

United Nations

Nations Unies

ANALYST'S FILE

TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL

CONSEIL
DE TUTELLE

UNRESTRICTED

T/P.V. 160
23 March 1949

English

43

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Fourth Session

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

Lake Success, New York
Wednesday, 23 March 1949, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. LIU CHIEH

China

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

OF PETITIONS LISTED IN THE ANNEX TO THE AGENDA (T/234,T/273)
 RESOLUTION OF MEXICO (T/282)

The PRESIDENT: We are half an hour late in starting today because the Drafting Committee worked until after two o'clock in order to complete the draft reports on the Annual Reports of Trust Territories. I propose, therefore, that we work today without interruption -- without the usual recess -- and that we will try to bring the proceedings to a close around half past five.

The first item on this afternoon's agenda is the examination of petitions in connexion with which there are four draft resolutions: one by the representative of Mexico, another by the representative of the Philippines and two by the representative of the Soviet Union. We will put them in the order in which they appear on the agenda.

First is the draft resolution by the representative of Mexico. This draft resolution is contained in document T/282 under date of 21 March 1949.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I do not know whether I heard incorrectly and therefore do not know whether you also referred to another proposal of Mexico about the land problem.

The PRESIDENT: I believe that was circulated yesterday but not in the usual documentary form. Do I understand, then, that the representative of Mexico desires that these two resolutions should be taken together?

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): No, I think they can be dealt with in the chronological order of presentation. Therefore, I will at first speak only about the resolution on political advancement.

The document submitted by Mexico in reality includes -- most explicitly and circumstantially -- only proposals that the Council itself has already adopted and approved. Therefore I consider that there can be no cause for much discussion or disagreement of
 /views in connexion

views in connexion with the Mexican proposal. This proposal resolves about the proposals in connexion with political advancement and in connexion with the views expressed by members of the Council thereupon.

Therefore I do not think it necessary to take the time to read page 31 of the Report of the Trusteeship Council edited in August last year by the Secretariat.

I would also like to say that the terms of the Mexican proposal, besides being based on a resolution of the Council on this particular point, also has a basis in the Declaration of Human Rights that the General Assembly approved in Paris in the first part of its session. Therefore, I feel that there will not be much discussion about my document. As I have said, the document has implicitly been approved already by the Trusteeship Council at particular moments.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I deeply regret that I have to oppose the resolution that has been put forward by the representative of Mexico because I am fully appreciative of the sincerity of his motives in moving this resolution.

My reason for opposing it first of all lies in the fact that we have already decided to postpone the consideration of the Visiting Mission's Report until the next session and a great many of these matters -- although they were referred to in the petitions which are quoted in the resolution -- nevertheless are based on recommendations of the Visiting Mission to Tanganyika. That is my first point.

The second point is that I consider that the terms of the resolution are asking for far too rapid a move in the direction of developing various organizations and forms of government in Tanganyika. If I may use the very excellent simile used by the representative of Mexico yesterday, we have two clocks. One may be moving a little slowly but I suggest that the other one is moving a little too fast.

I would refer particularly to one or two of the items, in one of which, for instance, there is a recommendation that Kiswahili should be used as a second official and working language of the Legislative Council, that various changes should be made in the electoral system and that a full system of district and provincial councils should be established immediately.

/As has been recognized

As has been recognized in one of the preliminary sentences of this resolution, "...the Administering Authority has pronounced itself in favour of introducing some of these measures" and is moving as rapidly as it can do in the direction of implementing all these matters which are proposed in this resolution by the representative of Mexico.

I appreciate as well as anyone else the danger of them moving too slowly but there is a far greater danger in moving too fast in a case of this kind. It is with very great regret that I feel bound to oppose this resolution.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I have already pointed out in one of my previous statements that in my opinion this resolution should be submitted to our examination and vote when we come to the final discussion on the Report of the Visiting Mission.

We have decided to adjourn to the next meeting the two parts of the Report of the Visiting Mission dealing with Ruenda-Urundi and Tanganyika and this in order to enable the two Administering Authorities to present their remarks to the Council on the conclusions, recommendations and observations formulated by the Visiting Mission. Under the circumstances it would seem to me somewhat illogical to take resolutions now which would anticipate on the final examination of the Visiting Mission's Report.

/The representative of Mexico

The representative of Mexico points out to us that his proposal is based on recommendations made previously by the Trusteeship Council as a result of the examination of last year's report on Tanganyika. If this is the case, I do not see the need for repeating recommendations which have already been made.

It would be a superfluous proposal which would not add anything to the various proposals or recommendations made previously by the Trusteeship Council.

If, on the other hand, the proposal which is now submitted to us goes beyond the scope of recommendations made previously, in that case I repeat that in my opinion this resolution should be discussed and, if necessary, adopted by the Trusteeship Council when we come to our next session.

I would, moreover, like to make certain remarks on one specific point of the Mexican delegation's resolution. It is point 6 -- the adoption of Kiswahili as a second official and working language of the Legislative Council of Tanganyika.

I would not like to deliver a course in philology in this respect, but I would like to remind the Council of the fact that Kiswahili is not a native language of Tanganyika. Kiswahili found its origin in the dialects of Zanzibar and the neighbouring island of Pemba. It is not even a language properly speaking; it is a dialect mixed with Arabic words and it is, if I may say so, a kind of pidgin language used for commercial purposes on the East coast of Africa. But it is in no case, and could in no case be considered, as far as I know, as a native language of the Tanganyika Territory.

Before being placed under British Trusteeship, Tanganyika Territory was the territory of German East Africa and at that time the island of Zanzibar was -- as it still is -- a Protectorate of the British Crown. This language became to a large extent that of Tanganyika, but only for commercial purposes and as a kind of lingua franca which enabled native indigenous persons speaking various dialects to be able to understand each other. But as I say, it

/is not

is not a native tongue any more than pidgin English in Hongkong could be considered as a dialect of the hinterland of the Chinese territory, for instance.

Under the circumstances, I do not see how we could suggest that this dialect used for commercial purposes and which, I repeat, is in no way an indigenous language of the Tanganyika Territory, be adopted quite arbitrarily as the second official language or working language of the Legislative Council of Tanganyika.

Moreover, the special representative of the Territory, I believe, unless it was the United Kingdom representative himself, pointed out to us that in the present state of development of this language it is still too rudimentary to be adopted as an official language on the same level as any other of the leading languages. It is a language that would have to be radically perfected in order to apply to administrative requirements.

Finally, the last point which I would like to stress before the Council, is as to whether it would be advisable, in the interests of the indigenous inhabitants of Tanganyika themselves, to compel them to study at length a language which does not yet exist completely as a language and which is still in a very rudimentary stage -- much too rudimentary to enable any teaching in Kiswahili to be given in the higher degrees of studies.

I doubt very much whether it is possible, for instance, to translate into Kiswahili any kind of course in higher physics or chemistry or transcendental mathematics. You may have noted in several petitions that the indigenous inhabitants themselves were very desirous of seeing in their elementary education the introduction of a great world language which would enable them to arrive as soon as possible to the higher degrees of studies. We saw this point of view expressed implicitly in part of a petition which had been submitted to us by the representative of the Philippines.

This petition came from Togoland. We found the same wish expressed for the same reason in a petition coming from Tanganyika.

/For all

For all these various reasons I think that in any case -- and I would reserve my position as to the whole of the proposal of the representative of Mexico -- I consider that it would be advisable to delete simply this point 6, and I would make a formal proposal to the representative of Mexico to this effect.

The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the next speaker, I would like to observe that I am no authority on philology or, particularly, on Kiswahili, but in order to keep the arguments cogent, the analogy given by the representative of France with regard to pidgin English in Hongkong is not applicable in this case, because pidgin English spoken in Hongkong certainly is not native to any part of China; and to compare the application of Kiswahili to pidgin English in Hongkong in relation to the language of the masses would not be quite correct, because I believe the ^{motive} of the representative of Mexico -- as I said, I do not know this language so I do not know whether he is correct in so proposing -- is that he seeks to have a native language used by the natives.

Therefore I would like the Council to feel that the analogy given would not be correct, because to try to suggest -- and I know that no one has suggested, but by analogy if there is any suggestion ~~that~~ a badly-spoken alien language could be brought into the hinterland of a country with a very highly-developed language, would not be a good analogy in this case as a ground to objection to this paragraph.

I say this without going into the merits of paragraph 6.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I also -- to my great regret -- am compelled to vote against this resolution.

First of all, we have not finished the discussion of the Report of the Visiting Mission.

In the second place, the two first paragraphs are really superfluous and useless. They are not worth pointing
/out to the

out to the Administering Authority because it knows that as well as we do.

As for the rest, I admire the self-confidence of the Mexican representative in thus deciding a number of questions where for years the Administering Authority and the best and most expert of its officials have been studying, still hesitate and have not arrived at agreement.

I have seen too many examples during my career of proposals made, not only by journalists, for instance, but even proposals made by high officials conscious of their responsibilities, who returned to the Government headquarters after a visit, for instance, with a proposal and discovered, to their great surprise, that this proposal which they formulated with the maximum of conscientiousness -- being convinced that it was favourable to the development of the Territory -- had already been the object of lengthy study and had been set aside for reasons which they admitted were perfectly valid after they had seen the various files and archives. And they admitted that if they had seen the archives and files before, they would not have made such a proposal, but they considered it was reasonable and therefore made it.

