grant registration only to persons possessing certain ^{medical} qualifications, and the Medical Board has so far declined to exercise any discretionary power under the law to lower the standards of qualification required for registration.

It is not known whether any applications were made to the Governor in Council which would have the effect of being appeals against the Board's decision. But in any case the Governor in Council would probably have felt himself unable to overrule the decision of a professional board in a matter of this kind.

There is no question, in this matter of racial discrimination because there are already thirty-one fully qualified Asians registered as private practitioners in the Territory, and it is hoped that in the not distant future fully qualified Africans will also be admitted to practice.

That shows that when these people have the necessary qualifications they are admitted to practice.

The petitioner is thinking now of people without adequate medical qualifications, and the dangers of unscrupulous practice which the policy of the Board is designed to reduce to a minimum, are very real and / formidable under

formidable under local conditions. And strong arguments can clearly be adduced in support of the attitude of the Board.

None the less, in view of the urgent need for extended medical facilities for the people of the Territory, the Administering Authority is discussing the whole question once again with the Tanganyika Government.

The other petition, that is T/PET.2/57, is a question of land. The petitioner asks that the Administering Authority should be empowered, by which I presume he means requested, by the Trusteeship Council to recognize titles based on past admissions by officers of the Tanganyika Administration, which were not, in fact, founded in law.

There is no equity in the demand that a mistake made in the past by unauthorized officers of the Government should now be perpetuated, and it would be contrary to the spirit of the Mandate/ and the land ordinance under the Trusteeship, to grant freehold titles by legislation where such rights do not exist by law.

The Trusteeship Council may however be assured that those persons who have been disappointed by inaccurate statements to title made in the past in official quarters, although they may not be granted freehold titles which they seek, will probably be granted by the Government of Tanganyika rights of occupancy on reasonable terms.

All those holders of such admissions who have not yet applied to the Land Office for a freehold title would be advised to do so at once in order that their claims might be investigated.

As regards appeals to the High Court from the decisions of the Registrar referred to in the petition, these^{are} not likely to be heard before July 1949, and the fact that these cases are now pending could if necessary be used as an argument against the Trusteeship Council making a suggestion. But I have no intention of doing that in this case.

The PRESIDENT: The Administering Authority has replied to the effect that as far as the medical service is concerned there is no discrimination against Asians. The restrictions were more a question of professional qualifications.

In the second petition, as far as land tenure - title to land - is concerned, the questions are pending in court and it seems to me that there is no call for any action on the part of the Council.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Did I correctly understand the explanation given by the representative of the United Kingdom, that in the legislation of Tanganyika there are no laws, rules or regulations that would prohibit the private practice of various medical practitioners and doctors after they had retired -- doctors who are on the basis of racial origin Asians or who are indigenous inhabitants of Tanganyika?

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): It is merely a matter of qualifications.

The PRESIDENT: May I ask the representative of the United Kingdom whether a non-indigenous resident can have other forms of tenure if the freehold is more or less restricted?

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): No, only certificates of occupancy, that is, a short lease.

The PRESIDENT: But can they have a leasehold?

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): No, it is not allowed.

The PRESIDENT: Therefore, if there are cases, as the petitioner claims, where titles were granted under the rule of the Sultan of Zanzibar these titles would not be valid.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): They would not be valid in law. It is proposed that where these people feel they have a grievance, because they were misled by being told something that was not so, they will receive special consideration in the grant of these certificates of occupancy.

Mr. BAKR (Iraq): I would like to ask whether the practice of any profession is affected by the citizenship of the person? For example, some of the Asians do not hold the citizenship of that Territory. Is the practice of their profession -- such as medicine -- affected by their citizenship?

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): No, it is merely a question of qualifications. These petitioners are complaining because, although /they have not the full

medical qualifications, they have had a certain amount of medical experience in a junior capacity and they think they should be allowed to practice as fully-trained medical practitioners. That is all there is to it. There is no racial discrimination of any sort.

The PRESIDENT: Apart from the titles granted under the Sultan of Zanzibar, are there any restrictions as to the acquisition of titles to land? I am not quite clear as to whether the certificates of occupancy are only applicable to those cases where there were titles granted under the Sultan of Zanzibar or whether there is a general restriction as to other titles.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I am not able to answer that very accurately. As far as I know no newcomers are allowed to obtain the entire title to land except in the case of those old pieces of land which were granted by the Germans during their occupation. There were a number of titles given by the Germans.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the question of the use of land, I think the petitioner is raising rather a complicated problem which is difficult of settlement and perhaps the Administering Authority could submit certain information pertinent to the problem so that we could come to a concrete decision, basing ourselves on full information that I think the Administering Authority is in a position to provide. I think it would be rather difficult for us to come to a decision on this question not having full information and documentation. Perhaps other members of the Council do have another opinion as to this question and they are able to express themselves on the substance of the petition but I find myself in a different situation; I would rather have full information before coming to any definite position.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I should be very glad to get that necessary information. In any case, as I mentioned before, certain petitions are going to be heard by the High Court in July 1949 and that will clear up the matter very considerably. But I shall be very glad to get any additional information that is required.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: I think the Council may well be advised to study further information because, as far as I know, English law pertaining to land tenure is very, very complicated. I know that a freehold is a very rare exception but there are such things as a leasehold which enable a person to hold land up to 999 years though not in Tanganyika. If those terms are applied it would be very complicated indeed.

In any case, if the cases are pending in the High Court I do not know what the Council can do; while the rules of procedure do not state any definite rule on questions pending in a court of this kind, the Council may still wish that a matter sub judice may be left for the time being before any definite conclusion is reached.

In regard to the first petition I think the Council may wish to reply to the petitioner to the effect that the Administering Authority has assured/^{the Council} that the refusal of permission to practice as a medical practitioner is entirely a question of professional qualifications.

Also the Council will withhold any decision in regard to the second petition on land tenure. Is that agreeable?

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the second petition I understand that we are requesting additional information from the Administering Authority and it is because of that/^{that} we are not coming to a decision. I do not think we should mention the fact that this question is now in the hands of a certain court; I think the matter is that we do not have full information and I do not think we need to tie up the question of additional information with the fact that a certain problem is now under consideration of the High Court.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: As I said, the rules of procedure do not have any provision applicable to cases pending in a High Court. The rules of procedure only refer to cases where petitions are directed against judgments of competent courts, and did not refer to any cases where they are pending in court.

When I said that cases were pending in the court I did not intend to make it the basis for any deferment; I only referred to it as an additional reason that might influence the Council to defer the decision.

I think the representative of the Soviet Union was quite right when he pointed out that the Council need only defer the consideration of these petitions because it desires further information.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I want to make it quite clear that I merely gave the information about the appeals to the court for the information of the Council. I made no suggestion -- in fact I specifically disclaimed any intention -- of urging that as a reason why the thing should not be discussed.

The PRESIDENT: I think that is quite clear now that the United Kingdom representative mentioned it without urging that the Council should base its decision ...

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I specifically asked otherwise.

The PRESIDENT: Then I referred to it also by way of perhaps giving an additional reason for such deferment; but the Council simply wished to defer consideration until it had got further and fuller information.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I am not quite clear what we mean by deferring consideration. The petition so-called does not make any request. It is a
/letter

letter in which the petitioner, Mr. Anjaria, says:

"I hope you will be good enough to study this aspect of the land laws carefully..."

I should think an acknowledgment and an expression of appreciation of his bringing the matter before us would probably be sufficient.

I have no objection whatsoever to deferring consideration of this matter in the Trusteeship Council. The question I raise is whether we need consider that the petition -- if it be a petition -- be considered later on and a further later reply be sent to him.

I do raise the question as to what are petitions. We have discussed that many times. This would seem, on its face, like a mere communication. It makes no request of any kind.

When the President suggests deferring consideration of the matter, therefore, I am a little uncertain what the meaning of that is; whether it means deferring consideration of the matter and discussing it then in the Council, which is quite in order, or whether it means deferring some reply to the signer of this letter.

The PRESIDENT: The reply need not be deferred, but the matter raised in the petition would require further study because the petition alleges that there is denial of title in the case of Asians and also, in the petition itself, the petitioner adds a postscript to say that the "request to have necessary amendments in law may be treated as a petition to the United Nations" -- in other words, the petitioner himself seeks some recommendation in the amendments to the law regarding land tenure.

If there are no further observations, I would suggest that we reply to the petitioner in regard to his first petition that in the medical service there is no discrimination on account of citizenship or nationality but only on the basis of professional qualification; and in regard to land tenure, I think we can reply along the lines suggested by the United States representative and add that the question will receive the Council's attention when further information is received

/from the

from the Administering Authority in regard to tenure of land.

If there are no further observations, then I think a reply can be sent to that effect.

PETITION FROM THE CHAGGA COUNCIL (T/PET.2/59)

The PRESIDENT: Now we come to the next petition, that is, the petition from the Chagga Council in document T/PET.2/59.

The petitioners request principally that native authorities should be given greater control of education; that teachers' training colleges be established in every province; and that English be taught at an early stage in primary schools: that to meet an acute land shortage faced by the Chagga Tribe, all alienated land should be returned to it, no further alienations should be made and new land should be retained and developed.

They propose also that the Administering Authority should consider the establishment of district, provincial and territorial councils.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I should like to make a preliminary statement. I am informed that mention of the three documents in question was made in the course of a long discussion which the Mission had with the Chagga Council. The Mission asked for copies of those documents and these were made and sent to the Mission Secretariat the next day. They have now been submitted as petitions received by the Mission from the Chagga Council.

But I should like it to be noted that the suggestion that these documents -- or, indeed, the memorandum actually prepared for the meeting -- should be submitted as petitions, as far as I know, never entered into the minds of the Chagga Council.

