

United Nations

Nations Unies

UNRESTRICTED

TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL

CONSEIL
DE TUTELLE

T/P.V. 184 21

14 July 1949

English

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Fifth Session

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

Lake Success, New York
Thursday, 14 July 1949, at 2.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Roger GARREAU France

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.184 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I declare open the twentieth meeting of the fifth session of the Trusteeship Council.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR A VISITING MISSION TO TRUST TERRITORIES IN THE PACIFIC IN 1950 (T/349, T/366)(Discussion continued).

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The Council will continue the discussion which it started yesterday on the question of sending a Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific during 1950.

Mr. LAKING (New Zealand): Our discussion on this question of a Visiting Mission for 1950 seems to me to have been based on two assumptions, one of which is that it is desirable for the Mission to visit all the Pacific Trust Territories in 1950, and the other that the maximum time which could be allowed would be about three months. Both of those assumptions seem to my delegation to be quite sound but I wonder whether the itinerary that is proposed is not a little unreal.

Some members of the Council have had the experience of travelling in the Pacific and I have a little experience myself. I was in Samoa when the Visiting Mission was there in 1947 and, while I did not travel with them all the time, I know just how tiring and exhausting a business that was. Of course, in that particular case there was a pressing problem to be solved in a limited time and there was a certain tension which would not necessarily apply in these other Territories.

But, on the other hand, in this case there are three different Administrations to be dealt with which involves making different contacts, dealing with different methods of administration in each case. There is a much greater diversity of peoples -- you have Micronesians, Melanesians and Polynesians to be dealt with; you have an infinite variety of types of organization; and the most pertinent factor of all, I think, is the tremendous distance to be covered, not only between the Territories but inside the Territories.

It is easy to assume that once the Visiting Mission has arrived at a Territory it has arrived conclusively but, in point of fact, I think the travelling inside the Territories will be infinitely greater and infinitely more tiring than the travel between the Territories. I do not want to suggest that this itinerary is physically impossible, but I do suggest that it is physically impossible to cover this amount of ground in that limited time with the conditions prevailing there, both as to climate and methods of transport, and to produce the sort of report which the representative of Mexico mentioned yesterday as being the primary purpose of the visit.

/I think possibly

I think possibly some other members of the Council might support me in that view. It seems to me that on the basis which is proposed here most of the time of the Mission would be spent in travelling rather uncomfortably by airplane from place to place, and if it has any lasting impressions at the end of the Mission, they would quite necessarily be mental impressions I think.

Before we get too much into detail on the question of the itinerary, I wonder whether perhaps some consideration could be given as to whether this is, in fact, a feasible itinerary which will produce a report of the same value as the reports which have been produced by Visiting Missions up to the present time.

Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General): After having heard the observations of various members of the Council, I should like to explain document T/366 which the Council is examining now. This document, prepared by the Secretariat, is in fact not a proposal, nor even a suggestion of the Secretariat as to what should be done with regard to the Visiting Mission to be sent to the Pacific next year. The only purpose of this document is to illustrate the various travel factors involved to facilitate the taking of a decision by the Council.

It is only on the basis of such a decision by the Council that the Secretariat will be able to estimate the cost of the Mission. There are, as you will see from this document, three factors to be considered now:

1. the size or numerical composition of the Mission;
2. the total duration of the visit;
3. the order in which the four Territories concerned are to be visited.

The Council is requested to take a decision at its present session only on these three points. Other points, such as the terms of reference and the detailed work of the Mission, will be elaborated at the next session, but the Secretariat would like to have a decision by the Council on these three points so that it can submit an estimate and have it approved by the next General Assembly.

With regard to the first two points, the composition and duration of the Mission, in the document before you the Secretariat has taken into account the views expressed by members of the Council with regard to Visiting Missions in general, namely, that as many members as possible should be afforded the opportunity of visiting Trust Territories, and that the duration of the Mission to East Africa was too short.

/The Secretariat has

The Secretariat has therefore suggested for the Mission to be sent to the Pacific a larger size and a longer duration than for previous Missions.

As regards point 3, the order in which the four Territories concerned are to be visited, the Secretariat has given an order which it thinks may be considered as best suited and the most economical in view of the location of the Territories to be visited and the travelling facilities available at present.

As regards point 1, the composition of the Mission, I should like to elaborate a little. We have included six members because the Council has expressed the idea that more Council members should go to the Territories. But if the Council decides to send a Mission of four members, then the number of the members of the Secretariat could be reduced from the original eight to six.

/According to our past

According to our past experience of Visiting Missions we consider that six members of the Secretariat are necessary on such Missions if they are to perform their duty.

One of these six members of the Secretariat is a Finance Officer from the Department of Administrative and Financial Services. According to the present practice of the Secretariat every field mission of the United Nations is accompanied by such a Finance Officer. The five other members of the Secretariat would be members of the Trusteeship Department, and we consider that this number of five is absolutely necessary.

As the Council is now aware, in addition to servicing the Mission during its visit, the Secretariat has to make the first draft of the report of the Mission. It must therefore provide not only a staff that can service the Mission on the spot, and therefore knowing the various languages used by the members of the Mission, but must also provide experts on the Territories to be visited, because these experts have to undertake the first drafting of the report after the Mission is completed. As you know there will be four reports because there will be four Territories.

According to rule 25 of the rules of procedure of the Council: "The Secretary-General shall provide and direct the staff required by the Trusteeship Council and such committees, sub-committees and other subsidiary bodies as it may establish." It is therefore the responsibility of the Secretary-General to see that the Missions are properly staffed by members of the Secretariat, and we consider, for the reasons I have just given, that six members of the Secretariat would be an adequate number for a Visiting Mission of four members.

Now as regards point 2, that is to say, the duration of the Mission, what we would like the Council to decide is the total duration of the whole trip, from the day of departure of the Mission until the day of its arrival back to headquarters. Of course within the total length of time the Mission will decide whether it will remain a few days longer in one Territory than was provided for, but what we would like to know is the total duration so as to be able to estimate the cost of the travelling expenses.

As regards the order of visit to the various Territories, perhaps the Mission will decide, when it is on the spot, to change its itinerary. This is not very important but of course any change in the itinerary may involve additional expense, but perhaps the difference / will not be

will not be very great -- we do not know yet how the transportation will be provided. If we have transportation provided by some Administering Authority, free of charge, then of course the Mission will be more free to move about when it is on the spot.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Does any representative wish to make any remarks on this matter? We have already heard a certain number of speakers making very interesting speeches and what we have just heard from the Assistant Secretary-General has clarified the question considerably.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): After listening to the observations of the Assistant Secretary-General I should like to express the support of my delegation for the view that it would be desirable for the Visiting Mission to be composed of as many members of the Council as possible, and that the period of the visit should be extended as long as possible.

It has been indicated in the discussions in this Council -- I think by one representative of an Administering Authority -- that the non-Administering members of the Council would have a different attitude with respect to the Trust Territories if they had had an opportunity to visit them. That remark would perhaps be correct insofar as the annual reports do not adequately reflect conditions in the Trust Territories. It should be observed, however, that the Administering Authorities are the ones responsible for the preparation of the reports and one purpose of the Visiting Mission is precisely to check the annual reports.

Another purpose is to allow the members of the Council to have an opportunity to see conditions at first hand without relying on second-hand information, and yet another possible purpose of the Visiting Mission would be to receive petitions.

My delegation believes that the view that it would be desirable to have as many members of the Council as possible to participate in the Visiting Mission, applies particularly to non-Administering members, because the members of the Council who represent Administering Authorities are presumed to have already an intimate knowledge of the conditions in their respective Trust Territories. And although it would be valuable for members representing Administering Authorities

/ to see conditions

to see conditions in other Territories my delegation would rather think that that should be part of the regular task assigned to the Administering Authorities in the administration of their respective Trust Territories.