/Here, for my

Here for my part I would state that I have been in a territory which is neighbouring the Territory of Tanganyika. I do not know the Tanganyika Territory very well; I have only spent a certain time there thirty years ago, and therefore I would not pretend to know what happens there now. I have only passed through that Territory, but for many years I subscribed to newspapers of the Tanganyika Territory, and therefore I took part in the life of the Territory in a certain way. I assure you that I would never dare to take the responsibility of advising the Administering Power to take such and such a measure.

For instance, the early establishment of district and provincial councils is proposed -- the latter possessing a majority of indigenous members. That raises the whole question of how many grades you have to have in the administration and as to whether you need a general council for the Territory as a whole, and then provincial councils and then district councils and then tribal councils.-- whether you have to have three grades or whether you have to have four grades.

Those are questions of extreme complexity which are decided in this manner with the whole authority of the Trusteeship Council by simply saying to the Administering Authority: "This is what the Trusteeship Council invites you to do, and if you do not do it, you will be in conflict with the Trusteeship Council."

Similarly in respect of the adoption of Kiswahili, I have to note to my regret that I do not quite agree with what has been said by the representative of France in respect of Kiswahili. I think that he considers this not as a properly constituted language, whereas Kiswahili is a language which for five or six centuries has received Arabic, Persian, English and other contributions and has perfected itself. I think it would be quite easy to translate into Kiswahili the United Nations Charter, for instance, and also the Government Ordinances for Tanganyika.

But to say that Kiswahili should become a second language, I do not know, and I would not dare to present such advice to the Administering Authority, because I presume that the Administering Authority has already considered this question, and if it did not adopt this language, it probably had reasons not to do so.

If it had been thirty or thirty-five years ago, I might have said that I thought it was a good measure, because thirty-five years ago Kiswahili was the only means of communication between persons belonging to
/various Bantu

various Bantu dialects and who had all adopted the Zanzibar language, which was taken into the interior of the Territory with the caravans of traders. But the position of Kiswahili thirty-five years ago is now occupied by another language which is English and which renders as many services as Kiswahili did then.

I do not know what-- if today we impose Kiswahili as the second official language--persons, such as the Basukuma tribes or the Bahaya tribes, who have more than a million inhabitants, would say. They might say: "We will give up Kasuma or Kihaya for English, but certainly not for any other language or any other Bantu language which is not from the Territory but which is imported from Zanzibar."

Those are the kinds of decisions which we are called upon now to take here without any preliminary study and which we are going to impose upon the Administering Authority, and we pretend to know things better than the Administering Authority does.

I confess that while having vast experience of African affairs, I do not consider that I am qualified to give such advice to the Administering Authority. If I had to discuss this today with the Governor of the Tanganyika Territory, I would discuss with him as an equal, but I would say that in respect of conditions in the Tanganyika Territory I would not venture to give him any advice.

The representative of France may have made a mistake in perfect good faith in respect of Kiswahili, and he knows as much as any other of us. He agrees that how can we decide that Kiswahili can be the second official language, when we do not even know what its place in the economy of the Territory can be.

No, for my part I admit that I am much too modest. I would never dare to give such advice to the Administering Power, and I will vote against this proposal.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): I must confess that I cannot quite follow the line of argument that this Council should postpone discussion of the Mexican draft resolution on political advancement until next session, because the Report of the Visiting Mission to East Africa has been scheduled for final discussion at the next session.

The Report of the Visiting Mission should be divided into two parts, one part, which is the main purport, arising from a separate provision of the Charter, Article 87 (c), which provides for "periodic
/visits

visits to the respective trust territories", whereas petitions are another matter. They arise under a separate Article of the Charter, Article 87 (b).

The reason for postponing action on the report on the main Report of the Visiting Mission is because the Administering Authority has not yet submitted its observations. With respect to petitions, we cannot say the same thing, because with respect to the petitions before us the Administering Authority has had at least five chances to make observations on these petitions. First, under rule 86 of our rules of procedure, these petitions ^{were} received by the Administering Authority at least two months before the date of the present session, and the Administering Authority had the privilege to submit its observations at least fourteen days before the opening of the present session.

The Administering Authority did not take advantage of this privilege, but when the petitions were discussed before the Council, the Administering Authority did present observations on the petitions.

Secondly, under rule 89 of our rules of procedure, the visiting representatives are allowed to make observations on the petitions presented to them, which is the case with respect to the petitions that we are considering now. The Visiting Mission did in fact make observations after consultation ^{not} only with the local authorities in Tanganyika, but even with the Colonial Office in London.

Again, when the Report of the Visiting Mission was discussed the other day, the special representative and the regular representative of the Administering Authority did make observations on these petitions.

Therefore, I see no obstacle to this Council's making a final decision on the points raised by the delegation of Mexico inasmuch as it has before it all the comments required by our rules of procedure in order to take intelligent action on the matter.

With respect to the question of introducing Kiswahili as a second working language in the Legislative Council of the Territory, I should like to draw attention to the fact that there are only four African representatives on the thirty-member Legislative Council in Tanganyika, and the reason adduced by the Administering Authority for not being able to increase the number of African representatives is that not enough Africans speak the English language.

/If it is

If it is admitted that Kiswahili is the lingua franca in Tanganyika, the proposal to make it a second working language in the Council is intended merely to afford the natives a chance to participate in the Legislature of the Council of Tanganyika through the medium of a language which they already know, and there is no compulsion on the part of the natives to ^{learn} Kiswahili.

The purpose of this proposal is only to take advantage of the knowledge already held by the natives of the Kiswahili language, in order that they may be able to participate and therefore be properly represented in the Legislative Council of Tanganyika.

For these reasons the Philippine delegation supports the Mexican draft resolution.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I have listened with the greatest attention to the remarks that various representatives have made upon the Mexican proposal. I would like to underline some of these remarks.

The representatives of Belgium, France and the United Kingdom have attempted to find in this proposal a recommendation of a mandatory kind to the Administering Authority; that is to say, something that would oblige the Administering Authority to develop these seven points of the proposal. But I think that if you read paragraph 3 of document T/282 attentively, you will see that the request is for an investigation of the political situation, with the end in view of introducing reforms. After this the seven points are enumerated.

That means that it has not been made obligatory for the Administering Authority to undertake the development of these seven points, but it has been requested to undertake a study of them.

The United Kingdom representative has referred to a statement I made yesterday to the effect that the Council seemed to base its working on a mechanism like that of two clocks, one of which went fast and one of which went slow. But I think the trouble is that one of the clocks has stopped, and does not go at all.

Let us look at the Report of the Administering Authority. There are two paragraphs in the Report for Tanganyika for 1947 where it is said that there has been no legislation promoting political advancement. The clock could not be more stopped than that.

Therefore, as I have said, the tendency of the proposal is to recommend to the Administering Authority to study the points, and then we give it a kind of guiding light, with seven points -- points which have been implicitly endorsed by the Trusteeship Council on previous occasions.

/As for the scruples

As for the scruples advanced by the representative of Belgium, in the sense that it was rather daring to recommend specific points to the Administering Authority, I imagine that to suppose this, as the representative of Belgium does, undermines the trusteeship system. According to him only the representatives of Administering Authorities have knowledge of what they can recommend to themselves, so that there is no need for the non-Administering Authorities to be here -- at least on the basis of that thesis.

Suppose that this recommendation failed. Political advancement would still be a developing fact in the Territory. That means that there would always be a renewed possibility of implementing new plans for political advancement in the Territory.

As for the question of Kiswahili as a working language in the Legislative Assembly, I had two reasons for including this in my resolution.

One was because in reality it is an obstacle to being a member of the Legislative Council if you do not know English. My point therefore is to eliminate this obstacle. There must be very many indigenous persons capable of taking part in public affairs, who have no acquaintance of the English language, but who can express themselves in the Kiswahili language.

Then again I would not say that any language in the world is perfect -- neither English nor Spanish are perfect languages. We have recently heard about plans for changing the orthography of the English language, and proposals in the same connexion have been made about Spanish irregular verbs. So I do not think we can reject Kiswahili merely by saying that it is not a perfect language. There is, indeed, no complete or perfect language.

Languages are like living organisms; in a constant process of change, acquiring new words and discarding old ones. This, therefore, cannot be made a pretext for rejecting this part of the Mexican proposal.

I think we must also remember that amongst the purposes of the Trusteeship Council is the main purpose of preserving the cultures of the peoples of the Trust Territories.

The representative of Belgium, who is an expert in this matter, told us that some thirty years ago Kiswahili could well have become an official or a working language in the Legislative Assembly, but that

/it cannot become

it cannot become that now. What is he telling us? He is really telling us that this language is being lost. There would therefore be advantage in conserving the Kiswahili language, and would not this particular phase of the local culture therefore be one of the trusts of the Council?

As to the point that it is not really a language but a dialect, I do not think it is really necessary to go into the history of the origin of Indo-European languages. All Indo-European languages were originally dialects. They all have borrowed words. None of them are strictly native to Europe, therefore all languages have to borrow.

Regarding the study of the petitions, I do not think I have to add anything to what the representative of the Philippines has said on this point. I myself, in a previous statement, advanced the same arguments a little more briefly.