The PRESIDENT: The Visiting Mission in its Report suggests that a policy somewhat similar to that advocated by the petitioners should be envisaged by the

/Administering

Administering Authority.

In regard to the point just referred to by the representative of the United Kingdom, I would like to draw the attention of the Council to the letter by the Chairman of the Chagga Council in which the petitioner -- or rather the signatory of that letter -- states in the concluding sentence:

"I should be grateful if you will please regard these same memorandum together with the one we submitted to you in discussion, as petition to the U.N. Council."

I think it was the intention of the Chairman of the Chagga Council when he brought the matter before the Visiting Mission to treat the matter as a petition to this Council. And as I said, the Visiting Mission in its observations contained in the Visiting Mission's Report suggests that a policy somewhat similar to that advocated by the petitioners should be envisaged by the Administering Authority.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
(Interpretation from Russian): The President will remember that at the last meeting of the Trusteeship Council I reserved my right to make a statement as to the petitions received from Tanganyika -- on all of them, so as not to split up questions that are raised by all the petitions.

In particular, in looking over the petition of the Chagga Tribe, I would like to dwell on questions that are also raised in the petition of the Tanganyika African Association and the Shinyanga Township Africans petition.

In connection with all these petitions and their discussion by the Trusteeship Council, the delegation of the Soviet Union wishes to make certain remarks as to the substance of the questions raised by the petitions.

In the opinion of the Soviet Union delegation, and we would like to draw your attention to this, the information contained in the petitions and in the Report of the Visiting Mission to Tanganyika substantiates the conclusion drawn during the third session of the Trusteeship Council with regard to the fact that the policy of the Administering

/Authority

Authority in Tanganyika is directed at the enforcement of a colonial regime in the Trust Territory of Tanganyika ; and one of the characteristics of this policy is a tendency on the part of the Administering Authority -- in this case the United Kingdom -- to the actual annexation of the Trust Territory by means of ^{an} inter-territorial organization, which would unite the Trust Territory of Tanganyika with neighbouring British colonies of Uganda and Kenya.

/This contradicts

This contradicts the Charter of the United Nations, which provides for the fact that the Administering Authority should "promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories and their progressive development towards self-government or independence."

The Trust Territory of Tanganyika, however, was subjected by the Administering Authority to legislation and administration which are built up on a union of the Trust Territory with the above-mentioned British colony and protectorate. We all know that the unification of Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika was actually concretized by Acts 201 and 210. The preparation of these Acts was done in such a manner that the indigenous population did not participate in such preparation. Moreover, Colonial Paper 210, which is, actually, the basic document in this question, was not known to the population of Tanganyika, nor was it known to the meeting of the Legislative Council of the Territory. It was put under discussion in such a light that the African members of the Council did not have sufficient time in order to consult with the electorate as to that question. The text of that document in the Kiswahili tongue was circulated to the African Council only two days before the voting on it took place.

Therefore, in the promulgation of these Acts, the Administering Authority did not concern itself with the opinion of the indigenous population of Tanganyika, and this is not at all by chance, because the representatives of the indigenous population of Tanganyika are actually against any measures that would be directed at a unification of the Trust Territory with British colonies.

On this question large factual documentation is at hand, both in the petitions as well as in the Report of the Visiting Mission itself, which was under discussion by us a few days ago. In connexion with this I will only wish to adduce a couple of examples.

In the petition of the Tanganyika African Association on this question we read the following:

"As regards the amalgamation of Tanganyika, Kenya and Uganda, there is not the slightest doubt that this matter of unification is causing a great anxiety among the indigenous inhabitants of Tanganyika in view of the fact that Tanganyika, being under the Trusteeship System it need remain as a separate unit, and that is what we pleaded since before."

/Later

Later it goes on to say:

"....but it is feared that all these things such as combination of departments, formation of High Commission for the 3 territories which will have jurisdiction over themwill cause misfortune in the long run."

But this negative attitude on the part of the indigenous population of Tanganyika with regard to unification is well known to the Administering Authority. On 27 September 1948 members of the Visiting Mission met with the Minister for Colonies in London, and in the discussions and conversations that took place, we see in the Report that the Mission was told that the United Kingdom Government does have full knowledge of the fact that amongst the Africans in Tanganyika there is strong opposition against any closer forms of union, especially such as would lead to a political union.

The Administering Authority also knew well the fact that the indigenous population of Tanganyika is against a union of the Trust Territory with neighbouring British colonies, but nevertheless and notwithstanding, it decided against the will of the population -- not actually being concerned with the opposition -- to carry out this union which actually is directed by and in the selfish interests of the Administering Authority and does not concern itself with the attitude and opinion of the indigenous population.

The Report of the Visiting Mission says that it saw opposition throughout the Territory against this union and also a concern as to the creation of an organization on the part of the African population as well as Asiatics that are in the Territory and with whom the Visiting Mission had conversations.

Later, as you will remember, the Report of the Visiting Mission notes the basic reasons for the opposition on the part of the Africans and Asiatics. Amongst them we can note the following reasons:

- "1. The Inter-territorial Organization, located in Nairobi, will remain under the domination of the white settlers in Kenya, who allegedly practice the policy of white supremacy and racial discrimination;
- "2. Tanganyika is a Trust Territory, which should constitute a separate political entity, while Kenya is a colony and Uganda a protectorate of the United Kingdom;
- "3. The economic and financial interests of Tanganyika will be /subordinated

subordinated to those of Kenya;

"4. Economic and financial union will gradually but inevitably lead to political union;

"5. The operation of the Inter-Territorial Organization will prejudice the determination of the ultimate status of Tanganyika in the sense that, when the inhabitants of the Territory are ready to govern themselves, the union will be so complete that Tanganyika will find it impossible to become independent."

It is impossible also not to note that all the concern on the part of the population of the Trust Territory is well founded. It is also necessary to note that the union of Tanganyika with neighbouring colonies is being carried out against the will of indigenous inhabitants and in violation of the basic principles of the Charter with regard to the international trusteeship system.

It is necessary to point out the fact that the information contained in the petition and in the Report of the Visiting Mission shows clearly that the indigenous population of Tanganyika well understands the selfish interests and aims of the Administering Authority in carrying out said union.

In connexion with this it is necessary to draw attention to the fact that the Administering Authority, instead of encouraging the respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, irrespective of race, sex or belief, in its practical policy and in connexion with the settlement of this question, flagrantly violates the rights and interests of the indigenous population.

The study of Colonial Paper 210 shows that the Administering Authority is creating the Inter-Territorial Organization in such a manner and is so orienting this Inter-Territorial Organization that in the Trust Territory there are no independent legislative or administrative organs in which the indigenous population would play a part, and, moreover, the existing so-called consultative organs with the Governor and all the administrative services are actually placed in a position of being subject to the whims of the administering commission and its services.

All this cannot but lead to a violation of the basic principles of the Charter, which provides for the encouragement of the development of Trust Territories towards independence.

In connexion with this, the Administering Authority should create in the Trust Territory such legislative and administrative organs as will

/not be subject

AME/dg

T/P.V. 158
29/30

19

not be subject to any organs that are created on the basis of a union of the Trust Territory with colonies, and also should implement the above-mentioned aims ^{with} such legislative and other measures as would be necessary.

/The Trusteeship Council

The Trusteeship Council should recommend to the Administering Authority that it carry such measures into effect. These are the remarks which we wish to make in connexion with the petitions received from Tanganyika.

Secondly, I would like to say something about the question of participation of the indigenous population in the legislative and executive, as well as judiciary, organs of the Trust Territory.

As we well know all the administration in the Trust Territory of Tanganyika is concentrated in the hands of the British Governor and various civil service officials in his service, who have access to the Governor through various other officials. The Governor is not restricted in the carrying out of his duties by any legislative or executive organ.

There is of course an Executive Council, of which the Governor is President, and which has four unofficial and seven official members, who are of the Legislative Council. But this Executive Council has no right to limit or restrict the rights of the Governor, because the final decision on any question which this Council discusses rests with the Governor. There is therefore no true representation of the indigenous population in this Council.

Further, the Governor also has a Legislative Council which has fifteen members -- the Governor and fourteen unofficial members. Amongst the unofficial members there are four Africans.

This Legislative Council is likewise only a consultative organ in connexion with the Governor-General's position.

The nature of these two Councils is fully manifest by the fact that the Governor nominates all members, and therefore all the power in the Trust Territory is in the hands of foreigners -- in this case of Englishmen -- and the number of indigenous inhabitants in the Legislative Council is so insignificant that it is hardly possible to say seriously that these appointees on the part of the indigenous population could defend opinion they might have, in the Council, if it happened to contradict the opinion or decisions of the foreign members of the Council, even if the Africans would wish to oppose the opinions of their colleagues.

The fact that they have no rights is evidenced by the fact that, in considering the question of the union of Tanganyika with neighbouring British Colonies, there actually was no serious discussion with these native members of the Council. When a number of them spoke against it, these considerations were not taken into account by the Administering Authority.

/With regard to

With regard to the organs of local administration, this is carried out by British officials, who make use of direct administration and are helped by tribal leaders and chieftains, especially in the case of taxing the natives.

The Administering Authority is encouraging the tribal system in the Trust Territory and is thereby impairing the political and complete development towards independence and self-government.

From the petitions that are before us we see that the Administering Authority fails to promote the creation of indigenous organs of government based on democratic principles, thereby hindering the progressive development of this Territory and violating the principles and aims of international trusteeship, which are set forth in the Charter of our Organization.

In connexion with this the Trusteeship Council should recommend that the Administering Authority take measures that would ensure the transition from a tribal system to a system of self-government based on democratic principles.