One question that I would like to ask in this connexion is whether the Council shall insist on a balanced composition of the Visiting Mission by which there will be an equal number of non-Administering and Administering members.

My delegation believes that the Council should not be governed by a sense of false economy in trying to reduce the number of members of the Visiting Mission to the lowest figure possible, because after all, what is important, as already pointed out by the representative of Mexico, is that the Visiting Mission should see and hear as much as possible and be able to render a good report; and it is the policy of the Trusteeship Council to send only one Visiting Mission a year, and that is not too much.

With respect to the duration of the visit, I should like to take up the observations made by the representative of New Zealand, wherein he indicated the vast distances to be covered and the possible difficulties which may be encountered by the Visiting Mission. From personal experience, having crossed the Pacific several times, I should like to say that even in luxury planes with sleepers, and where the flying time across the Pacific is only thirty-six hours, the trip is a little tiring, and I can imagine that if the trip across the Pacific should be extended for a period of three months it would be still more tiring and possibly physically exhausting. The members of the Mission would, I suppose, not be composed of military men but of civilians who would not be accustomed to long and protracted travel as part of their regular duty. I would not think that they could not put up with the minor inconveniences of travel but I do not think we should tax their physical endurance so much as to incapacitate them for useful work.

/ Therefore I would be

Therefore I would be inclined not to support a further reduction in the length of time estimated by the Secretariat. The special representative of the United States indicated that three weeks instead of thirty days would be sufficient time to cover the Pacific Trust Territories. I should like to point out, however, that if the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is to be covered in the short space of three weeks I wonder if this rapid pace of travel could be sustained for a period three or four times as long.

Visiting missions not only have to see conditions but have to interview the people and I doubt whether the suggested period of twenty-four hours to interview the entire population of the Trust Territory of Nauru suggested by the representative of Belgium would be adequate.

Moreover, the Visiting Mission will also have to hear and investigate complaints and possibly conduct hearings on important complaints and petitions. We also observed that in the case of the Visiting Mission to East Africa, which was in Tanganyika for about six weeks, many of the petitions were left without observations because the Visiting Mission could not make further observations because of lack of time.

Therefore if we limit the period of time during which the Visiting Mission will stay in the Trust Territories in the Pacific it is possible that it may not be able to investigate complaints or conduct hearings, if necessary.

For the foregoing reasons the Philippine delegation would not support any further reductions in the estimate made by the Secretariat.

Of course with respect to the number of the Secretariat staff, inasmuch as the Assistant Secretary-General has already indicated that six is the minimum number consistent with efficiency, we would not be willing to reduce the number further.

Mr. HOOD (Australia): When the special representative of New Guinea and Nauru spoke yesterday on this matter it was largely in response to the suggestion which had been^{made} by the President, I think, initially that there were factors which, apart from the local requirements in the Territories, might necessarily limit the time available for the Mission to be absent from headquarters. The special representative therefore indicated that in his opinion it

/would be possible

would be possible to shorten, at any rate, the duration of the visit to the Territory of New Guinea without any loss to the Mission or loss to the Council. That, of course, the Council will not take in any sense as an indication that the Administering Authority wishes to curtail the duration of the visit. On the contrary, the Administering Authority for New Guinea and Nauru would wish the Mission to take all the time that it considers necessary and will welcome it, however long it wishes to stay.

In a sense, are we not speaking somewhat in the dark? The estimate in the provisional paper prepared by the Secretariat on the duration of the visit to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is forty-four days. I take it, as the Assistant Secretary-General has just said, that it is not meant to be a suggestion but it is an estimate. But the Council I think will find it hard to form a final opinion about the necessary time which should be spent in a Trust Territory for travel without having before it a much more detailed itinerary. The representative of the Philippines has just mentioned, very properly, the necessity of ensuring that every opportunity is given for the presentation of local opinions and petitions and that the Mission should not be deprived at any point of the time necessary to go into every aspect of the administration as far as it is necessary.

A great deal depends on where the Mission goes. Obviously it cannot go to every point, every township and every island in the Trust Territory. It must make a selection of where to go and until the Council has before it an approximate outline of the places in the Territory which might be visited, it will be very difficult -- if not impossible -- to fix a definite time for the duration of the visit.

In the case of New Guinea a schedule has been drawn up, again provisionally, which would enable the Council to form a decision at the proper moment on whether the period of forty days allotted to New Guinea is enough, too much or just right. But until we have the corresponding itinerary, at least for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, it will be difficult to reach any definite conclusion.

Is there in that case any advantage in setting up a small committee in the Council which would, as a preliminary measure, prepare itineraries for all the Territories, giving exact places as suggested points where the Mission might visit?

/Mr. NORIEGA

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

Visiting missions, as far as the colonial history of Latin America is concerned, have a rather picturesque history and background; sometimes it was rather more than picturesque, it was rather a tragic history.

The Spanish Crown decided, when its imperial possessions were so great, to send visiting missions which were somewhat in the nature of delegations from the Kingdom and in those days, approximately three to four hundred years ago, from sudden death to bribery, intrigue and rebellion were regularly the results -- fruitless results, I must say -- of such visits of the visiting missions.

However, fortunately, we are now rather more civilized; we have left that type of situation far behind and I think we may very happily note that what we are discussing here are the possibilities of the duration, the facilities of transportation and so on of this Visiting Mission and not fighting for a place on the Mission.

I want to add a positive factor which might somewhat help the establishment of the schedule of this Visiting Mission including the itinerary of such vast Territories as New Guinea and the Pacific Islands, suggesting the possibility that this Visiting Mission might be divided and that it could simultaneously study the situation in two different parts. This doubtless would help the Mission in its work; it would double the possibility of good results as well as doubling the area which it could cover.

/I do not know

I do know whether the Council is ready to follow the suggestion, but I do think it is a useful one, made by the representative of Australia, who suggests that the schedule be established -- and I understand his point -- not only laying down the general itinerary of the Mission but establishing a schedule to be followed in the Trust Territories.

For example, in regard to the Pacific Islands, without a special committee being established to discuss this matter, the United States delegation could present a suggested itinerary; for its Trust Territory, the Australian delegation could do likewise.

It seems to me that the Mission would carry its work out better. My own delegation would not be able to give ^{comments} detailed/on the suggestions made by the Administering Authorities because we are not very cognisant of the factors involved, the surfaces to be covered and the areas to be considered. But the Council must very carefully consider, when preparing the schedule of the Visiting Mission, the fact that this Mission, whether it be made up of four, six or more members, can nevertheless be divided into two parts. That would definitely help the Mission in the carrying out of its work and probably, at the same time, shorten its duration in the different Territories. That economy of time in the visit to New Guinea or the Pacific Islands would permit the Mission to give more days to the visit to Nauru and Western Samoa.

This is a concrete suggestion.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Does any other representative wish to make any remarks?

We have several suggestions before us and of course they do not all agree. Different suggestions have been made regarding the duration of the Mission; others with regard to the number of members. The representative of Mexico has just asked the Administering Authorities to make suggestions regarding the time necessary to visit the different Territories under their trust.

All these suggestions are no doubt interesting and they will, little by little clarify the situation.