These petitions have no relation to the Visiting Mission. They can be studied without any reference to the conclusions that the Visiting Mission might have reached.

On the other hand, I would recommend to the Council that it establish a relation between this proposal of the Mexican delegation and the conclusions to be found on page 31 of the report of the Trusteeship Council. You will note that in their spirit the Mexican proposal complement the conclusions of the Council in the first report upon the Territory of Tanganyika.

On behalf of my delegation I welcome the announcement made by the representative of the United Kingdom to the effect that some of these proposal are acceptable. I would like to emphasize this: if the part about the Kiswahili language is not acceptable, my delegation would be willing to postpone this matter. But I would like to know what concrete objections exist against the other six points of my delegation's draft resolution.

I would like to know which of these points is inconsistent with the resolution approved by the Trusteeship Council in connexion with the political advancement, to be found on page 31 of the Council's report, in the section on Tanganyika.

/Sir ALAN BURNS

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I should like, first of all, to assure the representative of Mexico that however it looks, the clock has not stopped; it is still ticking along.

The representative of Mexico has told us that there is a suggestion that Spanish irregular verbs might be altered. If I were to make a recommendation either that they should or should not be altered, I should be making a fool of myself by making a suggestion regarding a language of which I knew absolutely nothing.

Most of us, including myself, know nothing of Kiswahili and I think, with the exception of the representative of Belgium, none of us have ever heard it spoken. But I should be very diffident, myself, about making a suggestion for the adoption of Kiswahili in this manner when the Administering Authority, with years of experience, has decided that it is not desirable.

As to the lack of a knowledge of English keeping certain indigenous inhabitants out of the Legislative Council, I have no knowledge of East Africa but I have known West Africa off and on for over thirty-five years. In both the legislatures of Nigeria and the Gold Coast, it is a qualification that a member must speak English. That of course excludes a certain number of people from membership in the Council. But in all my thirty-five years in Africa I have never heard a suggestion from any of the inhabitants of those countries that it was a handicap to the people or an objectionable rule that knowledge of English was indispensable for a member of the Council. I do not believe that it is.

I think that if Kiswahili were allowed in the Legislature there would be very few Kiswahili speaking people who did not know English who would be elected, if they were elected, or chosen if members were chosen. It would be essential for these members, if they are to take a full part in the discussions, to have a knowledge of English which would be the main language spoken.

As I said before, I am fully conscious of the high motives of the representative of Mexico in making these proposals. But it is not only the matter of Kiswahili to which I take exception. In paragraph four of the draft resolution there is a recommendation for an immediate increase in indigenous representation. It was stated, I think in the report and certainly by the special representative, that it was intended to have a member shortly for one of each of the eight provinces. Again, in paragraph 5, there is a recommendation for the introduction of an electoral system for the selection of all members.

/These matters

These matters cannot be rushed in Africa and it would be quite futile for this Council to endeavour to make the clock run faster than it ought to run in accordance with the movement of the sun.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the USSR has studied, with much attention, the draft submitted by the delegation of Mexico and considers that this resolution, to a substantial degree, reflects the urgent need of carrying out measures in order to have the indigenous population of Tanganyika participate more fully in the government of its Territory.

However, the delegation of the USSR considers that it cannot fully support this resolution if only because the proposal contained in this draft is, in our opinion, insufficient since the proposal, to an insufficient degree, goes forward along the path to recommend to the Administering Authority that it create, in the Trust Territory, legislative organs and governmental or administering organs which would not be subject to any organs either in colonies or based on a union with colonies as, for instance, the petitioners from this Trust Territory require.

Moreover, this draft resolution also is not forceful enough in reflecting the need for the Administering Authority to take measures in the Trust Territory for this purpose -- measures of a legislative and other character -- that would ensure the participation of the indigenous population in legislative, executive and judiciary organs in this Territory.

In connexion with this, the delegation of the USSR had submitted its own draft resolution dealing with these questions that in our opinion does go forward and does properly reflect the urgent need to carry out or implement measures to have the indigenous population participate to a greater degree in the administration of their Trust Territory.

So, as the clock of the Administering Authority has stopped, it may be started again, so that the clock may show that the Administering Authority is carrying out the basic provisions of the Charter. Up to now it is impossible for us to say that the Administering Authority is fulfilling properly the requirements and obligations of the Charter and specifically, Article 57.

The PRESIDENT: There has been, I believe, a proposal to delete point 6 of the operative part regarding the adoption of the Kiswahili language.

There are no other amendments. Therefore, unless I hear any other suggestions I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

/Mr. CRAW

- Mr. CRAW (New Zealand): I greatly regret that I have to vote against this resolution for the simple reason that I think the proper time to bring up a resolution of this nature would be at the time we finish the discussion of the Report of the Visiting Mission.

If we adopt this resolution there will be nothing to stop various people from introducing resolutions which will cover the educational, social and economic fields in Tanganyika. The result will be that the whole report of the Visiting Mission will have been approved and there will be no point then in taking it up at the next session.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): At the end of the last meeting, after having given the reasons which I repeated just now -- that is, after I had criticized the time in which this resolution had been submitted -- my conclusion was that this kind of resolution should be studied after we have considered the Report of the Visiting Mission.

Therefore we are not really in a position to deal with the matters of substance which this resolution covers though I did submit some remarks about point 6.

I should like to propose the deferment of this resolution, therefore, and I am renewing that proposal of deferring consideration of this resolution until we have concluded our consideration of the Report of the Visiting Mission. I am taking up this proposal of deferment again because I sympathize with some of the points in the resolution, the intentions of the resolution and I understand the Mexican position. I should be very sorry if I were placed in a position of having to vote against this resolution as a whole today for the reasons that I have just given.

/Sir Alan BURNS

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I do hope that my Mexican colleague will see his way to postponing this resolution, because it would be with the greatest reluctance that I should vote against it.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I should like to know whether the representatives of New Zealand and France, for example, who have said that the time is not ripe for this resolution -- if they can answer me -- would vote for this resolution as it is if the time were ripe.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I have already said that, in general, I sympathize with the desires expressed by the Mexican delegation to see political progress reinforced and established in Tanganyika, allowing the indigenous population to participate in the legislative and administrative life of the Territory.

I will not go into detail, of course, but I do think that this resolution can be amended. Some amendments could be submitted. I made some points about point 6. I criticized it and I would maintain my criticism because the discussion has proved that, while my analogy between pidgin English and Kiswahili was not entirely exact, it is nonetheless true that my principal objection is irrefutable -- namely, that Kiswahili is not a language indigenous to Tanganyika, but comes from Zanzibar and became lingua franca in the Territory involved, but this is not an essential point.

Therefore, to reply concretely to the question of the Mexican representative, I believe that this resolution is not properly in order. It should be submitted only at the time when we have concluded our consideration of the Report of the Visiting Mission. At that moment, I think, with a few small amendments, we can reach agreement on the whole resolution, in which case I would willingly vote for it -- but, of course, under the reservation of some necessary amendments.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of France has referred to point 6 again on the Kiswahili language. I would like to point out, if it is not fully understood, that the representative of Mexico has already accepted the deletion of that section.

/Mr. CRAW

Mr. CRAW (New Zealand): I am in exactly the same position as the representative of France. I see no reason why, when the Report of the Visiting Mission has been debated finally and fully considered, we could not come to some agreement on a suitable resolution of this nature. It would need to be amended before I could vote for it, but I see no reason why we could not have an agreement on it.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): In view of the declarations made by the United Kingdom, New Zealand and France, my delegation has no objection to postponing the discussion and voting of this resolution. We are willing to have it postponed. We would also like to express our appreciation of the expressions of sympathy that have been made by these representatives. We hope that, when the time does come to vote on this resolution, they will vote in favour of it.

(United Kingdom):
Sir Alan BURNS: I would like to say how greatly I appreciate the attitude of the representative of Mexico which is in keeping with the treatment that he always accords to the Council in the way of co-operation.

The PRESIDENT: Then there is no necessity for a vote. The sponsor of this draft resolution has accepted the proposal to defer this resolution until the next session when the Visiting Mission's Report will be examined again. Therefore, this draft resolution will be held over until the next session.

DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE PHILIPPINES AND THE UNITED STATES (T/290)

The PRESIDENT: The next draft resolutions are submitted by the representative of the Philippines, and I believe the two resolutions are now combined in one document, T/290, under today's date. The Philippines and the United States have jointly submitted the resolution.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): The original resolution introduced by the Philippines, T/283, should be withdrawn in view of the presentation of the joint draft resolution, T/290.

/In this connexion

In this connexion I should like merely to invite the attention of members of this Council to the fact that, if there is any petition which can be divorced completely and absolutely from the Report of the Visiting Mission, it is the subject matter of this draft resolution before us, because the Visiting Mission frankly admitted that it had had no time to study this question. Nevertheless we had the reply of the Administering Authority during our discussion of certain petitions at our meeting of Friday 18 March, and this resolution is based on the facts as furnished by the Administering Authority.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I just want to say that I am not going to oppose this resolution. I do want to place on record, however, that it is my Government's policy and intention always to take all the steps that are possible to end racial discrimination.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I think no argument is necessary on this resolution. My delegation is delighted to join with the Philippine delegation in proposing this resolution. I feel that I speak for every member of the Council in expressing the hope and the desire that no measures be spared to end discrimination insofar as that can practically be done in every one of the Trust Territories.