In connexion with the questions of economic development of the Trust Territory, which are raised by the petitions, as we know from the Report of the Visiting Mission, there are many factual documents that show that the policy of the Administering Authority in Tanganyika is going towards an economic ^{ment}enslavement of the Territory, and is holding back its economic development and perpetuating a low level of development. The Administering Authority is not carrying out any measures that would ensure the development of national industry -- leaving aside heavy industry, of course. The measures which are being carried out are directed at having and keeping the Trust Territory as an appendage for raw materials for the United Kingdom.

The Visiting Mission's Report says that the Mission heard complaints from the Sukumaland Chieftains, Shinyanga Township Officers, and members of the African Association of Arusha, to the effect that the indigenous inhabitants do not have any income coming from mines located in land in their possession. As you remember, the Visiting Mission's Report also has a statement made by one of the Sukumaland people, to the effect that the population around the Williamson diamond mine was evicted and is not able to make use of its land. That is, I think, on page 95 of the Report.

/The native resources

The native resources are not being made use of in order to develop local industry. They are exported as raw materials for the United Kingdom. We see from a petition that alienation of land belonging to the natives takes place in the Trust Territory, and also the forcible eviction of these people from their land. This is covered in petitions received through the Visiting Mission from the African Association, the Chagga Council and other organs.

We see from these petitions that the Africans are of opinion that they will soon have no land left, and in the Report we see that there is a considerable part of the cultivated or arable land in the hands of foreigners.

On pages 82 and 102 of the Report of the Visiting Mission we see the following data: in 1947 the arable area was 6,334,000 acres. Of this acreage, 1,846,278 acres did not belong to the natives, and therefore over 5,000,000 indigenous inhabitants have four million odd acres -- 4,497,722 acres, to be exact -- at their disposal. The foreign inhabitants, who comprise 7,500 people, have at their disposal 1,846,278 acres.

Therefore one indigenous inhabitant has less than one acre of land for cultivation, and one foreigner has more than 246 acres, which fact has already been emphasized in the Council. References to the fact that Asians also have large land-holdings do not change the general picture, because Asians do not actually own large pieces of land. This also is well known on the basis of the information at the disposal of the Council.

Further, there is, as we know, additional alienation of two million eight hundred odd thousand acres of land for the Groundnut Scheme.

/The Trusteeship Council has

The Trusteeship Council has already had occasion to discuss this question in connexion with the Siggins petition in which we had information to the effect that the natives evince direct opposition to the alienation of land for the Groundnut Scheme.

The Visiting Mission's Report says also that the indigenous population is being deprived of its land which is being given to a foreign corporation. In Kongwa the Visiting Mission was informed that 800 families were transported and there was a plan to transport 500 other families in order to make available land necessary for that foreign corporation.

We know that the Trusteeship Council has received complaints to the effect that the indigenous population is being driven off the land and that their land is being put in the hands of the foreign corporation. The Council should pay more attention to that question and should ask for further information on this point from the Administering Authority. It would be impossible to allow such a state of affairs as, for instance, took place in the history of England when, during the land reforms, the cows or the sheep actually ate the people -- figuratively speaking.

We could not allow the Groundnut Scheme to lead to the dying off of the indigenous inhabitants. In connexion with this we have to draw attention to the fact that the alienation of 2,550,000 acres of land and the placing of that land into the hands of an English company actually involves the rights of the indigenous inhabitants to their land. We could not allow the question of land tenure to be decided without any participation in this problem on the part of the indigenous inhabitants. The indigenous population owns the land and therefore questions connected with land and land tenure should be settled with the full participation of the native population.

In connexion with the general question of alienation of land which is raised in the petitions before us, the Trusteeship Council should recommend to the Administering Authority that it return to the indigenous population the alienated land and to prevent any further alienation in the future.

In connexion with the fact that the petitions before us have much material dealing with the question of education, public health and other questions, the delegation of the USSR -- bearing in mind that this information is fully at the disposal of all the members of the Council -- would like to limit itself to brief remarks, particularly in connexion with the proposal we have to make.

We propose that the Trusteeship Council, in the field of taxation policy, should recommend to the Administering Authority that it implement such measures as to change the head-tax or poll-tax by a progressive /system of

system of taxation; for instance, income tax or any other tax that would be fair and democratic.

We know that this question relates to the majority of the Trust Territories, annual reports of which were also under discussion by the Trusteeship Council during this session. Further, on the basis of the petitions, it is necessary to note that the Administering Authority has failed to carry out the basic requirements of the Charter in the economic and social field.

In this connection it is also necessary to note the unsatisfactory state of education ^{and} the inadequate appropriations for medical and health purposes. The Trusteeship Council should recommend that the Administering Authorities carry out the recommendations of the General Assembly as to the question of the improvement of education and other cultural enterprises and to increase the appropriations for education and medical needs.

These are the provisional remarks of the delegation of the USSR as to the consideration of petitions which have ^{been} received from the indigenous population of Tanganyika.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): We have just listened to one of the usual propaganda speeches which always come from the delegation of the USSR. I have not the slightest doubt that, in speaking, the representative had it well in mind that all of this would be reported in the proceedings of our Council and would be sent out to the petitioners. It is most excellent propaganda and I congratulate him on it.

He refers to the proposed "annexation" by the Administering Authority, of Tanganyika by means of the Interterritorial Organization. I make the categorical statement that my Government has no intention whatsoever of annexing Tanganyika and I deny that the Interterritorial Organization can have that effect.

The representative of the USSR has said that the Administering Authority has exercised a policy which will result in the economic slavery of the people. I deny that. I call the attention of the Council to the fact that he has invited the members of the Council to believe that the Administering Authority has failed to do anything for the economic development of the country. Yet in almost the same breath he tells us that this Groundnut Scheme— one of the largest schemes ever put into force in any tropical country— which has been designed for the benefit of the people of Tanganyika who will benefit from it in the long-run, is another case of the wickedness of the Administering Authority.

He cannot have it both ways. Either the Administering Authority is doing a good job in promoting the future welfare of the people through this

/Groundnut Scheme

Groundnut Scheme, or else it ^{is not} doing something for the benefit of the people. It cannot be blamed for not doing anything and for doing something. But that is typical of the kind of propaganda speech that we have heard again and again from the same delegation.

I am not going to waste the Council's time by denying the innumerable insinuations and distortions of fact which have come in this propaganda speech. I give a clear and categorical denial of the statement made by the representative of the USSR regarding the mistreatment of the people of Tanganyika by my Government.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): The arbitrary statement as to "propaganda" made by the representative of the United Kingdom does not free him from the responsibility which the Administering Authority bears as to the the Trust Territory of Tanganyika. That is especially true since the representative of the United Kingdom cannot adduce a single example to show that the statement made by the representative of the USSR is not based on concrete facts which the Administering Authority itself has presented.

No conclusion goes beyond the fact which the Administering Authority itself has presented. Therefore the arbitrary remark as to "propaganda" does not constitute an argument and fails to justify the policy of the Administering Authority as to the Trust Territory of Tanganyika. The policy is directed at retaining in Tanganyika the colonial existence of the native inhabitants.

/Mr. RYCKMANS

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I must confess that I was somewhat surprised to hear the comments made here by the representative of the USSR as regards this petition, because the representative of the USSR referred to points which really do not come at all within the purview of the petition.

I do not believe that the Chagga Council petition refers at all to the Inter-Territorial Organization or to the proposed unification of certain services as between Tanganyika on the one hand and Kenya and Uganda on the other.

On the other hand, the representative of the USSR does not seem to have a very clear-cut view of the land situation prevailing in Tanganyika Territory. He launched upon a comparison from which it should result that the indigenous inhabitants had four and a half million acres, and the Europeans approximately one and a half million acres. All land, except those known as Crown Lands, are actually available for the natives. There are 300,000 square miles in Tanganyika Territory, which amounts to approximately 200,000,000 acres upon which the natives can freely circulate and cultivate whatever they choose without being hindered in any way whatever.

The only land upon which the natives cannot cultivate at will are approximately 1,800,000 acres -- that is to say, only a very slight percentage of the land which was alienated during the past thirty years.

There can be no contention then that the natives have only one acre or three-quarters of an acre per capita, while the European inhabitants have a large number of acres, because, in point of fact, the natives have all the land except that which was alienated to Europeans.

On the other hand, the representative of the USSR does not seem to realize all the issues which confront the Administering Authority. He requests that budgetary allocations devoted to education and to medical services should be increased but, at the same time, he asks that taxes be decreased and he does not, therefore, seem to grasp what is the fact or situation in the Territory. Nor does he seem to realize that the duty of the Administering Authority is to distribute the budgetary resources of the Territory as is best possible in the interests of the population of the Territory itself. That is what the Administering Authority is in effect endeavouring to do, but it is impossible to conjure up resources out of nothing and to exact more than a reasonable rate of tax out of the inhabitants. It is all too easy to state that budgetary allocations should be increased, but budgetary allocations can be increased only by

/increasing

increasing tax rates. The one necessarily leads to the other, and it seems to me that it is dealing rather lightly with the matter to come here always to recommend that expenditures should be increased, without pointing out where the resources for these expenditures should be found.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) ^{(Interpretation from Russian):} In connexion with the last remark made by the representative of Belgium, I wish to say to him that this question of the Inter-Territorial Organization is raised by the petition before us. In order to convince him, I would like to draw the attention of the representative of Belgium to the petition of the Tanganyika African Association which directly speaks on the question of the Inter-Territorial Organization. The representative of Belgium can take this petition as a whole or he can look at the Report of the Visiting Mission in which this petition is also covered. In both instances the question is raised.