/Mr. RYCKMANS:

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): There is only one point on which I do not agree fully and that is the suggestion to establish an itinerary through the suggestions of the Administering Authorities. If I were asked to establish an itinerary in a familiar territory I would be in the same difficulty as an architect who is asked to build a house without knowing what kind of a house is required. He must always know what kind of a house is required, whether it is a one-bedroom house or an 80-room palace. Therefore, if I were to be asked how much time is needed to study New Guinea I would probably say one year, but if I were asked to establish an itinerary I would have to know how much time I could afford to spend on that visit. In this case, realities must limit the duration of the visit, at the most, to the length of time suggested by the Secretariat. When 110 days are suggested, this means it will be rather difficult for members of the Trusteeship Council who have other duties and have to attend other meetings to be absent for this length of time.

The first question to be established, therefore, is how much time do we have at our disposal? When we know the total time of the visit, we can then say that so much time shall be devoted to one Trust Territory, so much to the others and so on. Then we can ask the Administering Authority to establish an itinerary, bearing in mind a certain period of time.

With regard to asking the United States and Australia how much time is necessary to get an idea about the Territories of the Pacific Islands and New Guinea, the representative of the United States has already stated that the Constitutional Commission was satisfied with three weeks to get a general idea of the Territory, and for New Guinea a month has been mentioned. It would obviously not be possible to visit the whole of New Guinea or all the Pacific Islands, but there would have to be a choice made.

I think that to establish a committee to suggest an itinerary and then decide the length of time would be putting the cart before the horse.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): It seems to me that it must be the function of the Visiting Mission itself, after it has been constituted, to draw up the details of its own itinerary in

/consultation

consultation with the appropriate Administering Authorities. As I understand it, all that the Secretariat needs is a decision on two or three points which will enable it to prepare and submit to the General Assembly a proper estimate of the cost of this Mission.

Regarding the number of days, I am quite content to accept, for estimating purposes, the figure suggested by the Secretariat of 110 days. If it takes less, so much the better, but if the Secretariat considers that that is the approximate number of days that should be provided for, for estimating purposes, I am quite satisfied.

The other point on which the Secretariat wishes a decision is the number of members of the Mission and of the Secretariat and I will make a formal proposal that the number of members should be limited to four and the number of the Secretariat should be limited to six.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The representative of the United Kingdom has brought us back to the point under discussion. If it was thought indispensable to add to our agenda for this meeting the question of the Visiting Mission to the Pacific, it was definitely for budgetary reasons and what must be considered first of all is the establishment of this Visiting Mission and its composition; that is, the number of members and the number of the Secretariat, and the duration of the Mission.

I do not think the Council has to establish the itinerary and the number of days or weeks that will be given to the Mission for travelling, today or at this session. That is not an urgent matter. I think the Mission itself, once it is established, will be able to decide upon its own itinerary after necessary consultation with the Administering Authorities. I think that we cannot wisely or usefully establish an itinerary today. I must remind the Council that last time we discussed a Visiting Mission we did not give it specific orders to go here, there or elsewhere. They themselves decided how they were going to travel and where.

At the same time I consider that the Mission itself would like to know approximately how much time the Council wants to give it and how long it should stay in each of the Territories. But of course those have to be general directives, they cannot be hard and fast orders. We have to leave something to the Visiting Mission.

/Therefore, I think

Therefore I think we ought, at the moment, to confine our discussion to the number of members on the Mission and the number of necessary personnel from the Secretariat; the Assistant Secretary-General has just said that we shall have to leave it to the Secretary-General himself to decide upon the number of people necessary to carry out the secretarial work of the Mission. There are four Territories which have to be considered, and therefore four reports will have to be made. It is a very heavy piece of work.

The Assistant Secretary-General is quite right when he says that besides the Finance Officer who will have to go with the Mission, at least five members of the Secretariat will have to go. They will have a very onerous task. Do not forget that they, too, will travel, and they, too, will be tired from the travel, as the representative of the Philippines has pointed out.

I therefore think that we could safely leave this to the Secretary-General, who has had experience in these matters.

Regarding the number of members of the Council to take part in the Mission, the Secretariat has suggested 6, because of the expanse of the Territories to be visited. But certain members of the Council have mentioned the fact that we should follow the generally adopted custom, and have only 4 members of the Council, and that that should suffice.

I think the Council can very speedily solve this problem, and therefore I should like to ask the Council whether it prefers just 4 members. If 4 members is all right then we can adopt that without having to proceed to a vote. Let us therefore discuss that item alone, for the moment.

We have heard the opinions of a number of members on this subject, but in order not to waste so much time, I should like to put this precise question. Does the Council agree to sending 4 of its members on this Visiting Mission?

The number of personnel of the staff will, as I said, be left to the judgment of the Secretariat itself.

/Mr. SOLDATOV

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): I should like to ask that the proposal introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom be put to a formal vote.

Mr. LIU (China): I was going to suggest the same thing, and ask for a vote.

Mr. LAKING (New Zealand): On a point of clarification, I understood the representative of Mexico in his remarks to make a formal suggestion that the Mission might be divided into two parts. If that is so I think it would have some bearing on the number of people that it might be necessary to include in the Mission, but I am not quite clear as to whether the representative of Mexico did in fact intend to put that up as a formal proposal or not.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The representative of Mexico is not here at the moment.

If there is a formal proposal on behalf of the representative of Mexico then we must definitely decide on the previous question, and that is, whether all the members of the Visiting Mission will visit the four Territories, or whether the Mission will divide into two parts, or more.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): It seems to me that this question has nothing to do with the number of members of the Mission. If we take the possibility that there may be a division of the Mission, this would be one more reason to vote for 4 members, for you can divide ^{ide} 4 into 2, and 6 can be divided by two, but you cannot divide 3 members by 2.

Therefore, if we have for example 4 members, we can have equal representation of Administering and Non-Administering Powers, while if we have 6 and then we divide it, we shall have two Administering and one Administering Power or the other way around. Therefore, I support the proposal that the number should be such that it could be divided into two, and I suggest that the number be four.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The representative of Mexico was absent when this question was brought up; that is, the question of whether or not he made a formal proposal regarding the dividing of the Mission, if it were deemed necessary.

/The representative

The representative of Belgium has just said that it could be decided by the Mission itself, but if it is to be divided into two parts, each to visit two Territories, then that would be one more reason for the 4 member proposal to be adopted. As the representative of Belgium said, 4 can be divided by 2, and each of the two parts could visit two of the Territories.

We shall now proceed to a vote. Those who are in favour of 4 members for the Mission, please raise their hands.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The United Kingdom proposal was adopted by 8 votes to none with 4 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Regarding the staff, the Assistant Secretary-General has said that the minimum number should be six members of the Secretariat, but as I said before, I think we can leave it to the wisdom of the Secretary-General to decide upon that.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I merely want to ask the Assistant Secretary-General what would be the duties of six members of the Secretariat.

I remember when we went out to Western Samoa we had a Secretariat of three, and I should like to ask for information as to the duties of the Secretariat. Would it not depend somewhat on the language question? If, perhaps, someone serves on the Mission who speaks only Spanish, that would presumably require a Spanish translator, but if the work could be carried on, let us say, in English, in some of the Missions, would it require six? I should like to have a little more of the ideas of the Secretariat on the number.

Dr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General): In Western Samoa we were five, not three. There was one temporary member, so the Secretariat for the Western Samoan Mission was five, and we had no Finance Officer. At that time the principal secretary was also the finance officer, as a result of which he had to pay many ^{expenses} out of his own pocket. The rules are that if the Bureau of Finance does not agree with your expenditure, you have to pay yourself, and since he was not a member of the Bureau of Finance he had many frictions on account of that.

/Therefore, ever

Therefore, ever since, all the Missions of the United Nations have had their own Finance Officers. So we should need a Finance Officer, which makes one more member.