Those of us who have lived or worked in territories such as these know the evil, the terrible consequences and the poison that spreads from racial discrimination. I think every person sitting at this table feels heartily the same way, and my delegation is therefore delighted to join with the Philippine delegation in proposing this resolution.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): Might I ask the sponsors of this resolution whether they would find any objection to changing the words "colour bar" to "racial discrimination" because colour bar has a more or less definite meaning which is different from racial discrimination.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): That would be entirely agreeable to me.

/Mr. INGLES

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): Before I accept the amendment, may I request further elucidation by the representative of Belgium as to what is the actual difference?

/Mr. RYCKMANS

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): In Africa, especially in South Africa, the words "colour bar" are regularly used. "Colour bar" has a definite economic meaning; "colour bar" is prevention against certain people taking part in certain trades. It has nothing to do with social discrimination; it has a purely economic meaning. Racial discrimination is far wider in its meaning.

I believe that the "colour bar" really does not exist in Tanganyika. There is nothing to bar a man from becoming a mechanic, for instance, because he is black or because he is an Asian. That is the meaning of "colour bar".

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I should think the words "racial discrimination" include "colour bar"; they go further than "colour bar".

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): These words were merely taken from the exact wording of the petition before us. In view of the explanations made by the representatives of Belgium and the United Kingdom, we accept the amendment.

The PRESIDENT: The amendment is to the effect that the three words "the colour bar" should be eliminated and the words "racial discrimination" substituted therefor.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I shall limit myself to a few remarks because the point of view of the USSR delegation on the question of racial discrimination in Trust Territories is very well-known to all members of the Council.

On the substance of the joint resolution which has been submitted by the representatives of the Philippines and the United States, I must say that this draft resolution contains such reservation in the recommendation in the operative part as to the elimination of racial discrimination that we form the opinion that this draft resolution actually does not propose any concrete measures at all, and does not call upon the Administering Authority to take any concrete, immediate measures in order to eliminate racial discrimination. That is, racial discrimination is qualified by various considerations.

/In particular,

In particular, it says the elimination of racial discrimination should be carried out as far as is practically possible. It is very evident that racial discrimination cannot be justified by any considerations whatever. Why make reference to practical possibility? Can you justify the existence of racial discrimination, making it contingent upon any considerations of practicability?

That racial discrimination should be eliminated immediately without any delay whatsoever on the part of the Administering Authority. In connexion with this, we have to say that the original Philippine resolution went further and naturally proposed very clearly that the Administering Authority take effective measures to eradicate racial discrimination in the Trust Territory, especially as practiced against the indigenous inhabitants.

The joint draft resolution presented by the Philippines and the United States however, in our opinion, seems to worsen the original formulation which was contained in the original Philippine draft. Since the draft resolution submitted is insufficient in scope and tenor and does not propose any serious measures for the Administering Authority to take in order that racial discrimination be immediately eradicated, the USSR unfortunately, although it would have liked to express itself in conjunction with the delegations of the Philippines and the United States, cannot do so because the proposal is insufficient.

In connexion with this, I should like to draw the attention of the Council to a draft resolution which was withdrawn unfortunately by the representative of the Philippines, and would like to know what the opinion of the Council is in this respect. Perhaps the majority of the Council would still speak in favour of having that original Philippine draft which has been withdrawn, and which is contained in document T/283.

Without making any formal motion, I would like to call the attention of the Council to this matter.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the USSR is usually very correct in his procedural arguments. In this case, I would like to ask him whether he agrees that there is no draft resolution by the representative of the Philippines before the Council after it has been withdrawn, unless the representative of the USSR would like to consider adopting the withdrawn draft as his own.

/Mr. SOLDATOV

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): The President is very correct in interpreting the rules of procedure, and I do not intend to infringe upon them in any way. I only called attention to the difference which exists in the original draft as compared to the present joint text.

Since the original Philippine draft was before the Council, and was tabled as of 21 March as an official document, I thought I had a right to refer to it. If I do not have the right to refer to the draft in my statement, I shall ask to have my statement deleted.

The PRESIDENT: I meant that if you decide to have discussion on that draft, someone would have to adopt it. Otherwise it is no longer before the Council. I did not question the right of the representative of the USSR to refer to it.

If there are no further observations, I shall ask the Council to vote on the joint resolution submitted by the representatives of the Philippines and the United States, as amended by the representative of Belgium.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 10 votes to none.

DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (T/284)

The PRESIDENT: We come now to a draft resolution submitted by the representative of the USSR, document T/284, dated 21 March, on the petition from the Bakweri Land Committee.

There are two USSR draft resolutions before the Council. In order not to have any confusion, I will read this very brief draft resolution. It is as follows:

"THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

"HAVING CONSIDERED the petition from the Bakweri Land Committee,

"CHARGES the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in West Africa with a full investigation of the problems raised in the petition, upon which the Visiting Mission would present its recommendations to the Council not later than 15 December 1949."

/MR. SAYRE

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I question that date, 15 December 1949. I do not quite know what the significance of that date is. As I understood the situation, it may be that the Visiting Mission might not be back by then.

/Mr. SOLDATOV

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I think the date 15 December 1949 was put here so as to come to a final decision as to the Bakweri Land Committee petition, at least in the current year, so as not to prolong it until 1950.

Of course the Soviet Union delegation would be ready to hear any proposals as to change of date, since a practicable date should be placed in the resolution.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): As far as I am concerned, I shall abstain in the vote on this resolution for two reasons. The first is that if we have to give the Visiting Mission instructions to deal with the question of the Bakweri, it will be done in good time at the next session - there is nothing urgent in this. The second is that I do not give up hope that for our next session we shall be seized of the report of the senior officer who was entrusted with examining this question for the local government.

It is quite possible that at our next meeting we may have this report before us, and that we may have the decisions, taken by the local government, as a result of this report, and that we may be able to deal finally with this question of the Bakweri petition without having to entrust the Visiting Mission with dealing with this question.

Mr. CRAW (New Zealand): I, like the representative of the United States, am worried about this date. I think it is a little too early, and I wonder if we could have some information, perhaps from the Secretariat, as to when the Visiting Mission would be likely to visit the Cameroons. It would be interesting to know whether they are going to Togoland first and then to the Cameroons, and so on. I think that might help us.

The PRESIDENT: As I understand it the Visiting Mission will not be leaving until towards the end of the year, and therefore if it is to spend three months in the Territories to be visited, it will not be able to complete its Report before 15 March.

Mir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): May I ask the representative of the Soviet Union whether he wishes the Visiting Mission to report before it puts in its ordinary report on its mission?

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): The regular session of the Trusteeship Council takes place, as a rule, at the end of the year, either November or December. And if the next session of the Trusteeship Council after the summer one, will take place in November or December then the mention of the date keeps in mind that perhaps the last session of 1949 will have an opportunity to come to a final decision on this problem as to how the Report of the Visiting Mission will be presented in connexion with this question.

In our opinion it would be wise to have the Visiting Mission submit its consideration as to this question so that the Trusteeship Council could come to a final decision, bearing in mind what the Visiting Mission reports.

Of course this all depends on the date of the last session of the Trusteeship Council.

The Soviet Union delegation is of the opinion that the position is a serious one; we have repeatedly postponed its discussion and the decision on it, and therefore the Soviet Union delegation thought it wise to adopt this decision now, which would ensure it of a final decision as to this question not later than the end of 1949. And right now we would satisfy the petitioners by our reply, by saying "your petition is in such and such a position". Otherwise we will incur a delay and the petitioners may have a certain claim as to our Council.

I think that the procedure that we propose with regard to the Bakweri petition is a practical one and is acceptable. And that is why we say that the Soviet Union delegation does not insist as to this date. We could modify it, but only have it directed at an efficient decision, a settlement of the whole problem.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I wonder if the representative of the Soviet Union is not perhaps a little in error as to supposing that ^{the late autumn} meeting of the Trusteeship Council will take place in November or December.

I suppose that the General Assembly will still be at work in November. Remember we faced that question this past year, and because of that fact we decided not to hold the winter session of the Trusteeship Council until some time beginning in January.

It would seem to me quite possible that the same procedure would be followed during the coming year.

/ I wonder whether

I wonder whether it would be agreeable to the representative of the Soviet Union if we changed this date to some such form as "not later than the winter session of the Trusteeship Council". Some kind of formula which would charge the Visiting Mission with reporting to us during that winter session, we not yet knowing when that winter session will take place.

The PRESIDENT: That would be not later than the sixth session of the Trusteeship Council, because the summer session is the fifth.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): In principle the Soviet Union delegation has no objection to any similar formula, but the question comes up of the following quality. We have a conclusion made by the Visiting Mission, and we also ought to have some consideration or explanation on the part of the Administering Authority. The members of the Council should acquaint themselves with these documents and they, in this case, would not be able to do so, if the date were so late. Therefore it would be better to mention the earliest possible date; that is why we have the date 15 December figuring here.

If we were to draft it in such a form that the conclusions be presented to the winter session of the Trusteeship Council, we could face the situation when they would be presented ^{right} before the beginning of the session and we would not be able to study them as we should.

We have had experience of petitions and Visiting Missions' Reports which shows that such delays can take place.