As to the land question dealt with by the representative of Belgium, matters are very clear. We speak of arable land which is cultivated and the allocation of land, which shows that the rights of the indigenous inhabitants have been violated and are being violated. It is impossible to deal with the question merely by saying that there is very much land in Tanganyika. The representative of Belgium himself said that we have the tsetse fly there and there are certain lands which are not arable and cannot be cultivated. How would he then wish to have the native inhabitants live on land which is not subject to cultivation or which is unhealthy because of the tsetse fly?

Therefore, what we are saying is that there is a definite part of Tanganyika Territory which is being cultivated now and which represents the best land in Tanganyika. In connexion with that, I did cite tables taken from the Report of the Visiting Mission which show the unjust distribution of land. Moreover, the fact is the indigenous inhabitants are being forced to live on smaller pieces of land because the foreigners have larger areas. I can repeat these figures in order that there shall be no misunderstanding.

We speak of the best lands in the Trust Territory which are so distributed that the indigenous inhabitants of the Trust Territory are in an inferior position, being deprived of their own land. On pages 82 and 102 of the Report of the Visiting Mission, we have the following facts: in 1947 the cultivated area of land was 6,334,000 acres. Of those 1,846,278 acres are in the hands of non-natives. Thereby, for 5,487,722

/natives

natives, we have 4,497,722 acres of land, whereas for the foreigners, who comprise 7,500 people, we have 1,846,278 acres. Therefore, for every one native we have less than one acre of arable land, whereas for one foreigner we have more than 240 acres. Reference to the fact that Asians also have plots of land fails to change significantly the general picture because Asians do not actually own -- as we well know -- any large plots of land.

This is what I said. The facts are incontrovertible. We speak of the best cultivated land in Tanganyika, whereas mention of tsetse-infected areas or less arable areas was made. I do not think that the representative of Belgium would have us force the indigenous inhabitants onto land which is not arable or is unhealthy.

With regard to the increase of allocations for education and health needs, I think it is so evident that such increases should be made, that I do not think it needs any substantiation. Perhaps the representative of Belgium does not feel it necessary to increase such allocation, but that is his own opinion, or else the opinion of the Administering Authority which he represents. In our opinion, we should increase the allocation for education and public health. As to the source of income, that question did come up in committees and perhaps even in the Council, I do not quite recall, but this question does relate to the explicit competence of the Administering Authority. The Trusteeship Council cannot discuss the budget of the Territory, and cannot say how various income and debit figures should be distributed. If necessary, the Trusteeship Council could do this, but I do not think anyone has moved such a proposal and the objection on the part of the Belgian representative has therefore no force -- his mention of the increase of appropriations.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): The representative of the USSR insists on continuing to show the same bad faith by comparing facts which really are not comparable at all. He contends that the inhabitants cultivate approximately 6,000,000 acres. Of these 6,000,000 acres, approximately 1,800,000 belong to the European inhabitants: therefore, only 4,500,000 acres are under cultivation by the indigenous inhabitants. Then he compares 4,500,000 for the natives with 1,800,000 in the hands of Europeans.

/I repeat

I repeat that the 4,500,000 acres are those which at present are being cultivated by the indigenous inhabitants and that, apart from those, they have approximately 190,000,000 acres which are not cultivated at present, but which also legally belong to them.

It seems to me that it is manifest bad faith to continue to compare things which, as I said before, are not comparable.

/As to the question

As to the question of the increased budgetary allocations, the representative of the USSR knows perfectly well that the representative of the United Kingdom as well as myself would be only too glad to increase substantially all budgetary allocations, in particular budgetary allocations for medical services and education, but if we are prevented from doing so it is because of the lack of resources on the spot. We are doing all that we can to increase the resources of the country so that, at a later date, we can substantially increase budgetary allocations devoted to education and to medical services.

The PRESIDENT: The petitioner, in this petition, has raised a question on which the Visiting Mission has made certain observations. In short, the Visiting Mission recommended that a line of action similar to those recommended by the petitioner should be considered by the Administering Authority.

Inasmuch as the Council has decided to defer consideration of and conclusions on the Visiting Mission's Report, I do not know whether the Council feels it is able to give any definitive recommendation in regard to this petition.

If there are no suggestions, then I think the Council may reply to the petitioner in a manner similar to the replies given in the case of previous petitions connected with the Visiting Mission's Report; that is, to reply to the petitioner that the questions raised in the petition have been considered by the Council and will be dealt with further when the Council examines the Visiting Mission's Report at its next session.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): We have all the elements necessary to enable us to come to a final decision in regard to these petitions. We have the remarks of the Administering Authority; we have the petitions and, moreover, we have additional documentation and information on the basis of the Visiting Mission's Report. I would like to call the Council's attention to this fact.

The PRESIDENT: But I have heard no motion. It is not always the duty of the Chair to formulate the conclusions of the Council. The Council has to indicate its conclusions.

/Mr. NORIEGA

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I believe it would be appropriate, since we have all the elements necessary to issue a judgment on this matter, for the Council to adopt a resolution recommending to the Administering Authority that it make a complete study of land tenure and of the conflict involved in the land question because of new cultivation projects.

When the Council dealt with this matter previously, I ventured to point out that it would be appropriate for the local Legislative Council to have some say in the matter as regards these land tenure questions, as well as questions of the transfer of land ownership, whether from the natives to the governmental organization or from the natives to the corporation which will control these new cultivation projects.

I believe there is no reason to try to link these petitions to the Visiting Mission's Report. There is no reason whatsoever for the Council to postpone action on these matters as it has on other matters. That is why I suggest that this Council should consider the possibility of adopting such a resolution.

The PRESIDENT: May I ask that this motion be submitted in writing? It will then be considered by the Council together with the other resolutions so far submitted on the petitions.

PETITION FROM THE TANGANYIKA AFRICA ASSOCIATION (T/PET.2/61)

The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to the last petition on our agenda for today, the petition from the Tanganyika Africa Association, document T/Pet.2/61.

The petitioners ask for measures to raise the allegedly low standard of education in the Territory. They complain of poor conditions for recruited labour, low wages and inadequate diet, and insufficient labour inspectors. Further, they express fears of a land shortage among Africans and request the introduction of measures to obviate it. They ask for more help in the establishment of co-operative societies and request the introduction of an electoral system. They express anxiety over the results of inter-territorial organization and request that the Administering Authority should take concrete steps towards educating Africans for self-government. They also criticize conditions in the African zone of townships.

/This petition

This petition raises many problems of a general character. In regard to education, the Council has before it two draft resolutions. If these resolutions are adopted, they will meet the points raised in the petition in so far as education is concerned.

This petition also raises a question of land which is similar to the one raised in the petition by the Chagga Council. If, as I understand, the Council is going to discuss a resolution in regard to land tenure, that too would take care of that question in this petition if the resolution is adopted.

The petition also complains about poor labour conditions. May I ask the representative of the United Kingdom if he wishes to make any observations in this connexion?

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): This petition is so voluminous that it is very difficult for me to reply to it.

If you are discussing education, I can say that educational facilities are being improved and expanded in the Territory to the limit of the financial resources available. The Government is well aware of the shortcomings in education and is doing all it can in the circumstances to improve it.

As regards labour, one of the main functions of the Labour Department is to carry out competent inspection, and the Department is being increased by six European and nine African officers in 1949.

There are numerous other points, all of which the Government is well aware^{of}, and is doing its very best to solve. I do hope that the Council will appreciate that it is not possible at a stroke of a pen to reform everything in a few minutes.

/The PRESIDENT:

If there are no further observations I will come back to the observations that I offered.

I said that many of the questions are similar to those raised in other petitions and the Council is going to consider several of the draft resolutions which cover similar points.

Therefore it seems to me that if these resolutions are adopted by the Council then they may also be taken as a way of dealing with the particular petition under discussion.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): What are the resolutions that you have in mind? What concrete resolutions as to the petitions which we have postponed before.

The PRESIDENT: For instance, in regard to education we have two general draft resolutions on to-day's agenda.

In regard to land, I understand that the representative of Mexico has moved certain recommendations. That is, the land question raised by the Chagga Council.

The representative of Mexico recommended that the Administering Authority should study the question of land tenure as a whole, with a view to improving the share of the indigenous population.

In regard to political advancement, the electoral system and so on, the representative of Mexico has already circulated a draft resolution covering all the petitions relating to political advancement in Tanganyika.

If the Council adopts these resolutions then they can be taken as covering the petitions.

As I said before, these petitions raise matters of a general character and of general interest and it is difficult to reply to any individual petitioner as to what action the Council has taken in the case of particular petitions, but since the petitions raise these questions, and the Council has considered them, the actions taken by the Council may be communicated to the petitioners informing them that the Council has been seized with these questions.

Would that be agreeable? In other words, the reply to them is that we have considered these questions and if the Council has taken any action, or made any decision on any of the problems raised, these decisions should be communicated to the petitioners.

/ Mr. INGLES

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): At the last meeting of the Council the representative of the Philippines reserved the right to present a resolution with respect to racial discrimination, and I understand that it has now been circulated.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Philippines has circulated a draft resolution on racial discrimination.

Therefore it seems to me that we have considered these petitions and if general problems require decisions of the Council we will take them in relation to the draft resolutions submitted by representatives on the Council.

I think that as far as the petitions themselves are concerned we have considered them and can reply to them that the problems raised by the petitions have been considered by the Council and the decisions of the Council - if the Council adopts these resolutions - will be communicated to the petitioners.

Would that be agreeable? Then we do not have to refer back to the individual petitions.

We have examined all the petitions on to-day's agenda and the representative of the Soviet Union has reserved the right to introduce a resolution on the Bakweri land question, which has already been distributed to the Council.