Then there are four Territories, and as you know we have various experts and specialists in the department, and it is not the same ones who deal with all four. It is, I think, also in the interests of the Council that the members of the Secretariat should be given the opportunity of visiting those Territories on which they have to write ^{papers} for the Council. Members of the Council may change, but members of the Secretariat remain more permanently in the Organization, and I think it is in the interests of all that those experts in the Secretariat might have an opportunity of seeing the Territories about which they have to write.

Apart from this consideration of a more general nature, the members of the Secretariat have, as you know, to do all sorts of work, when the Mission is on a visit. They have to take down notes, and there will probably be petitioners who will want to present their petitions orally to the Mission, and the Secretariat has to deal with them. They also have to draft many reports and papers. It happened in the past that some members undertook to draft some papers, but two days later they still asked the members of the Secretariat to draft them. So you have to provide for that also.

/And, thirdly

And thirdly, as Mr. Sayre has said, it would also depend on the languages used by the members of the Mission. Since the Mission will be composed of various members of the Trusteeship Council who do not have the same languages in common, it is probable that more than one language will be used; perhaps three languages will be used by the Mission and the United Nations has no right to exclude any language if it is an official language. Language experts are not always experts on colonial matters. It might be difficult to find experts on the Trust Territories who speak all the languages required.

By saying that we need six people, I do not say that we shall necessarily send six people but we should like to have the possibility of sending six if we find it necessary.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): The Assistant Secretary-General, by his concluding remarks, has answered what was in my mind. As I understand it, this is a consideration for budgetary purposes. We need a sufficient budgetary allowance to take care of six members of the Secretariat provided we need them. We do not know yet whether we shall need them; that will depend on the language and other factors and will be a matter for determination later on. Do I understand that correctly?

Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General): The Secretary-General will determine, when the time comes, how many members of the Secretariat will be needed. However, I should like to reserve the right to send six members. It is for the Secretary-General to determine how many members of the Secretariat are needed for a particular mission, but he can promise to send no more than six.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I moved that the membership of the Mission should be limited to four, and the members of the Secretariat should be limited to six, basing the number of six on the statement made yesterday by the Assistant Secretary-General that if the number of the members of the Mission is reduced, the membership of the Secretariat could also be reduced. My motion is that the number of members of the Secretariat should not exceed six, which, I take it, is all that is wanted.

From what the President said, I wonder ^{whether} this is a matter which is entirely in the hands of the Secretary-General, or whether the Council has some control in a matter of this sort.

/Mr. KHALIDY

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I hope we shall not spend another half hour determining whether we are going to have six, eight or four members on this Mission. To my mind, this is surely a question which should be more or less left to the Secretariat. However, I am prepared to vote in favour of the proposal made by the representative of the United Kingdom.

I believe that this question is not entirely within the province of this Council, but it is within the province of the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly. It is the Fifth Committee from which the funds will be asked and the Fifth Committee will have to ask the Secretariat to convince them whether eight, six or four members of the Secretariat are necessary. Therefore, if we should decide here that there should be a maximum of six, we should be on safe ground.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I think that the Council can decide on this matter immediately. I think the Council can decide that a staff of six members of the Secretariat will be sufficient. Following the statement of the Assistant Secretary-General, I think we can follow that idea.

Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General): I think it was Sir Alan who asked the question as to whether it was for the Council to decide on the number of the members of the Secretariat.

In all the organs of the United Nations, it is the prerogative of the Secretary-General -- and also his duty -- to provide the staff to service that body, that organ, that commission or that visiting mission. To my knowledge, no other organ or body of the United Nations has wished to limit or fix the number of the members of the Secretariat servicing a body or a mission. Therefore, in my statement today, I expressed the views of the Secretary-General and I am giving information concerning the present practice. I do not think that the Secretary-General would consider that the bodies of the United Nations have to fix the number of the members of the Secretariat.

It is for the General Assembly, of course, to decide on the budget, but the question as to how many of the Secretariat are to service any particular body, I think it is for the Secretary-General to decide.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I think that I must interpret the statement of the Assistant Secretary-General as follows:

The Secretary-General decides upon the needs of the Secretariat, and therefore he will be asked to service the visiting missions and he will present an estimate which must definitely be approved by the Council of

the United Nations affected or concerned. In this present case it is the Trusteeship Council which must make the request in order to obtain the necessary funds to cover the expenses of a visiting mission.

Therefore, I consider that the Council agrees in giving the Secretary-General the opportunity to decide on how many members/^{of}the Secretariat are necessary for the Mission. But it is the Trusteeship Council which is responsible for asking for the money necessary from the budget of the United Nations.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium)(Interpretation from French): I do not think that this is the interpretation given by the Secretariat. The Council decides on a mission and asks the Secretary-General to supply the necessary personnel to service this mission. The Secretary-General then decides on the number of Secretariat members which he considers necessary to accomplish the task of the Mission. I think it is the Secretary-General, not the Council, which will ask the Fifth Committee for credit.

The Secretary-General, when he establishes the number necessary, will take into consideration the facts as to whether the Secretariat will be requested to prepare the draft report, or whether the draft report will be prepared by the members of the Mission, in which case it would be necessary to send only stenographers and no specialists on draft reports would be necessary. But if the Trusteeship Council requests the Secretary-General to send someone who can prepare such draft reports, then the Secretary-General will send such a person.

To this extent the Council is master of the situation, but only to this extent. For example, the Mission may decide to prepare the report itself and it will therefore need only stenographers from the Secretariat.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Under these circumstances, we shall not consider the number of staff to accompany the Mission because the Mission has not as yet been decided upon; it does not, as yet, exist. No one can say today whether the future members of the Mission which we are planning will wish to prepare the report themselves, or whether they will leave that task to the Secretariat.

/Therefore

Therefore I think that, first of all, we shall have to decide that no solution can be taken on that matter at the moment, but we should determine the composition of the Mission.

The Council has decided that there will be four members in this Mission. Therefore, following the usage adopted here, the Council must first decide on the countries that will be asked to nominate candidates to go on this Mission, people who can take part in the work of the Mission and who will be personally and individually acceptable to the Council.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): This question is not on the agenda, nor is it urgent. It appears that the only question on which the Secretariat wants a decision from us is the duration of the Mission's visit, with some indication as to the period to be spent in each Territory and the order in which they will be visited: whether the Mission will first go to New Guinea, or to Samoa first and then to the Pacific Islands and New Guinea. But the question of the membership of the Mission is not urgent and can be decided later.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): If the representative of Belgium is suggesting leaving this matter until our next session, I would remind him that the Mission has to leave at the end of March or the beginning of April, and that its members must have time to prepare and brief themselves. The Council knows how long it took us to prepare the special Mission which went to Samoa, and I should like to point out that this time we have an additional difficulty in that the Mission will probably last at least three months and may have to leave before the end of the first session of next year, not returning before 15 June.

It will therefore be difficult for certain members of the Council to take part in that Mission: they will have to find alternates to take their place at the beginning of the second session of the Council next year. I do not, therefore, think it would be very wise to wait until our next session to decide on the composition of this Visiting Mission; we should decide now not only upon the number of members, but also on who is going to take part in the Mission.

Of course, that is only a suggestion; if the Council has a different attitude I am very willing to listen to it.

/Mr. KHALIDY

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I am not going to suggest any decisive action to be taken now, but before the President spoke I asked for the floor to say that perhaps those members who have not yet been on a Mission could tell us what their stand is on that particular point now. There are certain members -- four, I believe -- of the Council who have not yet gone on a Mission. It is probable that they would be going this time -- though this is, of course, ultimately in the hands of the Council. Would these members like to pronounce an opinion on that subject now?