I think we ought to have concrete mention of a date which would allow us to deal ^{effectively} with the whole question. Of course the majority may think that this question is rather a small one but I think it is a rather serious one - an important one - since the Bakweri Tribe must await our earliest decision anxiously.

Perhaps we could mention the date as 1 January or 10 January, that is before the commencement of the winter session. We would be in a position to acquaint ourselves with the documents and study the replies of the Administering Authority.

/ As far as the Mission

As far as the Mission is concerned I do not think this will be a difficult task for the Mission. It will be able to send in its conclusions through the Trusteeship Department which will present the conclusions to the Trusteeship Council.

I repeat once again that the question of dates is before our consideration because we want a date that would ensure an efficient solution on the part of the Trusteeship Council of this problem in a final manner.

The PRESIDENT: There has been a proposal to change the date to not later than the sixth session of the Trusteeship Council. To that proposal the representative of the Soviet Union raises no objection except that he feels that a more definitive date -- something like 15 January -- should be set.

Mr. SCIDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): It occurred to me that perhaps we could formulate it in the following manner: no later than two weeks before the commencement of the sixth session of the Trusteeship Council.

The PRESEIDENT: If the Trusteeship Council meets in January -- as it did this year -- that would bring the date around Christmas, not many days after the original date. In fact, I was going to observe that the suggestion of the representative of the United States would also leave the question rather ambiguous in the sense that the Council may meet two months and it may mean not later than the beginning or not later than the end of the session; that would be quite some difference.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): But we are not sure when that Mission will return. AS I understand, the dry season does not begin until December -- I speak subject to correction -- and it could be that the Mission will go off and not get back until after the Trusteeship Council has started its session. I speak in ignorance but I think we must hold that possibility in mind.

The PRESIDENT: That is why I ventured to point out that possibility to the Council, that even the suggestion of the representative of the United States may not be as practical as it may seem at first sight because if the Council meets in January
/then a date

then a date not later than the sixth session of the Council must be taken to mean not later than ^{the termination of} the sixth session rather than the beginning of the session.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): This resolution might just as well be adopted at the next session. We would still have time to give the necessary instructions to the Visiting Mission because this delay would enable the representative of the United Kingdom to inform us of the terms of the report of ^{the} Cameroons Authorities in respect of the Bakweri Petition.

If I understood correctly, the representative of the United Kingdom told us that at present the authorities are enquiring as to conditions on the spot and the Administering Authority would be able to give us the conclusions of the Administration at the next session. If that is the case and if the United Kingdom representative can give us the necessary information from the local authorities at that time, we could decide as to this matter. If it happened that the representative of the United Kingdom was still not in a position at the next session to give us this information then it would be up to the Trusteeship Council to take a final resolution in respect of the Bakweri Land Committee's petition.

The proposal tends, therefore, to adjourn the examination of the proposal presented by the Soviet Union representative, it being understood that that would in no case delay the action of the Council since instructions have to be given to the Visiting Mission and these instructions can be given at the next session just as well.

For these reasons I would propose adjourning this resolution until the next session in the hope that the representative of the Administering Authority would be in a position to give us all the necessary additional information so that we can take a final decision at that time on the Bakweri Petition.

The PRESIDENT: It seems to me that the basis of decision for the Council is not so much whether it will receive the Administering Authority's observation; it is whether the Council decides that the Visiting Mission going to the Territory concerned should be authorized to study the matter on behalf of the Council even if the Council has meantime received the observations of the Administering Authority. After all, the Council sitting here seldom has an opportunity of /studying a matter

studying a matter on the spot but if the Visiting Mission is at the Territory concerned, the Council may want to take advantage of the Visiting Mission and ask it to study the matter on behalf of the Council and submit recommendations.

Therefore, it seems to me that ^{since} this particular petition which, the Council will recall, originated as far back as 1946 -- of course bearing in mind that the Council was not in existence then -- and then was repeated in August 1947, it is a petition which has been before the Council for well-nigh two years. Therefore I think that the cogency of any argument for deferring any resolution on this petition is not as strong as in the case of some of the other resolutions.

Mr. CRAW (New Zealand): I think ~~that~~ ^{is} the additional point, which may have been forgotten by the representative of France, that we owe it to the petitioners to let them see that we are taking a real interest in their case and while it is not necessary from the point of view of the Visiting Mission to adopt this resolution, I think that from the point of view of letting the petitioners know that something will be done it is most important that we adopt something on these lines.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I want to say approximately the same as the representative of New Zealand has said and to say again that the representatives of the Bakweri Land Committee did send an additional document for this session of the Council. In the additional petition they asked us to consider the original petition and stated that they were unable to arrive here in the time when the petition was under discussion and that was because of circumstances beyond their control.

I shall not repeat again the argumentation that was expressed and aired earlier when this whole question was up for discussion.

The representatives of the Bakweri Land Committee asked for the consideration of this petition and we have carried ^{that} /out. The petition says that the studies being carried out by the Administering Authority does not have any bearing on the substance of the petition because they raise quite another question than the one being studied by the Administering Authority. That is very clearly mentioned in the petition. I do not think it is wise to postpone the study of this petition until the next session and particularly because the petitioners asked us to consider this petition during this session.

/This would not be

This would not be consistent, to defer questions to the next session when it is possible to finish with them during the present session. Certain representatives did oppose deferment of questions to the next session, although they did not have very many grounds for doing so. -- in particular in connexion with the question of the Visiting Mission. Why is it in question? Where we would have been able to defer the consideration of questions, we did insist on finishing them during this session; and now when we are dealing with the Bakweri petition it is proposed that we defer consideration until the next session.

The whole petition question was discussed at length; the situation is clear and the resolution before the Council does not propose anything to which objection may be raised. I think the President correctly noted that fact. There are no elements in it which are disputable outside of the date; and I think that we could arrive at a very quick decision as to the date.

I think that would be the only wise way of dealing with the matter. I do not think it is wise at all to defer the consideration or the adoption or non-adoption of the resolution to the next session. The Soviet Union delegation sees no grounds for this, and I think the majority of the Council would support me in this.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): May I ask the President to refresh my recollection. What action was taken on a similar petition from the Bakweri Land Committee at our last session?

If my memory serves me correctly, we discussed the matter and we had before us a request by the Bakweri Land Committee itself to postpone consideration until the November session because of its inability to send anyone here.

I wonder whether a communication has not already been sent to them with regard to the former petition and if so how that fits in with this present question. Might I ask for information on that?

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: I think that information is contained in a letter addressed to the Secretary of the Bakweri Land Committee by the Assistant Secretary-General under date of 2 August 1948, which states:

"In reply to your cablegram of 16 June 1948, I am instructed by the Trusteeship Council to inform you that the Council has decided to defer consideration of the problem dealt with in your communications of 24 August 1946 and 17 November 1947 until a subsequent session of the Trusteeship Council. Your representative will be notified in advance of the date of such consideration."

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): That date, if I heard the President correctly, was early in August, was it not?

The PRESIDENT: 2 August, 1948.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): Am I correct in believing that the Secretariat told us that the present petition was sent prior to the receipt of that letter?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, but that is rather a continuation of the first petition. I did not reply to the question whether it was received before or after; what I meant was that in any case it related to the same petition -- that the additional petitions came after the receipt of the Assistant Secretary-General's letter. The letter informed them that the Council deferred the examination of the question until the subsequent session, that is, this present session.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): If I understand correctly the object of this resolution proposed by the representative of the USSR, it is to charge the Visiting Mission with making a full investigation of this matter, and is therefore only indirectly concerned with the petition. It would not constitute a reply to the petition. Am I correct?

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: It would constitute an action by the Council ⁱⁿ/relation and in response to the petition, I would think.

Sir Alan BUNNS (United Kingdom): I am not going to oppose this resolution and I doubt very much if anyone else will. It is merely a question of time.

The resolution mentions the date of 15 December 1949 and it may well be that the Visiting Mission will not be able to do it -- will not be there, perhaps.

I suggest that if the representative of the Soviet Union would agree, the words should be changed to "as soon as possible." Then we can get on with our work. We are wasting hours over this sort of thing.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): What I said a short time ago has no relationship with the reply which would be appropriate to send to the Bakweri Land Committee.

Faced with the petitions submitted to us this year, we have decided in common what replies should be given, and I do not see why in respect of the Bakweri Land Committee we follow special procedure. Nothing prevented the Council from deciding to reply now to the Bakweri that the Council had been informed of the matter and had discussed it and that the Administering Authority had, moreover, promised to inform it after results of the enquiry which was proceeding on the spot; moreover, that a Visiting Mission was to go to the Cameroons at the end of the year and that therefore the question raised by the Bakweri Land Committee and the object of their petition would be submitted to a careful examination by the Council and the Visiting Mission.

I do not see why we should have special procedure in respect of the Bakweri Land Committee's petition. I do not see why we should not proceed as we have done with all the other petitions collectively.

I would add that I would not be in agreement with the United Kingdom representative in respect of the way in which this proposal is presented. I would have to vote against it, for the procedural reasons which I have just pointed out. I consider

/that a

decision of the Council in respect of a petition may be made collectively and not in the form of a special, specific, recommendation.

The PRESIDENT: Do I understand, then, that the representative of France will not pursue any further his motion for adjournment to the next session?