I will therefore ask the Council to adjourn for the usual recess and meet here again at 4.40 p.m. when it will consider the various draft resolutions.

The Council is adjourned.

The Council recessed at 4.15 p.m. and reconvened at 4.46 p.m.

/ The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: The meeting is called to order.

DISCUSSION OF RESOLUTIONS

The PRESIDENT: We have several draft resolutions before the Council. Taken in the order in which they were presented, we have a draft resolution by the representative of Mexico concerning petitions relating to political advancement in Tanganyika; secondly, a Philippine draft resolution on racial discrimination; and, thirdly, a draft resolution by the USSR representative on the Bakweri Land question -- the petition from the Bakweri Land Committee. Also there is another draft resolution presented by the representative of Mexico which is being processed now. Therefore, taking them in order I would ask the Council to consider first the Mexican draft resolution on petitions relating to political advancement in Tanganyika.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): Speaking on this draft resolution I must point out that in the past records of the Council the representative of the Administering Authority announced that the United^{Kingdom} Government intended to take certain measures in respect of political advancement of the inhabitants of this Territory.

My delegation considers that in political matters whatever measure may be adopted -- if simply an isolated measure -- does not really have a very fair chance of success or of giving rise to beneficial results. That is why in drafting this resolution the Mexican delegation took into account the possibility that although this resolution is couched in very basic terms the Administering Authority might develop a policy to foster the political advancement of the inhabitants of the Territory so that this political advancement might be political advancement, properly speaking.

/If the measures

If the measures which were to be adopted were only to apply in specific areas or regions or in specific sectors or segments of the indigenous population, such measures would really only affect a few areas in which progress would prevail, but these areas would be extremely limited.

On the other hand, however, according to the proposals of the Mexican draft resolution there is a possibility for a broad policy furthering the political advancement of the inhabitants to be carried out in a homogeneous manner throughout the Territory.

I hardly believe that it is necessary to add any more explanatory comments.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): With reference to the fact that the draft resolution proposed by the delegate of Mexico, because it constitutes quite a sizeable document, has only just been submitted for the consideration of the Trusteeship Council, it would appear to us that the vote on this resolution should be deferred until the next meeting of the Council because this draft, in the opinion of the Soviet Union delegation, does need additional study and consideration.

For our part, we do not oppose any discussion of this draft, but we still consider that the vote should be deferred until at least tomorrow.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I think that all of us will sympathize with the broad objectives of this resolution. All of us believe in doing everything possible to secure the political advancement of the inhabitants of Tanganyika as well as the inhabitants of every other Trust Territory.

In fact, under Article 76 of the Charter, we are already bound to promote the political advancement of the inhabitants of Tanganyika.

So that there is no question as to our sympathy with the underlying objective of this resolution. We are all already bound to pursue that objective.

/That leads

That leads me, however, to ask as to the necessity or the advisability of passing a resolution, if that resolution means no more than the Charter requires. I think, as we read through the details of the resolution, ^{that} it does raise certain questions; that is, we cannot consider it simply as a single broad resolution. It has some rather specific requirements and as to those, it would seem as though, until we determine what action the Council will take with regard to the Visiting Mission's Report, - a matter which we have agreed to defer until the June session, - it would be difficult to take action on these specific paragraphs, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

I think we may be in general sympathy with those paragraphs, but are we specifically? For instance, as I look at paragraph 3, for example, -- "The early establishment, to the above end, of a full system of district and provincial councils, the latter possessing a majority of indigenous members, who should be elected by the people or, in the meantime, chosen on as democratic a basis as possible, and being endowed with broad legislative, executive and financial powers" -- should they be elected by the people, or chosen on as broad a democratic basis as possible?

Personally, I imagine they should be, but I would like to know first more of the facts. I would like to hear the comments of the Administering Authority on the recommendations of the Visiting Mission's Report.

On each of these paragraphs as one reads them, one faces again that same question -- is this the time, rather than the June session, to take definite action?

It would seem to me that we should wait until June before passing such a resolution as this.

The PRESIDENT: I notice that many representatives want to speak, but in view of the point raised by the representative of the Soviet Union I would like to ask for an indication of the Council's desires as to whether it wishes to postpone the discussion of this resolution until tomorrow.

Rule 57 does not necessarily exclude the discussion and adoption of any resolution that is not circulated twenty-four hours in advance. It states that "to the extent possible",

/the Secretary-

the Secretary-General "shall circulate copies to the representatives twenty-four hours in advance of the meeting at which they are to be considered. The Trusteeship Council may decide to postpone the consideration of resolutions and other substantive motions or amendments, the copies of which have not been circulated twenty-four hours in advance."

Therefore, whether the resolutions should be considered now or tomorrow will have to be decided by the Council and if the voting on these resolutions is to take place tomorrow, then I would suggest that in order to save time the entire consideration of these resolutions should be deferred until tomorrow and we will pick up the other items on today's agenda.

Those who are in favour of postponing the draft resolutions presented today until tomorrow, in accordance with the wish of the representative of the Soviet Union, or in accordance with rule 57, please raise their hands.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
(Interpretation from Russian): There is no objection to this. Why are we coming to a vote on this rule? There is no objection. I mentioned the vote only; I did not object to the discussion of the draft resolutions.

If there is no objection, I think it is clear that members of the Council do not object to a discussion.

The PRESIDENT: I did not say that there was any objection. I was drawing the attention of the Council to rule 57 that it has to be decided by the Council, and if we are not going to take any definite decision on the resolutions it seems to me a saving of time if we leave the entire discussion until tomorrow; otherwise the debate would be impeded and it would be preferable to take a decision at the same meeting as the resolutions are considered.

Rule 57 does not refer to a mere vote. It says that "The Trusteeship Council may decide to postpone the consideration of resolutions", and that is why I feel that if we are not going to take any definite decision on any of the
/resolutions

resolutions, then we may save time by leaving it till tomorrow when all representatives will have had time to study them, and in the meantime we have quite a number of items on the agenda which can be proceeded with immediately.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish):
My delegation has no objection whatever to having this matter studied and voted upon tomorrow.

Naturally, if we leave the discussion open -- that is, if we were to continue discussing this matter today -- we might well take up all the time remaining for this afternoon's meeting; that is, we might well discuss at great length the various points touched upon in this resolution.

My delegation wishes to facilitate the work of the Council and has no objection to having its resolution discussed and voted upon tomorrow.

/Sir Alan BURNS:

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): All I wish to say is that I heartily support the President's point of view. If we are going to vote tomorrow, let us discuss it tomorrow.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): First of all, I should like to associate myself to the comments made by the representative of the United States. I believe that all members of the Council have read with feelings of warm sympathy the draft resolution advanced by the Mexican delegation, and I am one among these representatives.

But I must advance the same comments which I made previously when, after the adjournment of the discussion of the Report of the Visiting Mission to Ruanda-Urundi, I abstained in the vote on a proposal which had at the time been advanced by the Philippine delegation. I had said at the time that I had great sympathy for the resolution but I did not feel that the time was appropriate to come to a vote on the resolution. I would have preferred to have this resolution voted upon at the next session, at which time the Belgian Government would have had an opportunity to give its comments on the Report of the Mission and at a time at which it would be possible to take final decisions advisedly on the Report of the Visiting Mission. That, as a matter of fact, is the reason for which the Council decided to postpone discussion of that Report until the next session and to follow the same procedure as regards a part of ^{the} Report which dealt with Tanganyika. Again here we postponed the discussion so as to enable the ^{United} Kingdom Government to submit, if it saw fit, whatever comments it wished to make after having perused the Report of the Visiting Mission. It is at that time, then, that it would be possible to draft resolutions or recommendations; that is, recommendations or resolutions of the same nature as those submitted today by the Mexican delegation.

I believe that the discussion and vote on this resolution should take place at the next session for the reasons which I have just outlined to you.

These being the circumstances, I would propose that we postpone both the vote and the discussion of this Mexican resolution until the next session of the Council.

The PRESIDENT: I think that deferment of discussion until
/the next session

until the next session is one step further ahead of the other suggestion. There seems to be no objection to my statement that all those propositions which are presented today will be discussed tomorrow, including the suggestion on the part of the representative of France for deferment until the next session.

I would like to draw the attention of the Council to the fourth draft resolution submitted by the representative of Mexico which has now been circulated. Therefore, this resolution, too, can be taken up tomorrow.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR A VISITING MISSION TO TRUST TERRITORIES IN WEST AFRICA

The PRESIDENT: We proceed to the other items on today's agenda. I believe these items are very important and can be disposed of very rapidly. First we have "Arrangements for a Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa."

It will be recalled that this question was discussed at an earlier meeting and some decision had already been arrived at. Nominations for this Visiting Mission to West Africa this year were made, and the proposal was that the Visiting Mission should be composed of the present representatives of the United States, of Belgium, and Mr. Khalidi of Iraq. The question was not finally decided upon because the representative of Mexico asked for time to consult the Mexican Government for the nomination of a representative. I understand that the Mexican delegation is now in a position to nominate such a representative. I would therefore bring this question to the Council with a view to immediate determination.

Mr. NORLEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I have the honour to inform the Council that my Government has decided to name Mr. Abelardo Ponce Sotelo for this post, and we therefore present his name as a candidate for this Visiting Mission. Within the next few days my delegation will certainly be in a position to give members of the Council -- or to the Council itself for that matter -- the curriculum vitae for Mr. Ponce Sotelo.

The PRESIDENT: I think the Council is aware that the members of the Visiting Mission, while they represent their Governments, /are nominated

are nominated and elected on their personal standing and for the purposes of the Visiting Mission, they are responsible to the Council in the sense that they will have to submit a report to the Council. Therefore, the nominations are made by name.