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I should also like to hear the views of these members. The members of the Council who have not taken part in a Visiting Mission -- the special Mission to Samoa was considered as a Visiting Mission -- are the United Kingdom, New Zealand, the Soviet Union and the Philippines. Those are the four countries. New Zealand, however, is an Administering Authority and therefore excluded, leaving only three countries that have not yet taken part in Visiting Missions: the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and the Philippines.

Those three countries would, I suppose, be the first to ask to go on this Visiting Mission. The representative of Iraq has requested the members who have not taken part in a Visiting Mission to be good enough to give their points of view; I am more than interested to hear these.

Let us start at the end of the table: does the representative of the Philippine have any observations to make?

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): We consider the sending out of Visiting Missions to be one of the most important functions of the Trusteeship Council. I have consulted the head of my delegation, and he has made it clear that if the Philippines is nominated as a member of this Visiting Mission, we shall accept.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Now I should like to ask the representative of the Soviet Union the same question.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (Interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation will not find it possible to take part in the Visiting Mission.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I am in the same position as the representative of the Philippines: if the United Kingdom is
/asked to

asked to nominate a representative to go on the Visiting Mission, it will be pleased to do so.

Mr. LAKING (New Zealand): I should just like to make an observation on this question. I am not really in a position to speak on behalf of the New Zealand delegation, being only an alternate representative on the Council, and possibly our representative's own views will be available tomorrow, but the President mentioned the fact that New Zealand would be excluded by virtue of being an Administering Authority. Certainly, I should not think that any Government would want to report on its own Territory or ask to do so. On the other hand, if the Mission is so constituted that it is divided into two sections, it would not necessarily follow that all the Administering Authorities would be excluded -- that is to say, New Zealand, the United States or Australia.

I mention this point solely because it may be that Sir Carl Berendsen will want to express some views on the question tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The same question again crops up: is this Visiting Mission to be divided into two parts or not? I should like to hear the opinions of the Council.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): I agree that the Visiting Mission could be divided into two groups of two each: for example, two members of the Mission could go to Ponape, while ^{the} two other members could at the same time go to the island of Truk. However, I do not agree that two members of the Mission should go to the Pacific Islands while the two other members go to New Guinea, because that is not the same thing.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I do not think we ought to pronounce judgment on this issue here at all. It is not for the Council to decide whether the Mission should divide or not; this must be left entirely to the Mission itself.

The difficulty of New Zealand is well understood, and I believe that if New Zealand were included in the Mission and if the Mission decided to divide eventually, ^{the} New Zealand ^{representative} would not be sent to Samoa; he would be sent to another Pacific Territory. We really cannot divide the Mission here.

/Mr. NORIEGA

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): When, a little while ago, my delegation proposed the possibility of dividing this Mission, we did not mean that the Mission should be so divided as to become two separate Missions. What I intended to suggest -- and if it would facilitate the work of the Council, I am very ready to present this as a formal proposal -- was that the Mission should divide itself in each Territory.

I understand the scruples expressed by the representative of Iraq when he said that this should obviously be left to the Mission itself to decide, but we must recognize the fact that we are faced with a practical problem: the number of days that can be allowed this Mission to carry out its work in each of the Territories.

If at this moment the Council and the Administering Authorities agreed that an itinerary should be drawn up, and if this itinerary were to be considered, bearing in mind the fact that simultaneously in the same Territory two different parts could be visited, it would definitely have a great influence on the preparation of the plans for the Visiting Mission. We could calculate that about half the time -- or at least one third of the time -- would be economized by adopting the system of dividing the Mission into two groups in, for example, New Guinea and the Pacific Islands.

/Regarding

Regarding New Zealand's taking part in this Mission which I consider very desirable because we should take advantage of the experience of that country since it is very cognizant of the problems in the Pacific, I do not think there would be any disadvantage in the Government of New Zealand taking part in this Visiting Mission to the Pacific Islands and New Guinea.

In regard to the visit to Western Samoa, perhaps the delegation of New Zealand could be substituted for by another representative. I think it would be very desirable for the Council to have New Zealand take part in this Visiting Mission. New Zealand has had great experience and has great knowledge garnered from this part of the world and we should take advantage of that experience. I do not see any problem involved. At least one part of the work could be done together with the delegation of New Zealand and then it could be replaced later for the visit to Western Samoa.

Mr. LAURENTIE (France) (Interpretation from French): I should merely like to state, as the representatives of Mexico and Iraq have stated, that New Zealand should take part in this Mission. The Mission could be composed of only three members to visit Western Samoa, but in regard to the other Territories New Zealand could take part. New Zealand has definitely presented itself as a possible candidate.

The Mission itself is not being discussed at the moment. In the interior of each of the Territories the Mission could divide itself. We had a precedent established by last year's Mission when all four members were not present at all places visited in Ruanda-Urundi or Tanganyika. Certain members visited various parts of these Territories and made investigations at certain points, but it was always understood -- and this has never been the cause of any doubt in the Council -- that the responsibility was shared equally by all four members. Members who are detached from a Mission for a certain length of time to do certain work report the findings of their investigation to the Mission, so that there is one report on behalf of the entire Mission, and no minority report.

If any members of the Visiting Mission are detached en route for a short length of time, I do not think there would be any division of the Mission itself. Under these conditions, I think the Visiting Mission will be able to work perfectly well and it is probably that it can divide itself up in the Territories if it is deemed fit.

/Mr. LAKING

Mr. LAKING (New Zealand): I just wish to express my appreciation to the three representatives who spoke about the possibility of New Zealand's inclusion in the Visiting Mission. I am not in a position at this moment to express the views of either the head of my delegation or the New Zealand Government as to whether New Zealand would wish to be included and, if so, whether we would be able to make someone available.

Subject to what the President may say, I should like to suggest that possibly a decision might be deferred until tomorrow when the views of the head of my delegation would be available.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We shall postpone the decision on this matter. While awaiting the statement of the representative of New Zealand, I think the Council will agree that the United Kingdom and, in principle, New Zealand on the one hand as Administering Authorities will be members of the Mission and, on the other hand, the Philippines. I thought that the representative of the USSR would accept on behalf of his Government to take part in the Visiting Mission, but after his statement excluding himself as a candidate, I have to find a fourth member.

Due to the system of rotation which we have followed, the fourth member should be one presented by the Chinese representative. In regard to the Mission to East Africa, Mexico and Iraq presented their candidates so, by the system of rotation, the choice now falls to China. That is the only possibility open to me.

I should like the representative of China to tell us whether his Government would accept the presentation of a candidate to the Council.

Mr. LIU (China): Since this subject has just been presented to me, I am not prepared to give an answer at this time. I shall think it over and perhaps consult with my Government, if necessary, before giving an answer.

Mr. KHALIDY (Iraq): I should just ^{like} to remind the President that next year there will be two new members in the Council. Perhaps one of those two would accept membership in the Visiting Mission if no one can be found at this time.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): There will not be time enough to wait until then. As I said before, the Mission will have to leave, at the latest, at the beginning of April. That is our difficulty. If the Visiting Mission could wait until then, we would be able to make a choice as suggested by the representative of Iraq.

/We are awaiting

We are awaiting replies from New Zealand and China and, subject to those replies, those are the four countries presented as candidates which will be acceptable to the Council.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium)(Interpretation from French): The President assumes that participation in a visiting mission means a nomination should be made by a country. Why?