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): I maintain my motion for adjournment of this question.

The PRESIDENT: If that motion is maintained, then I shall have to put it to the vote before other motions.

Those who are in favour of adjournment until the next session please raise their hands...

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I only wanted to say -- and I do not think the President caught my eye when I was asking for the floor -- that in order to expedite the settlement of the question I would agree with the formulation proposed by the United States representative to finish with the question here and now and not waste any more time on the procedural discussion of this question.

The PRESIDENT: I can quite understand that.

The representative of the Soviet Union has expressed his preparedness to accept the suggested amendment as to the date, but as long as the representative of France maintains his motion to adjourn, I have to put that to the vote in accordance with the rules of procedure.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): The motion for adjournment would not be of any use if the Council simply decided to reply at the present stage to the Bakweris as they replied to all the other petitions. The Council is in a position to reply immediately to the Bakweris without taking a specific resolution. That /is how we

is how we proceeded for all petitions. Therefore the motion for adjournment which I submit would be ^{without} without purpose if the Council did decide simply to reply to the Bakweri Land Committee in the way which I think would meet with agreement by all the members of the Council.

Therefore, this resolution need not be voted any more than my motion for adjournment. I simply propose that the Council proceed as it always did in such cases -- that is, that it decided in what form it would be appropriate to reply to the Bakweri petition. But if this resolution is maintained, then I would propose the adjournment of this resolution to the next session.

The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: The representative of France must, I think, be aware that there is a draft resolution to take a course contrary to his suggestion, and there have been amendments to the original draft resolution.

In order to dispose of the obstacles to finally taking a decision on this matter, I shall put to the vote the motion of the representative of France to adjourn until the next session.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The motion was rejected by 7 votes to 2.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United States has proposed a wording which was acceptable to the representative of the USSR. I would like to know whether the representative of the USSR is equally agreeable to the proposal of the representative of the United Kingdom.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Unfortunately, I cannot agree with the proposal that has been made by the representative of the United Kingdom, because the words "as soon as possible" will sound rather hollow to the representatives of the Bakweri tribe, if we were to inform them of this decision, because then they will say: "Well, the Council has been discussing this petition for more than a year now, and before that they turned to the Administering Authority. Now they tell us 'as soon as possible.'" I do not think that sounds right.

Because of this, I shall not be able to agree with such a formulation. I think it would be better to adopt the proposal with regard to the date that had been made by the representative of the United States.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I do not mind as long as we get on with it, but it would sound much more hollow if we tell them to make a report by a date when they have not arrived in the Cameroons.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I would like to know whether the vote on this resolution will include an adjournment
/of this discussion

of this discussion to the session of next winter; that is, if before the next session of the Council, we have the report of the enquiry described by the Administering Authority, whether the Council would give up the discussion of the Bakweri petition and would adjourn it in any case until next winter. In that case, I would vote against the resolution; otherwise, I would abstain.

The PRESIDENT: I think if this resolution is adopted, it will have the effect of influencing the Council not to take any final decision until the sixth session.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): Then I will vote against it.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): Of course, when we were discussing the proposal made by the representative of the United States and when we were discussing this question, it was very clear that the adoption of this third resolution will not hinder the Trusteeship Council on receipt of additional material from the Bakweri tribe or from the Administering Authority to discuss this question and come to a decision -- perhaps even before the Visiting Mission leaves for the Cameroons or the Trust Territory.

Therefore, this resolution would not hinder in any manner the Council's action after receipt of additional material from the Bakweri people or from the Administering Authority.

I would like to have that clear in the minds of the Council.

The PRESIDENT: I certainly did not say that it would hinder the Council from taking any action. In regard to that question I say it may influence the Council.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): I fully agree with the representative of the USSR that we ought to discuss this question as soon as we have the material to discuss it. But then what is the sense of voting on this resolution now and on fixing the date? Perhaps the whole matter will be changed by then -- before the Visiting Mission ever gets on its way.

/Mr. SOLDATOV

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): So much the better!

The PRESIDENT: To come back to the resolution, the representative of the United States has proposed that the last few words "not later than 15 December 1949" be substituted by "not later than the sixth session of the Trusteeship Council". Of course, I would understand that to be any time during the sixth session of the Trusteeship Council and not/^{not}later than the beginning. Is that right?

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): It would depend really on when the Mission does return. I should think my interpretation would be that the resolution would be fulfilled by a presentation of the recommendations during the session.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, I tried to give that interpretation to it, so that the Mission would know that they are not required to present it before the beginning of the session, because we have two rather uncertain factors: first, when the Mission will be coming back, or will be able to submit its report; and secondly, when the sixth session of the Council will begin.

Therefore, with that understanding and since the amendment has been accepted by the representative of the USSR, I ask the Council to vote on the resolution as amended.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The ^{draft} resolution as amended was adopted by 8 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: I thought the representative of Belgium also wanted to vote against it.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): No, it has been accepted that we have a right ^{to} discuss the question at the next session. Then I would not vote against it.

DRAFT RESOLUTIONS OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (T/284, T/291)

The PRESIDENT: Now we come to another USSR draft resolution, that is contained in document T/291, 22 March 1949, petitions concerning
/Tanganyika

Tanganyika. It is a very brief text, and I would like to read it.

The text is:

"The TRUSTESHIP COUNCIL,

"HAVING CONSIDERED the petitions received from the Tanganyika African Association, from the Chagga Council and from the twenty-two Shinyanga Township Africans,

"RECOMMENDS to the Administering Authority to return to the indigenous population of the Trust Territories all lands alienated from them, whatever the manner of alienation, and not permit in the future any alienation of land belonging to the indigenous population."

In this connexion, I would like to invite the attention of the Council to another resolution submitted by the representative of Mexico on this same question. The text has been circulated, although not in the usual document, but it has been circulated, and the date borne by the Mexican resolution was 21 March.

I think the two draft resolutions deal with the same matter.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): In view of the fact that this Mexican proposal was not circulated amongst the ordinary documents -- that is, those on green paper -- and also in view of the importance of this point, my delegation has decided to postpone the discussion of this point until the next session.

The PRESIDENT: On this question does the representative of Mexico mean including the USSR draft?

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico): Our proposal.

The PRESIDENT: The Mexican proposal. Then it is not before the Council for our purposes.

Therefore, there remains for the Council only the draft resolution submitted by the representative of the USSR.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I would like to clarify one point: why it is that on the agenda we do not have included the draft resolution which the USSR delegation submitted on the question of political advancement in Tanganyika in connexion with the petitions that we have had submitted to us -- a draft resolution that was circulated on white paper earlier.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: It has not come to my notice. I will cause a search to be made for it.

In order to prevent any misplacement, I think it would be best for resolutions to be sent in to the Secretary of the Council to be processed. When papers are circulated around the table while the Council is preoccupied with other debates, they may sometimes not have been properly noted.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I did not violate any rules whatsoever, and this document was circulated to all members of the Council yesterday. But for some reason or another it was not printed on green paper. That is the point that I wanted to raise.

The PRESIDENT: I am far from saying that the representative of the USSR has violated any rule of procedure. I was saying that it seems to have escaped my notice or that of the Secretary.

I have before me a draft resolution by the representative of the USSR, on the subject of political advancement. I think I have already begun to draw the attention of the Council to the other draft resolution on the question of alienation of land, and that is already on today's agenda.

I would suggest that the Council proceed first with that resolution: document T/291, dated 22 March.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I shall be as brief as the resolution and simply say that the resolution seems to me totally unacceptable and I shall vote against it.

Mr. GARREAU (France) (Interpretation from French): In this resolution there is one point that seems strange to me: that is that if all alienation carried out should be remedied or annulled, would that also imply all purchases of land or alienations which have been made for the benefit of non-indigenous persons, that is, Asians or Indians?

I think that the text implies that all alienation of land for the benefit of any foreigners to the Territory should be annulled,
/and the

and the indigenous population is the population living in and originating in the Territory, and not immigrants.

I therefore presume that, according to the terms of the resolution, it implies any alienation of land to any person outside the Territory, that is, European, Indians, Asians and other Africans who are not of the indigenous population of the Territory of Tanganyika. Therefore this resolution is rather strange.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): The resolution appeared very clear to me. We speak of a situation where we have a Trust Territory. On this Trust Territory we have people -- the indigenous population.

These people have the land on which they live, but the Administering Authority, due either to the inheritance that it received from the past, or because of its own policy, did carry out this alienation of land, or at least sanctioned such alienation of land, from the indigenous population.

The indigenous population is therefore placed in a position where it is deprived of its own land. Figures were actually produced -- I could always repeat them -- when we said that a definite part of the land is arable, and can be and is being cultivated.

But these lands are so distributed and allocated that it appears that the indigenous population of the Trust Territory is placed in a difficult situation, since the foreign part of the population has seized 1,800,000 acres of the best land of the 6,000,000 acres that are available, and is making use of it.

Therefore, out of 6,000,000, the foreign population, which numbers only 7,500 men, has grasped 1,800,000 acres of land, whereas the indigenous population -- 5,000,000 of them -- has but 4,000,000 acres.

I am not quoting exact figures now. I am just giving a rough picture of the situation. I could always find the requisite figures, but I have been mentioning them just as an illustration.

Therefore I would like to ask certain representatives in the Council not to think that the USSR representative does not adduce correct figures.