The Mexican Government has nominated Mr. Abelardo Ponce Sotelo. Therefore, if this nomination is accepted, the Visiting Mission will be composed of Mr. Ryckmans for Belgium, Mr. Sayre for the United States of America, Mr. Khalidi for Iraq and Mr. ^{Ponce} Sotelo for Mexico.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I simply want to state that if I cannot personally go, Mr. Benjamin Gerig, my deputy, may go in my place.

The PRESIDENT: I think an early determination of the Visiting Mission will enable the Secretariat to go ahead with the preparations. The Council has taken note of the remark of the representative of the United States that in the event that he himself may not be able to go on this visit, then Mr. Gerig will take his place. I think the Council will certainly be agreeable to Mr. Gerig in the event that Mr. Sayre will not be able to go on this Mission.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): While we are very touched by the honour and the proof of confidence which is conferred upon me by the Council when the Council mentions my own name, I must make it quite clear that it is not at all certain that it will be possible for me to take part in this Visiting Mission. When the question came up I asked the Council to decide whether, in case I found it impossible to go, it would be left to my Government to submit another name to the Council. I believe that that is the way in which the situation should be understood, should it not?

The PRESIDENT: I think ^{that} in matters of this kind, when there is more than half a year intervening in the course of human events, we can only make a tentative decision, leaving the final determination to the time when the preparations are about to be finalized.

/Mr. NORIEGA

Mr. NCRIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wanted to suggest that, in view of the great interest which is at present attached to these Visiting Missions, the Council should study the possibility of inviting the ILO, UNESCO and the World Health Organization to submit the names of a panel of experts, from which the Council might choose certain members to accompany the Visiting Mission.

The PRESIDENT: I would first like to ask the Council to decide on the composition of the Visiting Mission itself, before it comes to this other suggestion.

Does the Council agree on the composition of the Visiting Mission as I have stated; that is to say, Mr. Sayre, or, alternatively, Mr. Gerig, for the United States; Mr. Ryckmans for Belgium, with the reservation that the Belgian Government may appoint an alternate to go on this Mission; Mr. Khalidi is nominated for Iraq and Mr. ^{Ponce}/Satelo for Mexico.

Then, that is agreed.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I would like to remind the President of the position taken by the USSR in this question, and I want to draw attention to it in connexion with the fact that certain representatives in the Council prefer at times to study the conditions in Trust Territories before expressing certain criticisms.

Although such remarks on the part of certain representatives do not have much force, nevertheless I would like to note the fact that the proposal of the USSR to include a representative of the USSR in the composition of a Visiting Mission would promote and actually assist the effective work of the Council.

The USSR delegation cannot, of course, insist on its demand to the detriment of the interests of other members of the Trusteeship Council to be represented in this Visiting Mission. Therefore, it may be possible that the Trusteeship Council, in view of the fact that the Mission has a great amount of work to do, will reconsider this question and may deem it fit to increase the membership of the Trusteeship Mission from four to six, or perhaps there may be another proposal. I think there is a plan /to have the Mission

to have the Mission visit four Trust Territories, and therefore it may be over-burdened.

The PRESIDENT: These names for the composition of the Visiting Mission were nominated by the Trusteeship Council at a previous meeting. Do I understand that the representative of the USSR considers that the number of representatives on the Mission should be increased?

I have some recollection that some other delegations may also wish to participate in this Visiting Mission, but as I said, I read out the nominations, and no other nominations have been formally proposed.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): At the first meeting of the Trusteeship Council, when this question was discussed, I think the President will remember that the USSR delegation did formally move the inclusion of a representative of the USSR in the Visiting Mission. That is what I wanted to recall.

The PRESIDENT: If that is the case, then I was mistaken in thinking that there were only four nominations. If there were more than four nominations, I shall have to ask the Council to vote, to choose four, because I understand that the budget only provides for four members on the Visiting Mission.

Unless there is some revision of that budget, the Council will have to vote for four members if there are more than four nominations.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I believed that the composition of the Visiting Mission had already been finally settled; that is to say, the number of members to be included in the Mission.

There can be no question of having five members, because then it would be impossible to set up the Visiting Mission as we have agreed in the past. We would then have to have six members to follow our usual procedure.

The Council, however, has already decided that the Visiting Mission should comprise only four members, and I see no reason to reverse this decision.

If the Mexican Government had been unable to submit a candidate to us, then the question might have come up as to who should be used as a
/substitute for the

substitute for the Mexican candidate. But that is not the case, since the representative of Mexico has just advised us that a Mexican delegate has been appointed to the Visiting Mission. Therefore there are already four members appointed, and I hardly see why the matter should be raised anew.

The PRESIDENT: That determination was based on my declaration that there were only four nominations. The representative of the USSR has now reminded the Council that at a previous meeting the USSR delegation did nominate a representative from the USSR.

If that is the case there would be five representatives nominated on the list. If the Council feels that only four could go, then I am afraid I can only ask the Council to vote for four, out of the five.

While I ask the Secretary to refer the Council to the minutes of that meeting concerning this question, I would like to ask whether the representative of Iraq can tell me if Mr. Khalidi is available.

Mr. UMARI (Iraq): We have made it quite clear on previous occasions that Mr. Khalidi will be available for the Visiting Mission. The information that Mr. Khalidi definitely will be on the Visiting Mission, has been made available to us in New York.

The PRESIDENT: I was asking for confirmation. I recall that that was the case. I seem to recollect that some other representative was mentioned in the event of one representative not being able to go.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the Council's decision that the Mission will not leave before January, I believe, and since there are definite considerations of a financial nature to be considered, when we speak of increasing the number of members of the Visiting Mission, perhaps we ought to defer this consideration until the June meeting.

The PRESIDENT: For this particular Visiting Mission the budget has been approved by the General Assembly, and it seems that there would be difficulty in revising the budget. The situation will not be altered during the June session.

/If the question is

If the question is deferred until June, we would simply be postponing questions which will then be in the same difficult position as they now are. There will be no other possibilities of revising the budget.

/Mr. GARREAU

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I must repeat that I really see no plausible reason whatsoever to reverse a decision which has already been taken. It seems to me inadmissible to reopen a debate on a matter which has already been voted upon simply at the whim and caprice of one or other of the members of the Council.

As the President has recalled, there is a decision of the General Assembly which can certainly not be altered before the next session of the General Assembly, that is next fall.

I see no reason to reverse these decisions. It has been decided that, because of financial and other reasons of a practical nature which were frequently invoked here, these Visiting Missions would comprise four members. This is a formal and final decision and I see no valid reason whatsoever to reverse this decision.

In the second place, it has also been agreed that, by way of seniority so as to avoid any difficulties, the Governments represented on this Council would be turned to, but it is clearly understood that those same Governments simply suggest certain names. Once these persons have been voted upon and have become members of a Mission, they no longer represent their Governments; they are members of a Visiting Mission which falls within the control of the Trusteeship Council exclusively.

We have already agreed as to the Governments which should furnish us with the names of candidates and we have also agreed as to a certain number of appointments: Mr. Ryckmans whom we know, Mr. Sayre; whom we also know or Mr. Gerig whom we also know, and we can certainly immediately agree as to their appointment; Mr. Khalidi, whose appointment we agreed to also because we know him, and today Mr. Noriega is advancing a candidacy upon which naturally the Council has not as yet voted, because we must not only know the name of this appointee, but also have a few indications as to his personality and curriculum vitae. Now we must take a decision which we have not as yet taken -- that is to say, on the suggested candidate who has been advanced by Mr. Noriega. If Mr. Ryckmans could not be a member of the Mission, then the name suggested by the Belgian Government should also be accepted by the Council by resorting to a vote. We could not simply ask the Belgian Government to name a member for this Visiting Mission at the last minute. We cannot make any such delegation of power. If Mr. Ryckmans could not take part in this Visiting Mission, then during the next session or at

/same other time

some other time, the candidate who would be named to substitute for him by the Belgian Government should be agreed to according to all due procedure by the Trusteeship Council.

I believe that this refers to all the decisions which were taken previously, and on this point I should particularly like to recall the comments made here frequently by the representative of the United States as to the choice of the members of a Visiting Mission. There are two procedures which could be followed: either simply to ask a Government to name one member who would then be available to the Council and would ipso facto become a member of an organ or a Mission which fell within the control of the Trusteeship Council exclusively; another procedure would have been to disregard the Government and to choose either in or outside the Government certain persons who would be considered competent and qualified by Council members.

The net result of all this was a compromise solution, taking into account the equal number of members of this Council: we ask Governments to advance certain names as candidates, but all these candidates must be agreed to separately by the Council by separate votes. I recall this because we have the following case before us: the Mexican Government, having been requested by the Council to submit a candidate to us, has done just that. However, it is not sufficient simply to have the name of Mr. ^{Ponce} Sotelo; we should have a few indications as to Mr. ^{Ponce} Sotelo's qualifications. I am sure that the Council will agree to the choice made by the Mexican Government, but a formal decision must be taken as regards Mr. Ponce Sotelo by the Council.

The same would apply in the event that Mr. Ryckmans would not find it possible to leave and that the Belgian Government would suggest an alternate to replace Mr. Ryckmans.

The PRESIDENT: Now I have located the minutes of the meeting at which this question was discussed. On page 17 of document T/SR/121 the minutes read as follows: "The President considered that it would be premature to decide the composition of the Mission at present. The Council would be in a better position to do so when the Report on the Territories to be visited had been examined, which would be during the forthcoming summer session." Immediately following that remark by the Chairman Mr. Soldatov "thought that it would be better for the members who were to go on the Mission to be chosen straight away, so that they could prepare for the voyage and make the necessary preparatory studies."