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We cannot name the representative here.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium)(Interpretation from French): But we can ask a certain number of countries to participate in the mission.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): That was what was done. There is still one point to be decided and that is the duration of the visit. We have heard certain interesting comments on that point and, for reasons of a budgetary nature which have been stated here, we would definitely have to establish a maximum duration for the visit.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): I should like to find out the following: As of the present time, we have a situation which means that three Trust Territories will be visited by four members of the Mission and one Territory will be visited by only three members. Does that mean that four members of the Mission will visit Samoa but that New Zealand will be replaced by someone else? I should like to find out exactly what the situation is before expressing my views.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): That is one point which had occurred to me as well.

/Obviously if the

Obviously if the Mission that is going to visit Western Samoa is to be made up of four members then we will have to find a fourth member, because New Zealand cannot take part. Therefore we will have to designate a fifth member of the Mission and that will definitely have financial implications.

If you have one Mission of four members that will visit all the Territories then there will of course be no difficulties. But if you have four members of whom one cannot visit one of the Territories then you have to decide either to have a three-man Mission in Western Samoa and a four-man Mission visiting the other Territories, or else you have to have a special member designated for Western Samoa.

But then we have to consider the financial implications of a trip of five members of the Council.

481 .V. 9\T

50\TET

Mr. LAKING (New Zealand): The question that has been raised by the representative of the Soviet Union remains a purely hypothetical one until the prior question is determined as to whether or not New Zealand would wish to be considered for inclusion in the Mission this year. So I wonder whether we could not perhaps defer consideration of it. There is little point in designating a fifth member if it turns out in the way I have suggested.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (Interpretation from French): It is not exactly this way that I understand this question. In my view, the Council, in taking into consideration all the circumstances and the number of members of the Council who participated in Missions and who did not, ^{should} request certain governments to participate in particular Missions. For example, with regard to New Zealand and Australia, in the given conditions, and with regard to the United States, for example, New Zealand, Australia and the United States are in such a situation that they have a perfect right to tell us that they would prefer not to participate in this Mission, for if Australia, for example, had to step out with regard to one Territory and New Zealand had to step out with regard to another, and the United States with regard to a third, in regard to Territories under Australian Administration the Visiting Mission would consist of only one member representing the Administering Authorities and two members representing non-Administering Authorities.

/ Therefore one has

Therefore one has to free the countries concerned from service on Missions this year.

Next year and the year after there will be Missions in which there will be no obstacles in the way of the participation of Australia, New Zealand and the United States, and it would be preferable to send the representatives of these countries to regions where no such difficulties will arise, for example, to East Africa.

If you apply this system it will mean that Belgium, for example, would abstain on Ruanda-Urundi but would go to other Territories, and you will have Missions consisting of six members. I do not think this is a practical approach and I think the Trusteeship Council should request certain governments to participate in such Missions. If these governments are of the opinion that they cannot participate for some reason, then the Council will take another decision. But a government should not be asked to participate in only part of a Mission, unless the government concerned says that for its part there is no objection.

If the representative of New Zealand will tell us that his Government does not object to a Mission going to Western Samoa consisting of only three members, then New Zealand could participate. But I would not be in favour of accepting a situation in which a government which is to participate in a Mission has to be replaced for one part of the Mission. If there is no replacement it means that there is unequal distribution.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I do not think we need continue this discussion to-day. We can take it up again to-morrow or on Monday when we will have more facts and the last opinions before us.

We still have to decide on the duration of the Mission. Is the Council ready to accept as the maximum duration the 110 days suggested in the memorandum of the Secretary-General? It is of course understood that this will be a very general and elastic framework and the duration of the Mission will be made shorter if possible, but the maximum will be 110 days. This is so as to enable the Secretariat to arrange the matter along financial lines and to know exactly where it stands.

/ If there are

If there are no definite objections from the Council we will accept as the maximum -- and I want to emphasise maximum -- duration of the Mission 110 days. If there are no objections then that proposal will be adopted.

Then it is adopted as a maximum duration.

We will now have a recess of fifteen minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 4.07 p.m. and reconvened at 4.36 p.m.

REPORTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS MISSION TO EAST AFRICA (T/217, T/217/Corr.1, T/217/Corr.2, T/217/Add.1, T/217/Add.1/Corr.1, T/218, T/218/Corr.1, T/218/Add.1, T/333, T/350, T/351, T/352, T/353, T/361, T/361/Add.1, T/364).

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): We now come to the consideration of the second point on our agenda, the Reports of the United Nations Mission to East Africa. We know that great attention was given to these reports at our last session and the discussion was adjourned until today to prepare a report for presentation to the General Assembly on East Africa as well as certain connected items which had been reserved and postponed.

We were also awaiting observations which had been promised to us by the representatives of the United Kingdom and Belgium. If they wish to make remarks on any specific points we will be more than ready to listen to them if they desire it.

I think that after the very long examination which was given these reports we ought to be able to cover this item on our agenda very speedily and that might permit us -- if the debate is brief -- to catch up with the time we have lost in our previous discussions in the Council, because we are rather in arrears as far as time is concerned. I think the representative of Mexico wished to make certain remarks on this subject and I call upon him to do so.

Mr. NORIEGA (Interpretation from Spanish): First of all, the Mexican delegation would like to express once again -- because we said this before -- our greatest appreciation for the work carried out by the Visiting Mission and especially its Chairman, Mr. Laurentie of France and the other members of the Mission, the representatives of Australia, Costa Rica and China.

The Council will no doubt recall that the position of my delegation regarding the reports of visiting missions has been consistently maintained in that we wished to keep those reports in their entirety. These reports should not, we think, be subject to approval or rejection by the Council, and we have maintained this point of view because we consider that if the conclusions and recommendations of a visiting mission were put to the vote in the Trusteeship Council, the mission would obviously be rather chary and might not wish to put the entire facts before the Council. They might be rather afraid of doing so.

/If, as has been

If, as has been understood, the task of the Visiting Mission is to examine and investigate the situation obtaining in each and every Territory it visits, and to present to the Council the knowledge it has garnered from this task, then we shall find that what is happening is that we are carrying out a technical piece of work, and that is all. On questions of a technical nature, I do not quite understand, when it is a matter of information or data, that this information or data, or these observations, can be subject to a vote. We do not vote on facts.

As far as recommendations are concerned, my delegation has understood that these recommendations should be maintained as living material for reference in the examination of the report on the Territories that have been visited by the Missions. I think that the proof of the work of a visiting mission is very valuable because it permits us to have information which has been gathered on the spot.

Regarding this report that we are now considering, we have the situation that one of the Administering Authorities has submitted certain observations regarding the report. As the Council is well aware, the remarks made by the Administering Authority, on certain items at least, indicate that it diverges from the point of view expressed by the Visiting Mission. It does not quite agree on all points. But I do not think that the Council can at this moment consider itself competent to decide on one attitude or another; that is to say, to decide between the observations of the Visiting Mission and the counter-observations of the Administering Authority.

My delegation is therefore of ^{the} opinion that we ought to maintain intact the freedom of action of the report presented by the Visiting Mission, and also, of course, keep the document presented by the Administering Authority with its observations, so that when the Council considers the next report -- in this case, the next report on Tanganyika -- it would have both documents for reference when it considers the annual report presented by the ^{Administering} Authority on that Territory.

Therefore, my delegation will present to the Council a draft resolution which follows these general lines, that I have placed before you now. Perhaps, in order to facilitate the work of the Trusteeship Council, it would be best for the Secretary to read the draft resolution which has been prepared. I would ask the President to be good enough to have him do so. I do not think I need say that,

/if this resolution

if this resolution were to be adopted, the Council would be able to save a great deal of time and obviate a great many difficulties which will definitely slow down the work of the Council. I think that time is^{of}/the essence, in this case. The Council should be able to take full advantage of the time before it and also catch up with the time lost previously on other subjects. That would permit us sufficient time at the end to consider the reports that the Council has asked its Sub-Committees to prepare, and which it will finally present to the General Assembly.