/I am just giving

I am just giving you a rough illustration of the state of affairs there.

It seems that the indigenous population has been forced off the best land and a plan is being implemented for the alienation... of 2,500,000 acres of land, which is also the property of the indigenous population. That is being carried out against the will of the indigenous population.

People are being deported from these lands, and we have examples in the Report of the Visiting Mission. We have examples of 500 families being moved out.

Moreover this question has not been fully reflected in the Report of the Visiting Mission, as we well know. It is therefore being raised in the petitions and, in the statements that were made here in the Council, the requisite parts were cited.

I do not think there is any reason to speak on the substance of the question, but the land that has been alienated should be returned to the native population, so that it will be able to do what it will with the land.

As to the reference to the fact that there are Asians who actually do not own the land; since they have the land on such discriminatory conditions, as for instance, the Tanganyika population itself, the question of Asians does not come up at all.

We ought to decide the basic question. The indigenous population has had its land alienated, and is being deprived of the best land, which falls into the hands of foreigners, in this case English colonizers, who have arrived in the Trust Territory. Justice should reign. We should establish equity, so that the interests of the indigenous population as to land are not infringed in any manner.

It is for this aim that the resolution submitted by our delegation is proposed.

As to the clarifications mentioned by the representative of France, I can adopt any clarifications which would show that we do not wish to place Asians or any other people in an inferior position. The resolution does not have as its aim the placing of Asians into an inferior position to other people.

/Mr. RYCKMANS

Mr. RYCEMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): This proposal is the type of proposal made with the certainty that it is quite impossible for the Trusteeship Council to adopt it.

It is a proposal which is made simply in order to be able to say later on--and we know quite well that it is impossible for the Trusteeship Council to adopt it--but after that we can say: "I did propose that all the indigenous population would have their land given to them, and nobody else accepted it."

/In the first place

In the first place, this is contrary to the Declaration of Human Rights. It is stated in Article 17 of the Declaration of Human Rights that:

"Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.

"No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of this property."

So, what will the owners say when they are expropriated? Owners will be deprived of their lands in order to give a so-called restitution of lands to the indigenous population. The owners will ask why and will be answered that this is for purposes of public utility.

The representative of the USSR said that the indigenous population had 4,000,000 acres and the Europeans 1,700,000 acres. Besides these 5,700,000 acres there are still millions of other acres which the representative of the USSR does not even mention.

If the indigenous population only has 4,000,000 acres and the Europeans 1,700,000, then the solution is quite simple: that of the 185,000,000 other acres we give to the indigenous population the equivalent of the 1,700,000 acres which the European or non-indigenous population occupy. It seems that that would be all right.

The representative of the USSR knows perfectly well that the indigenous population, at the present time, has under cultivation 4,000,000 acres and that next to that they have 185,000,000 acres which they can use when they like. He knows that perfectly well.

He also knows perfectly well that, if a certain number of indigenous inhabitants who at the present time complain of not being able to recuperate land which was alienated, that was generally made by agreement some time ago. On the other hand there are a lot of indigenous inhabitants who are very glad to have a European or an Asian with them because the fact of having a plantation gives work and salaries. There is a canteen and very often a dispensary in the farm of the European and so forth.

There are a great many circumstances in many places where the indigenous inhabitants would be very vexed to see the white man go away.

Moreover, this speaks of all lands alienated from them, "whatever the manner of alienation." Even in the case when it is the indigenous inhabitants themselves who voluntarily sold their ^{land} to someone in order to do good business, the owner would have to be expropriated and his land taken away from him.

If the proposal is made, it is simply for propaganda purposes and I hope the Council will not accept such manoeuvres.

/Mr. LIN

Mr. LIN (China): The question which the delegation of the USSR has brought out is one of great importance. He refers to the petitions received from the Tanganyika African Association, the Chagga Council and twenty-two inhabitants of the Shinyanga Township.

I can say that when the Visiting Mission was in Tanganyika, members of the Visiting Mission as well as the members of the Secretariat heard from many sources the expressions of fear and apprehension that large-scale alienation of land may take place in the future.

Therefore I think that the recommendation of the delegation of the USSR deserves our serious consideration. The Council must give some assurance to the inhabitants who have fears for their Territory in this respect.

I should like, however, to say that I am not able to vote for the resolution of the delegation of the USSR in its present form. I should like to call ^{the} attention of the Trusteeship Council to the recommendations of the Visiting Mission in this respect and I shall introduce -- perhaps not today -- recommendations which follow the recommendations of the Visiting Mission and take the preamble of the resolution of the delegation of the USSR as it appears and recommend to the Administering Authority, in the words of the Visiting Mission:

"As a general policy, all ex-German estates should come under African ownership preferably on a co-operative basis; and

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

Something to that effect, I think, would be more in harmony with the unanimous conclusions of the Visiting Mission. As it is late, I shall reserve my right to introduce a resolution to that effect.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): From the point of view of my delegation, the draft resolution of the delegation of the USSR has certain objectionable points but we are glad to note and we welcome the second part of the recommendations; that is, the part which suggests that the Administering Authority should not permit in the future any alienation of lands belonging to the indigenous population.

This specifically meets the fears expressed by the petitioners in the petitions which we have considered to the effect that soon no land would be available to them because of the increase in the population and because of the illegal alienation of land in favour of non-natives.

/Further, with

Further, with respect to the first part of the recommendation concerning the return to the indigenous population of all lands alienated from them, whatever the manner of their alienation, we could subscribe to this only on the assumption that all the alienations of land were made illegally or fraudulently. We could not subscribe to any principle which would deprive anyone of lands/^{acquired}legally and according to law or in accordance with transactions entered into in good faith. We do, of course, condemn alienations as a result of illegal or fraudulent manipulations.

For these reasons, my delegation would be able to support the second part of the operative clause of the resolution of the delegation of the USSR but we should be able to support the first part only if it is limited to fraudulent and illegal alienations.

The PRESIDENT: May I ask whether the representative of China is in a position to produce his amendment now since the language is already familiar to the members of the Council as it was taken from the Report of the Visiting Mission? I should not like to hold up the Council on this matter for another day as, according to our time-table, we have only two days remaining.

If the representative of China wishes to present his amendment tomorrow, that would prevent the Council from completing the resolutions on petitions today. Unless the members of the Council wish to insist on following the rules of procedure to the letter, since we know the contents of the Report of the Visiting Mission I should like to put the amendment to the vote.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I am afraid I should have to see the amendment.

Mr. LIN (China): I could simply read the text as it appears on page 103 of the Visiting Mission's Report, taking sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) which will cover the corresponding two points in the resolution of the delegation of the USSR.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I am afraid not. I want the text before me as I do not have a copy of the Report. It is not necessary to do this today. There are plenty of other things on the agenda.

The PRESIDENT: In that case I am quite agreeable to that. I only felt that some representatives want to complete the petitions and I should not like any representative from my delegation to give the impression that the Chinese delegation is holding up the Council's work. But if the other representatives want to see the text before it I will leave the matter open and will go on with the other items on the agenda.

I think Mr. Lin's proposal is an amendment to the Soviet draft resolution.

Mr. CRAW (New Zealand): I have the impression that the Mexican delegation was going to raise this question at a later date. Could not the Chinese representative introduce his resolution as an amendment or an addition to the Mexican draft?

The PRESIDENT: The Mexican draft has been withdrawn for the present session. It is no longer before the Council.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I would like to say now, with reference to the representative of China's proposal, that this is another of the instances where the recommendation of the Visiting Mission is going to be acted upon in the form of a resolution when we have already decided to postpone the consideration until the Administering Authority's views are known.

Here is a most important question of land alienation, on which the Administering Authority will almost certainly have comments to make.

The PRESIDENT: Now we can take up the draft resolution -- the once missing resolution, Although this resolution is not circulated in the usual document form, it was circulated by the Soviet delegation yesterday and should and could therefore be discussed.

The Soviet resolution reads as follows:

"THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL,

"HAVING CONSIDERED the petitions received from the African Association, Chagga Council and 22 inhabitants of Shinyanga township in Tanganyika,

"RECOMMENDS the creation on the Trust Territory of legislative and administrative organs, not subordinated to any organs which have been set up on the basis of the union of the Trust Territory with colonies, and for this purpose to introduce such legislative and other measures which would assure the participation of the indigenous population in legislative, executive and judicial organs of the Trust Territory."

/Those who are in favour

Those who are in favour of this draft resolution by the representative of the USSR, please raise their hands.

A vote was taken by show of hands

The draft resolution was rejected by 6 votes to 2

DRAFT RESOLUTION OF MEXICO: ORGANIZATION OF A SEMINAR IN AFRICA (T/269)

The PRESIDENT: Now we proceed to the other item on today's agenda: Educational advancement in Trust Territories, the draft resolution of Mexico, document T/269.

May I ask whether the representative of Mexico wants to say a few words on the resolution now before the Council.

Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): The study of the very full and complete Annual Reports upon the Trust Territories that have been submitted to the Council by the Authorities responsible for their administration has shown the particular interest and concern, both of the Council and of each and every one of its members, in the interest that educational advancement has for the inhabitants of those Territories.

The Mexican delegation has paid particular attention to the chapters on education included in the Reports that we have examined in the present session of the Council. We have noted with satisfaction the efforts carried out by the Administering Authorities for the purpose of extending educational facilities in their respective Territories.