/Now the situation

Now the situation is reversed. I did propose that the composition be decided on in the summer session, but the representative of the USSR wanted it to be decided immediately.

I am reciting this, not to refute the validity of any reason which may have prompted a change of mind.

At the end of that page, Sir Alan Burns proposed as members of the Mission Mr. Sayre, Mr. ^{Padilla}/Nervo, Mr. Ryckmans and Mr. Khalidi. Then Mr. Soldatov requested that his country should be represented on the Mission. He was quite correct that he did make the request that the USSR should have a representative on the Mission.

After some discussion the question was again raised by the representative of the Philippines that "it would be wiser to postpone appointing the membership of the Mission to the next session of the Council, and make a formal proposal to that effect."

Then the Chair put that proposal to the vote and the Council decided to settle the membership of the Mission during the present session by 9 votes to none. Therefore, it seems to me that the decision was definitely to settle the composition during the present session and I would not put any other proposal to the vote which would be contrary to that decision.

However, I do say that Mr. Soldatov did make the request that the USSR should be represented on this Mission and, in view of the records of the meeting, although no name was suggested, if Mr. Soldatov would nominate a Soviet representative, I would put it together with the other names and ask the Council to vote on the four members who are to go on the Mission. When I say four members, the Council will recall that the Assistant Secretary-General informed the Council at that meeting that the sum allotted for the Mission in the budget would not allow for more than four members, together with a strictly indispensable number of Secretariat members.

I wonder if Mr. Soldatov is prepared to go himself, or if he is able to nominate a representative of the USSR now.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the USSR adheres now, as it did before, to the point of view that the composition of the Visiting Mission should be settled during this session, and when this question did come up this attitude was clear and there is hardly any contradiction between the point of view expressed at the beginning of the

/discussion of

discussion of this question and the proposal that I have recently made. It no longer ^{exists} because right now certain difficulties have cropped up in settling this question. What are these difficulties? Well, the representative of Belgium said that he does not know whether or not he will be able to go with the Visiting Mission and the representative of the United States similarly voiced concern and moved Mr. Gerig's candidacy.

/The Mexican delegation

The Mexican delegation submitted a new candidate who is not well-known to the members of the Council. Therefore new elements and new difficulties have come up in settling this issue. How can we come to a vote as to who will represent Belgium when the representative of Belgium, Mr. Ryckmans, stated that he does not quite know whether or not he will be able to go.

The representative of the United States similarly voiced a fear. Who will we vote for? Will we vote for Mr. Sayre or for Mr. Gerig? It is impossible to vote for the two gentlemen at the same time.

Further, the new candidacy on the part of Mexico is on an individual who is not well-known to the members of the Council and therefore we consider that it is because of these new elements that it is better to discuss and settle this question at the next session. With regard to the financial implications, I did say that they may be such that it will be possible to increase the number of members of the Mission. That was not a proposal which seemed to have met with such opposition on the part of the representative of France. But there is no need to get hot under the collar; I only said that such an opportunity may arise. If there is no such opportunity that is quite another matter.

I do not say that this is the main reason for deferring this question. That was not my motion at all. If financial apportionments are such as not to allow for an increase in membership, then we, as other organs of the United Nations, will continue to insist on economy.

However, we are faced with difficulties as to who we will vote for. That is not clear and therefore, because of this fact, it may be better to defer the whole question until the summer session.

As to the representative of the USSR, I think that the point of view which I expressed was very clear on this point and if the Council were to agree to come to a vote at this session I do not think that any difficulty in this respect will come up because the point of view of the delegation of the USSR was expressed clearly; that the USSR, as a delegation, wished to have its representative in the membership of the Mission. We spoke of the representatives on the Trusteeship Council and that was very clearly understood.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I must say once again, quite categorically, that a vote has been taken according to which it has been decided that this Mission would comprise four members. I ask that this vote be confirmed. There is no earthly reason to reverse or to change that vote.

/Now, as to the

Now, as to the composition of the Visiting Mission, that is another matter, but as regards the number of members to be included in this Visiting Mission, this has already been decided by the Council in the past and there is no reason to reverse our decision now.

On the other hand, I must also say that hitherto no member of this Council has wished to impose himself forcefully into a mission. There is a question of courtesy here. After all there is a question of seniority. Why should not the representative of the Philippines, for instance, also be a member of the Mission.

Let us assume that financially this were possible. We should then have to add two members representing the non-administering authorities and then we should have to add again two members of the Administering Authorities and the whole Council would go on this Visiting Mission and this would be rather ludicrous.

We cannot constantly bend to the will and caprice of one member of the Council who wishes to impose his will upon us and who wishes to reverse decisions of the past. I say this and I am getting hot under the collar; We do not here agree to ukazes. We must stick by the votes we have taken in the past and we cannot constantly reverse decisions which we have taken.

The PRESIDENT: May I assert that the Council did decide by a vote on the question as to whether the composition could be decided during the present session. The Council decided that the membership of the Mission should be settled during the present session by 9 votes to none but the record/^{does not} show that we decided the number of persons on the Mission except that the Assistant Secretary-General informed the Council that the budget only provided for four members and there was no objection to that.

Therefore it seems to me that the situation is this: We already have the four member nations and we have decided to settle the membership of the Mission during the present session.

If the representative of the USSR wishes to nominate a fifth member then I shall ask the Council to decide by a vote as to which four members are to serve on the Mission.

In the event of any member not being able to go on the Mission, I can think of a situation arising where Mr. Sayre cannot go and Mr. Gerig would take his place. Inasmuch as Mr. Gerig is well known to the Council I am sure the Council will have no objections to Mr. Gerig's going. The Council may/^{now} be giving its agreement in advance.

If Mr. Ryckmans cannot go he may nominate another member of the Belgian delegation or another member may be nominated by the Belgian

Government and the Council will have an opportunity to indicate its approval.

But, inasmuch as the members have been already nominated, I think there is no reason for that decision to be deferred. If the decision is deferred until the next session, a similar situation may arise. If the representative of the USSR can make his nomination now, I should be very glad to place it before the Council.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I wish to make two short remarks. The first remark relates to something which is not at all understandable. I refer to the remarks of the French representative who inferred that the representative of the USSR is imposing certain decisions on the Council.

This is such a ludicrous statement because the impossibility of my delegation's imposing any decision on the Council is so flagrant, so manifest as not to warrant any serious consideration.

The second remark deals ^{with} the candidacy of the representative of the USSR in the Visiting Mission. In connexion with the fact that the representative of France as a representative of an Administering Authority, both at the beginning of the discussion of the composition of visiting missions as well as during this present session, objects in one way or another, categorically, against having the candidacy of a representative of the USSR accepted, the delegation of the USSR does not insist on having the candidacy of the representative of the USSR put to the vote together with the candidacy of other countries which have been nominated for the Visiting Mission. It is very, very evident that since the representative of the Administering Authority objects so categorically, he has definite reasons which move him to object to a representative of the USSR visiting a Trust Territory of France.

I think that my last comment will meet halfway the representative of France.

The PRESIDENT: Am I to understand that the representative of the USSR is not making any nominations? Then there will still be only four names before the Council. Will the Council confirm the four names until and unless future events necessitate any change..

Mr. UMARI (Iraq): May I suggest that the first four names suggested here be confirmed and then, if Mr. Sayre or Mr. Ryckmans are not able to go, the Council can take the necessary measures to substitute other representatives as their delegations may suggest. In order to make our decision definitive it would perhaps be best to decide first on the four
bers.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I think my proposal to finish finally with the question at the next session remains before the Council. I would like to have that considered by the Council because it is impossible to decide upon the composition of the mission without having specific candidates upon whom to vote. Otherwise, at the next session we will again be discussing this question of these candidatures.

As to the final decision on the part of the Council at this time, I think it is impossible because there is no information as to one of the candidates.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I believe the representative of Mexico might give us a few points right now dealing with Mr. ^{Ponce}/Sotelo and these would very probably be quite adequate to enable the Council to vote at once on his candidacy.

As regards the other candidacies I see no difficulties whatsoever. We have already agreed as to Mr. Khalidi. As to Mr. Sayre and Mr. Gerig, I also believe that the Council agrees. As for Mr. Ryckmans, he simply stated that he might not perhaps be able to go in person, but for the time being, we can perfectly well name Mr. Ryckmans. This presents no difficulties.

We have, therefore, only the candidacy of the Mexican appointee and we could, I believe, vote on this tonight. If I asked a few moments ago for a few points of clarification on Mr. ^{Ponce}/Sotelo, it was merely a matter of principle. We must vote on each person named to a visiting mission. A government names a candidate but it is, in principle, for the Council to accept this candidacy. That is why I wish Mr. Noriega would now give us a few brief points on Mr. ^{Ponce}/Sotelo. Then we can vote on this right now. I see no reason for postponing until the next session this vote since we have all the elements for sound judgment at hand.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I am afraid we are wasting a great amount of time in this matter. We have already decided at a previous meeting that the question should be settled at this session. I consider it quite wrong that that matter should be reopened.

Secondly, we have before us a proposal that four gentlemen should be appointed to this mission. It is possible that Mr. Ryckmans may not be able to go, but it does not follow that he will not be able to go. If
/he cannot go,

he cannot go, he will let us know later on and then we shall make another decision.

I quite agree with what my French colleague has said. If Mr. Noriega can give us the necessary information, let us vote at once for the four members who have been proposed, and, as we know already that Mr. Sayre thinks it possible he may not be able to go, for Mr. Gerig as an alternate. We can do that in two minutes if necessary.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I am extremely sorry that I cannot give any further detailed data to this Council concerning Mr. Ponce Sotelo. What I can say is that Mr. Ponce Sotelo is perfectly well qualified professionally to discharge his functions as a member of the Visiting Mission. He has wide knowledge of demographic matters as well as sociological, educational and agrarian matters.