Finally, I should like to add that it might be appropriate, in making reference to future work of the Council, that we should also take into consideration the memorandum presented by the delegation of Costa Rica on this same subject of the different opinions on the report on the Trust Territory of Tanganyika. If necessary, that could be added to the last paragraph of the text of the draft resolution I have just presented.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I will ask Mr, Aleksander, Secretary of the Trusteeship Council, to read the draft resolution presented by the delegation of Mexico.

Mr. ALEKSANDER (Secretary of the Trusteeship Council):

"THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

"TAKES NOTE OF the report of its Visiting Mission of 1948 to Ruanda-Urundi and Tanganyika and the observations submitted thereon by the Administering Authorities concerned,

"EXPRESSES its appreciation of the work accomplished by the Visiting Mission on its behalf,

"TAKES NOTE OF the conclusions and recommendations formulated by the Visiting Mission and included in its report, and

"DECIDES that, in formulating its own conclusions and recommendations in the course of its examination of future annual reports from or of questions relating to the Trust Territories concerned, the observations, conclusions and recommendations of its Visiting Mission and the observations of the Administering Authorities concerned shall be taken into account."

Mr. LORIA (Costa Rica): My delegation would like to say a few words about document T/364, which is a memorandum transmitted by the delegation of Costa Rica, containing certain comments on the observations of the United Kingdom Government on the report of the
/Visiting Mission

Visiting Mission to Tanganyika.

My delegation greatly appreciated the honour and obligation involved when the Trusteeship Council appointed a Costa Rican, Mr. R. Woodbridge, to its first Visiting Mission, and it is hoped that his work contributed in some small measure to the very interesting and invaluable report that this Mission has placed before the Trusteeship Council. It is a matter of considerable regret that Mr. Woodbridge could not be present here to participate in the Council's discussion of this report.

My delegation has been strongly impressed by a statement in the Trusteeship Council, particularly by the representative of New Zealand, Sir Carl Berendsen, that the experience of members of visiting missions should not be lost to the Council.

With this point in mind, my Government has requested Mr. Woodbridge to present his comments in writing. It is in the hope that this document will help to clarify some matters raised by the reply of the United Kingdom Government, and that it will facilitate the consideration by the Council of the Visiting Mission's report, that my delegation has submitted this memorandum to the Council.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): The members of the Council have noted with great interest the document which has been referred to by the representative of Costa Rica. It is a document which, together with the document of the United Kingdom, completes the matter on Tanganyika, and I think that the Council will definitely have enough information to consider the question and speak on it later.

(Belgium)
Mr. RYCKMANS/(Interpretation from French): Before I speak definitely with regard to the text of the proposal introduced by the representative of Mexico, I should like to say that in general I agree with the idea which is the basis of this proposal. This was always my attitude and when the question arose in the Trusteeship Council of considering, point by point, the report on Western Samoa, for example, I said that this report was written and that the Council could not change anything in it. We prepared a report and presented in that report all that we could judge, and what we considered to be the truth. Our report is presented, and whatever consideration may take place in the Council would not change anything in it.

/I could speak

I could speak with regard to Ruanda-Urundi, for I know the Territory personally, and spent many years there. But with regard to the Territory of Tanganyika, it would be impossible for me to judge to what extent the Visiting Mission correctly appreciated the situation, and only those who participated in the Mission can come to conclusions. All that we can do, as is done in the Mexican proposal, is to thank the members of the Mission and take it into consideration.

At first glance it seems to me that something should be added to this. The proposal is an indication to the Governments concerned to take into consideration the observations of the Mission. Where my Government is concerned, it proved, in presenting the first annual report after the Visiting Mission, that it took into consideration the remarks of the Visiting Mission with regard to many of these aspects.

The Government of Belgium has already taken measures on many questions. Important measures are still to be taken, and in some aspects they could not agree.

/But in any case

But in any case, the Government certainly paid all the necessary attention to this report and it will in the future also pay the greatest attention to these observations. I shall not, therefore, add anything to the Mexican proposal at present.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I am convinced that the governments concerned will take into consideration the reports of the Visiting Mission, that those reports were given very careful consideration and that the observations and conclusions which were given by the visiting mission will always give practical results of a useful nature. I think that the justification can be found on the level of reality, and although the conclusions/are sometimes brief, it is because ^{of the visiting missions} they have lacked time. But for the governments concerned there will always be something to ponder upon and something from which to take useful decisions.

I should like to hear . . . remarks from the members of the Council before we distribute the draft resolution of the representative of Mexico. This resolution was presented this evening, and therefore if the Council is willing to consider it immediately, we can do so. We should therefore gain a few hours of time.

Mr. SAYRE (United States of America): I wish to express my appreciation to the representative of Mexico for the initiative he has taken in bringing this resolution before us. It seems to me to be framed along sound lines.

My understanding of the purposes and functions of visiting missions is that they should go out to given territories to be the eyes and ears of the Council. I think that we must rely on them for information more than anything else. We wish to know, at first hand, what is going on. They may see fit to make their recommendations but I do not see that the Trusteeship Council, as such -- as has been brought out by Mr. Noriega -- can approve or disapprove of the great majority of the visiting missions' recommendations. We do not know the facts. The recommendations of the visiting missions are based on their own conclusions. I think we should, however, utilize the mass of information which comes through the visiting missions for reaching or determinations from year to year with respect to our recommendations on annual reports, with respect to our disposition of petitions, with respect to the many other questions which we decide upon. In other words, I feel, as does Mr. Noriega, that we should utilize this information of the visiting missions, that we should pour it into our

reservoir of knowledge of the conditions of the various Territories, but I do not feel that we should necessarily approve or disapprove of each specific recommendation. It seems to me that that would serve no very useful purpose.

It is along that line that I understand this resolution to be framed. It seems to me to be a very sound line to take, and I, for one, would be glad to support a resolution such as the one which has been introduced by Mr. Noriega.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): Are there any objections to having the draft resolution which was read to you voted upon this evening?

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): Inasmuch as the resolution presented by the representative of Mexico was presented at so late an hour, my delegation will not be in a position to express its final views on the resolution until it has a copy of the draft resolution before it and has had enough time to study the matter. I would therefore invoke the rules of procedure and ask that the vote on this matter be taken at the next meeting.

At the same time, I should like to make a few observations with respect to the attitude which the Council should take on a report of a visiting mission. My delegation regards the report of a visiting mission as valuable only in so far as it presents facts before this Council. The conclusions reached by the visiting mission are not considered by us to be of great value unless they are supported by the facts contained in the report. From the facts contained in the report, the Trusteeship Council may arrive at a conclusion which is different from that of the visiting mission. I would have the Council reserve for itself the power to reach its own conclusions on any report of any visiting mission, because, as I have said, the report of a visiting mission would be valuable only in so far as it presents facts before this Council.

However, with respect to the facts contained in the report of the visiting mission, I agree entirely with the representative of Mexico that there is nothing which the Council can do either to approve or disapprove the facts, because they are questions of facts. I am, however, concerned with the disposition which the Council makes with respect to the recommendations of the visiting mission and perhaps with the conclusions and observations of the visiting mission.

Pending a study, therefore, of all the implications of the draft resolution presented by the representative of Mexico, my delegation feels that this Council should not, at least at this time, take a vote on the matter until it has been fully discussed.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I can very well understand the scruples of the representative of the Philippines and I trust that once this text has been distributed and the representatives have given it due reading, they will see the scope of that document. Then perhaps all the representatives will be able to understand it and the representative of the Philippines will be in a position to withdraw his motion to put off the vote until tomorrow.