My delegation has also expressed its conviction that it is necessary and urgent year by year to increase the efforts carried out in this field.

In connexion with our debate about educational advancement, and in connexion with the proposals and suggestions of the representative of UNESCO, I venture to submit to the Council the proposal that can be found in document T/269, the purpose of which proposal is to channelize and bring to our help the resources of UNESCO in the study of these problems.

We all know that one of the basic purposes of the International Trusteeship System, in accordance with the purposes of the United Nations, is that of promoting the political, economic and social

/advancement

advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence."

The representatives on this Council and those in the Fourth Committee and in the General Assembly have shown a very special interest in the promotion of educational advancement amongst the inhabitants of the Trust Territories, the conviction being that the raising of educational standards is an indispensable condition of economic and social advancement as well as of political evolution.

For this reason, the General Assembly Resolution that was adopted in Paris on 18 November 1948, which was based on the Report of the Trusteeship Council, considering that educational development is an essential requirement for the advancement of the Trust Territories, recommends that we request of the Administering Authorities an intensification of their efforts to increase educational facilities and to improve and extend those facilities that already exist in connexion with the preparation of native teachers.

UNESCO, for similar reasons, on 4 December 1948, adopted in Beirut a resolution in which it invites the Member States responsible for the administration of Trust Territories to avail themselves of that co-operation which it is UNESCO's duty to offer in matters within its competence.

/The great majority

The great majority of the United Nations, and of the states represented on this Council, are members of UNESCO. They have, by membership in UNESCO, shown themselves convinced of the validity of the purposes of this specialized agency. Amongst these purposes is that of promoting popular education.

UNESCO co-operates with the member states for purposes of educational improvement, for purposes of suggesting the best methods of preparing children to assume the responsibilities implied in freedom.

For solutions of this general kind, the Charter in Article 91, as well as the agreement signed between UNESCO and the United Nations, recognizes the special interest the Trusteeship Council would find in a collaboration with UNESCO, and in requesting co-operation from this specialized agency.

UNESCO has paid special attention to this field. It has gained great experience in the organization of seminars, the purpose of which is to study in a territory or specific region the concrete educational problems to be found there.

The members of this Council are aware, both on account of the representative of UNESCO's explanations and of the documentation that has been submitted to us by the Secretary-General, in document T/276, of the purposes, the organization and functioning of these seminars.

One such seminar was held in France in 1947, and in 1948, a seminar was organized in the United Kingdom and another in the United States, amongst others. In the present year, UNESCO is in the course of organizing two seminars, one in India in connexion with the problem of rural education of adults, and another in Brazil on literacy campaigns.

The Mexican delegation considers that both the Council, for purposes of its future work as well as the Administering Authorities involved can obtain satisfactory results, and results of unquestionable usefulness, from the study that UNESCO will be able to carry out by organizing a seminar on the problem of the fundamental preparation of teachers for the Trust Territories, the reports on which this Council has examined.

My delegation believes that if the authorities responsible for administering these Territories accept that help of which they can
/avail themselves

avail themselves by calling upon UNESCO, and agree to the possibility of organizing such seminars, an important piece of work could be done -- a study which would be of great technical assistance and value to the Administering Authorities in the fulfilment of the complex task that is required of them in this field.

For all these reasons, I trust that all members of the Council will approve the following draft resolution. This draft resolution reads as follows:

"WHEREAS the Trusteeship Council, in accordance with Article 91 of the Charter and Rule 105 of its Rules of Procedure shall, when appropriate, avail itself of the assistance of the Specialized Agencies in regard to matters with which they are respectively concerned,

"WHEREAS the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization has agreed to co-operate with the Trusteeship Council in the carrying out of its functions and in particular to render such assistance as the Trusteeship Council may request in regard to matters with which the Organization is concerned,

"WHEREAS the assistance of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in the study of the technical problems involved in the promotion of the educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories may be of great value both to the Council and to the Authorities responsible for the administration of the territories concerned.

"WHEREAS the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization has acquired considerable experience in the organization and running of seminars to deal with questions of education on a purely scientific and technical basis,

"THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

"REQUESTS the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to examine, in consultation with the Administering Authorities concerned, the possibility of organizing in 1950 a seminar in Africa, for the purpose of studying the problems of fundamental education and training of teachers as regards Trust Territories."

/I believe

I believe that, as this draft has been circulated some days ago and as the proposal which I made on behalf of my delegation was put to the Council for the first time, if I remember correctly, on 17 February 1949, the members of the Council will already have had an opportunity of carefully inspecting the various phases of this proposal -- its advantages and the implications it is likely to have.

I hope that, for the reasons I have previously given, this resolution will get the support of my colleagues in the Council.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium): Does the President believe now is the time to begin a discussion? The discussion may be prolonged if I speak at this time.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Belgium may make his remarks now, and if there are other speakers, I shall adjourn the discussion until our next meeting.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): What is the purpose of UNESCO? In short, the purpose of UNESCO is to ensure participation of various areas of the world which are less advanced from the point of view of education, science and culture in the benefits of areas which are more advanced.--that is, to establish a kind of average between the more advanced nations and the less-developed nations.

/The establishment

The establishment of this average could have been done at any time by the resorting of a less-developed nation to a more-developed nation. But such a resort would give rise to difficulties, suspicions and objections.

It is quite natural that a lesser-developed country should fear resorting to a greater power to receive assistance in the field of culture, or in the economic field, or even in the military field, through military missions, with instructors and so forth; because the less-developed countries would fear that the greater powers would profit through such a relationship to resort to political interference. Hence the idea of entrusting to an international body, which would not be suspected of such political interference, the task of human solidarity which we do not always like to see done through great powers which might seek to gain some profit or even might abuse their power in order to exercise political influence.

Having said this I consider that my country, and I think that the other Administering Powers would consider themselves in the same position, belongs to those countries of the world which are privileged, in as much as from the point of view of culture, science and education, they are in a greater stage of advancement than the average.

In the order of countries which give and countries which receive, Belgium is among the countries which give. Ruanda-Urundi is among the countries which receive.

Belgium is quite prepared to give its complete assistance to UNESCO; with one limitation, however; that is that its first duty goes to the areas where it exercises a direct influence either because these areas belong to its administrative and political authority -- that is the case for the colony of the Belgian Congo, which is a Belgian territory -- or else because, as in the case of Ruanda-Urundi, Trusteeship over this country has been given to it.

Therefore, as I say, we are quite prepared to give our share of experience in culture, education and science to UNESCO, it being perfectly understood that the colony of the Belgian Congo and the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi have priority and prior claims before UNESCO, whose task is to circulate among the less-developed countries, the benefit of the experience of more-developed countries.

But Belgium is among the countries which give to UNESCO, and not countries which shall receive from UNESCO.

/ We are prepared

0

Mr. GERIG (United States of America): I would have no objection if you think it necessary to have that referred to the ad hoc committee that did the work before but I understand that drafts on these lines are pretty well-advanced by the Secretariat. There is a certain form that has been followed in the past and the decisions have been made by the Council. I am just wondering whether it is really necessary to have that Committee or whether we could in this case, and even in future cases, entrust that kind of drafting to the Secretariat.

Also, I think that the Council -- in view of its present schedule and the amount of work that still remains -- may have to meet in the morning -- if not tomorrow morning, then another morning -- in order to complete our agenda by the proper time. There seems to me to be several questions left on our agenda that will require considerable discussion and it might be more profitable to consider having a morning meeting of the Council, having the Secretariat bring the drafts on petitions which we can deal with here as a kind of committee of the whole. I suggest this merely as an alternative form of procedure.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I entirely agree; I am sure that we ought to have a meeting of the Council tomorrow morning and probably Friday morning as well.

The PRESIDENT: Is it the desire of the Council, then, to meet tomorrow morning? I think that there are two questions before us: one is whether it is necessary to refer the drafting work in connexion with petitions to a drafting committee?

Mr. CRAW (New Zealand): I agree that we will probably have to have a morning meeting but as far as my delegation is concerned it will be a little difficult. You will recall that yesterday there was some commitment made to Sir Carl Berendsen or the Council agreed that the question of Part II of the Western Samoa report -- which again is bound up with Part II of the other reports -- would be considered tomorrow afternoon and Sir Carl at the moment, I think, is in Philadelphia. I do not think that he could get back for tomorrow morning's meeting.

/The PRESIDENT:

The PRESIDENT: I do not think that affects the situation because there are other problems for us to consider.

Before I ask the Council whether they will meet tomorrow I would like to know if the Council is agreeable to the suggestion by the representative of the United States that the Council dispense with the drafting committee and will examine any draft submitted by the Secretariat. Ordinarily I would have thought that it is better to have a drafting committee in the sense that it would save a certain amount of discussion in the Council and, in the second place, it would serve as a buffer between the Council and the Secretariat because the Secretariat drafts may be subjected to infinite criticism. I do not know whether the Secretariat agrees with me; I am just thinking aloud.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I think we can assure the Secretariat that we would be very gentle with them.

Mr. ALEKSANDER (Secretary of the Council): After this assurance I think we can tackle this.

The PRESIDENT: Then we will dispense with that procedure. The Council is adjourned until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.