The Mexican Government, since it is well aware of the responsibilities placed on the shoulders of the Visiting Mission, would never have dared to submit as a candidate to the Mission any person who could not represent the interests of the Council in this matter and co-operate duly with members of the Council and the other members of the Visiting Mission.

I am extremely sorry that I cannot give the Council further details, but I can assure you that Mr. Ponce Sotelo is fully qualified and competent to discharge his functions as a member of the Visiting Mission.

The PRESIDENT: As I said before, the Council's decision stands; that is, that the composition of the Visiting Mission should be decided during the present session. We have four names presented, and reservations are made only in the event that they may not be able to go. We have no indication that any of the candidates are definitely not going. In the case of the representative of the United States, the alternate nominee is so well known to the Council that that would not present any question.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): The USSR delegation will abstain when the Council comes to a vote on this question as a whole because it does not consider it possible to settle this question in view of the conditions which have arisen.

The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the composition of the Visiting Mission, that is, Mr. Sayre for the United States of America, alternately Mr. Gerig; Mr. Ryckmans for Belgium; Mr. Khalidi for Iraq; and Mr. ^{Ponce}/Sotelo for Mexico.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The composition of the Visiting Mission was adopted by 10 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now take up the draft resolution regarding relations with the Security Council.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico)(Interpretation from Spanish): The Council will remember that I suggested that we consider the possibility of certain experts accompanying the Visiting Mission, namely, members of ILO, UNESCO and WHO. I should like some discussion on this question.

The PRESIDENT: The Council may appoint experts to accompany the Visiting Mission but I understand that, as the present budget stands, no provision is made for such experts. The question will have to be taken up with the specialized agencies concerned as to whether their representatives can accompany the Mission at the expense of the respective specialized agency. Therefore, this question can be taken up at the next session when we have ascertained from the specialized agencies what arrangements can be made for their experts to go.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Evans, representative of ILO, took his seat at the Council table.

Mr. EVANS (ILO): I shall certainly refer this matter to my Director-General with a view to that matter being taken up along the lines suggested.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I have not the slightest objection to any of these specialized agencies being represented, but I would call to the attention of the Council the very real difficulties which would arise with regard to accommodations for a large party.

I think there were six member of the Secretariat and four representatives in the Tanganyika party. If there were to be an addition to that number, it would present some very real practical difficulties.

/Mr. NORIEGA

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): We all know perfectly well that the travels of a Visiting Mission are not simply a pleasure trip; it is not an excursion or a vacation trip. The Visiting Missions have to work and they have to undergo certain difficulties. That is why I do not think there are any insuperable obstacles to having ten or fifteen people travel in this way. I do not think it would be that difficult to find adequate housing for these additional members.

We must consider that it is desirable and appropriate that there should be direct participation on the part of specialized agencies in such tasks as are carried out by the Visiting Missions. I think their co-operation is invaluable in this field.

/The very function

The very function, after all, of the specialized agencies is to study these matters and they should be able to study them in the Trust Territories and to co-operate with the Trusteeship Council as regards these various issues.

If we look at the Report of the Visiting Mission to Ruanda-Urundi and Tanganyika we find that there were certain fields which could not be dealt with or touched upon by the Visiting Mission because the members were not able to come to these matters although they wanted to. If the Visiting Mission were to comprise experts, and it is very probable that the Specialized Agencies could afford the funds for the travel of these experts, then the Visiting Mission would enjoy the invaluable contribution of these experts in carrying out their work in the Trust Territories. I do not believe the Council should discard such help.

Furthermore, governed by the spread of international co-operation and collaboration, I believe that we should enhance co-operation between the Specialized Agencies and the United Nations in this field.

If in the first few years of the United Nations existence there seems to be some difficulty in obtaining co-operation between member nations, I do believe that none the less there will be no such difficulty in obtaining the actual co-operation of the Specialized Agencies with the United Nations.

I might add that it seems to me only appropriate for the Secretariat to consult the Specialized Agencies I have referred to as to the possibility of their sending experts or representatives of their organizations in the Visiting Mission; and as what would their position be also as to the expenditures incurred.

The PRESIDENT: This question will have to be decided upon after we have heard from the Specialized Agencies as to whether they are prepared to finance their own experts. Or the Council may have to ask for a supplementary budget for future Visiting Missions. But this is a question which can not be decided during the present session.

Mr. UMARI (Iraq): We still have fresh in our minds the very good impression that we had from seeing the moving film that was presented by the New Zealand delegation on the conditions in the Trust Territory, and we have suggested that such methods be also followed in other Trust Territories, particularly in conjunction with Visiting Missions.

I remember that the representative of the United Kingdom once / mentioned that

mentioned that this method is going to be adopted by the British Administration in Trust Territories, and I hope that that arrangement will be made in conjunction with the Visiting Mission.

I should like also on this occasion to express my delegation's support of the statement made by the representative of Mexico in connexion with the help that could be secured from Specialized Agencies to make the reports more adequate and technically equipped.

The PRESIDENT: This question will have to be decided upon when we have heard from the Specialized Agencies ^{or} when the Council has had further occasion to consider the desirability of arranging for experts to accompany the Visiting Mission.

RELATIONS WITH THE SECURITY COUNCIL (T/271).

THE PRESIDENT:
I was on the point of drawing the attention of the Council to a draft resolution in regard to relations with the Security Council.

The Council will recall that during previous sessions a sub-committee of this Council had discussed the question ^{of the relationship} between these two Councils in relation to the Trust Territories which are strategic areas.

The question was discussed during the last session and very recently the Security Council has adopted a resolution endorsing the recommendations of the Committee of Experts of the Security Council; and as a result of the conferences between these two Councils, the Security Council has also agreed to the interpretation of this Council regarding the functions of this Council with particular reference to the question of the form and such things as the questionnaire.

The resolution of the Security Council was communicated to me by the President of the Security Council, and it seems to me that in order to complete action on this matter it would be incumbent on the Trusteeship Council to pass a resolution in connexion with this matter. You have the text before you and if there are no observations I think the matter can be voted on very quickly.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I move that this resolution be adopted.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) It seems to me that this resolution is a helpful way of going forward. As this Council knows, the United States has already made a report on these Pacific Islands, which, as a matter of fact, follows in the main the existing questionnaire. That report has been received by the Secretary-General / and the United States

and the United States would be very glad, if this resolution is passed, to have that report considered in full by the Trusteeship Council.

As we all know, the Charter accords to the Trusteeship Council, in the case of non-strategic Trust Territories, the power to submit questionnaires to the Administering Authority and to consider reports based upon them, to examine petitions and to provide for periodic visits to Trust Territories.

In the case of strategic Trust Territories the Security Council has no such powers.

Nevertheless, the United States, in the Trusteeship Agreement which was agreed to by all concerned, wrote article 13, which provides that "the provisions of Articles 87 and 88 of the Charter shall be applicable to the Trust Territory provided that the Administering Authority may determine the extent of their applicability to any areas which may from time to time be specified by it as closed for security reasons."

Since that time, only a single, very small area has been closed. December 1947, the United States informed the Security Council effective 1 December 1947, Eniwetok Atoll was closed for security reasons, in order that the United States Government, acting through its Atomic Energy Commission, might conduct necessary experiments relating to nuclear fission.

The result of this is that except for Eniwetok Atoll, the United States will welcome the exercise, by the Trusteeship Council, of all functions which are embraced in Articles 87 and 88 of the Charter, which of course includes provisions for questionnaires, for reports, for petitions and more particularly, for visits.

In other words the United States will welcome the exercise by the Trusteeship Council ^{under} the resolution passed by the Security Council, and of this resolution if it passes, of those functions embraced within Articles 87 and 88 of the Charter.

/ Mr. SOLDATOV

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation considers that the draft resolution submitted by the President contains a number of items that demand study and because of that I move to have this draft not put to the vote today although I will not object to having it discussed at today's meeting.

The PRESIDENT: It is six o'clock now and there is a proposal to postpone the voting. Does the Council feel that it wants to postpone consideration of this draft resolution until the next meeting?

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): It seems to me that it is a matter of pure form and that it might be adopted without even a vote.

The PRESIDENT: That is what I thought. May I ask whether the representative of the Soviet Union feels there is any urgent reason to postpone the voting until the next meeting, because this is a matter of form? We have conferred at some length with the Security Council and the Security Council has voted for this arrangement; it is only a matter of confirmation on our part.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I thank you for your explanation but I am acquainted with the manner in which this question was discussed, both in the Committee of Experts and in the Joint Committee of the Trusteeship and Security Councils. Nevertheless, I have already said that the proposed resolution demands study and discussion and because of this I ask, if possible, not to put it to the vote today. Of course if the Council were to decide otherwise it is up to the majority but I think you will bear in mind the difficulties and that is the proposal that I want to make.

The PRESIDENT: It is, as both the representative of Belgium and I have said, purely a matter of form -- in fact, the Council can adopt it immediately. But in looking over this draft resolution I have found that there is a flaw in the form. The second paragraph says:

"NOTING that the interpretation given to this resolution by the Trusteeship Council....."

Now, I have not had occasion to make any interpretation on this

/resolution

62

resolution which was passed by the Security Council on 7 March 1949. The interpretation was given to a draft resolution prepared by the Committee of Experts of the Security Council and, therefore, although in substance they are the same it cannot be said that we have given an interpretation to that resolution -- in fact, that interpretation was referred to twice in this draft resolution. In view of that fact, I am agreeable to postponing the decision until I have found some remedy to this flaw.

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

The Council will meet at 2.30 p.m.

The meeting rose at 6.04 p.m.