I think that we should consider the fact that we have a possibility before us to finish with a matter which is, I think, crystal-clear in the minds of the members of the Council.

/On the

On the other hand, my delegation is ready to accept the suggestion made by the representative of Belgium, according to which the Council would recommend to the Administering Authority that it take into consideration the observations of the Visiting Mission. I think this suggestion is valid and very valuable, because it takes into consideration the statement made by the representative of the Philippines a few moments ago.

Therefore, I should like formally to submit to the Council two amendments to the text that is just being distributed to members of the Council. One is that among the documents that will be taken into consideration -- and I refer to the last paragraph -- we should include the observations of the delegation of Costa Rica, document T/364, and include also a final paragraph saying that the Trusteeship Council:

"RECOMMENDS to the Administering Authority that it take into consideration the recommendations made by the Visiting Mission."

This, I think, would satisfy the representative of Belgium. It is a suggestion which I consider to be both feasible and tenable, and one which I believe would also be acceptable to the delegation of the United Kingdom.

Mr. LAURENTIE (France) (Interpretation from French): I merely wish to make a very brief statement regarding the statement just made by the representative of Mexico.

I wholeheartedly agree with what he has just said, but there is, first of all, a question of form to be taken into consideration. This question of form will not permit the Council to follow one of the suggestions put forward.

The memorandum presented by the delegation of Costa Rica is a very interesting one, and as far as I personally am concerned, I state quite clearly that I consider it acceptable from the point of view of the omission made last year. Nevertheless, I hardly feel that it is up to one member of a Council to reply as an individual to the statements made by the representative of another country, and I do not think that the Council can take into consideration the reflections on the points of view expressed by a member who took part in a Visiting Mission last year. This Mission does not exist today; when it handed its report to the Council, it no longer existed itself.

/Each of the

Each of the members of the Mission can, of course, present his opinion and it is very useful that they should do so, but the Visiting Mission does not exist any more. I think, as I said before, that the document of the delegation of Costa Rica is very interesting and very useful, but we must not confuse the issue: the individuals who made up a Visiting Mission must not be confused with the Mission itself; they are two completely different things.

I think, therefore, that it might give rise to a misinterpretation and misunderstanding were we to adopt the two last suggestions made by the representative of Mexico. I do wish to share the attitude of the Council regarding the memorandum of the delegation of Costa Rica, but I do, at the same time, feel that the Council must definitely stick to the recommendations and observations made in the report of the Visiting Mission.

I should also like to point out that, in fact, this report does not make recommendations; it contains only the conclusions at which the Visiting Mission arrived. The Trusteeship Council can make recommendations on those matters, and I think, therefore, that it might be better to call these conclusions rather than recommendations. In the draft resolution, we might say that the Trusteeship Council:

... "TAKES NOTE of the conclusions formulated by the Visiting Mission", rather than the "conclusions and recommendations" because there are no recommendations.

Mr. NORIEGA (Mexico) (Interpretation from Spanish): I recognize that the statement made by the representative of France is a very just observation and very much to the point, and if we must adhere to the formal structure of the Council and how it works, then we have to decide whether the document containing the observations of the delegation of Costa Rica should be included in the resolution.

On the other hand, I am perfectly sure that from the practical point of view, in any future work of the Council that may refer to the consideration of the report on Tanganyika or Ruanda-Urundi, obviously this document, which is an official document of the Council, can serve us as a reference document.

Therefore, in order to avoid any objections, I am willing to withdraw my amendment which referred to the memorandum presented
/by the delegation

by the delegation of Costa Rica. At the same time, I think I might safely say that I accept the idea presented by the representative of France of changing my resolution -- in accordance also with the representative of Belgium -- so that the third paragraph reads:

"TAKES NOTE of the conclusions formulated by the Visiting Mission. .",
and not the "conclusions and recommendations".

I am sure that the delegation of Costa Rica will be satisfied with the procedure that we have had to adopt on this matter, taking into account, as I said before, that for all practical intents and purposes its document will be maintained as a reference document in any future consideration given by the Trusteeship Council to Ruanda-Urundi or Tanganyika.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): My Government will, of course, give the most careful consideration to the observations and conclusions of the Visiting Mission; it has already done so to some extent.

I had intended, as this resolution deals with one of the Territories for which the United Kingdom is responsible, to abstain from voting on any resolution put forward, but as a token of my appreciation of the practical initiative shown by my Mexican colleague which I greatly welcome, I propose to depart from that idea and to vote for the resolution.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): May I ask the representative of the Philippines whether he wishes to maintain his request to postpone the debate and to vote on this matter at our next meeting, or whether, in view of the clarifications given and after having read this document with greater care, he is now willing to let us vote on this matter? Does he consider that we might vote now and finish this question this evening? I should like to put this same question to all other members, but I am addressing it to the representative of the Philippines.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): I would not want to delay unduly the proceedings of the Council if the obstacle pointed out by my delegation at the beginning of this discussion were the only obstacle to the approval of this resolution. I should
/therefore

therefore like to ask other members who may have observations to be kind enough to express them before the Council so that I may know if my delegation is the only one which has qualms about the matter.

After a cursory glance at this resolution which I have before me, my first reaction is to ask the representative of Mexico whether it would not be possible in connexion with the amendment introduced by the representative of Belgium -- which I gather, it having been presented orally only, to be a recommendation to the Administering Authority to take note of the conclusions of the Visiting Mission -- to make another addition. Would it be possible to include in this paragraph of the resolution a further recommendation to the Administering Authority that it also take into consideration the observations made by the members of the Council during the discussion of the report of the Visiting Mission?

/If that would be acceptable

If that would be acceptable, then it would not be necessary to make a specific reference to the memorandum submitted by the delegation of Costa Rica because then it would be one of the observations made by one of the members of the Council.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): May I ask the representative of Mexico if he would accept that amendment presented by the representative of the Philippines which would be to add to the new last paragraph, which has not been included in the document just distributed, the words "also take into account the observations made by the members of the Council during the discussion on the report of the Visiting Mission."

The last paragraph would then read:

"INVITES the Administering Authority to take into consideration the conclusions of the Visiting Mission and also take into account the observations made by members of the Council during the discussion on the report of the Visiting Mission."

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium)(Interpretation from French): There was a reference made to what was called an amendment made orally by the representative of Belgium. I did not introduce a proposal for an amendment. I said that my first reaction would have been to bring to the attention of the Governments concerned that they should carefully study the conclusions of the Visiting Mission, but I rejected this first reaction. I did not follow it for my Government has already proved by the observations introduced in the annual report that it pays the greatest attention to these conclusions.

14 July

It would be rather awkward at this date, to invite the Government of Belgium to pay attention to these conclusions, for we have a document before us, dated 6 July, from which I shall quote in English:

"It will be apparent from a careful reading of this report that it was the constant concern of the administration at all levels to give the widest possible effect to these recommendations." Therefore, I do not think it would be polite, after receiving this document, to invite the Belgian Government to read the report of the Visiting Mission.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): My Government is in exactly the same position. We have already dealt with many of the observations made in the annual report on Tanganyika which is now before the Council.

/Mr. SOLDATOV

64

77

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(Interpretation from Russian): I support the request of the representative of the Philippines that we continue the consideration of this question and that the vote take place at the next meeting.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): It is so decided. The Council will take up this matter again at tomorrow's meeting. Members will have time then to consider the matter and to peruse this text with greater care. I hope we will work a little faster at our next meeting.

The meeting is adjourned.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.