

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL
T/PV.515
13 March 1954
ENGLISH

Thirteenth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND FIFTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Saturday, 13 March 1954, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. MUNRO (New Zealand)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/SR.515 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The PRESIDENT: Before the Council resumes the discussion of conditions in the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, I call upon the representative of India on a point of order.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): As I pointed out two days ago, the progress of our work in relation to the timetable before us shows that we are proceeding very slowly, and I should like to move that on Monday, at whatever time we meet, we should take up those items which relate to the resolutions from the General Assembly. I do not know whether the President would want me to put forward the arguments for this, since they are well known to the Council, but my proposal is that Monday's meeting should be held specifically with a view to discussing these resolutions from the General Assembly, irrespective of the state of progress on other matters.

The PRESIDENT: I wish first of all to give my own view on this matter. I hold the view that we must complete the examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, and I further hold the view, upon which I shall elaborate in a moment, that we must complete that examination before we go on to consider the resolutions of the General Assembly.

I am fully aware of the importance of these resolutions and of the fact that resolutions which are transmitted to us by the General Assembly are entitled to the greatest respect and the closest attention. Nevertheless, I do not think that anyone in the Assembly would or should suggest that the routine examination of the conditions in the respective Trust Territories is not of the most supreme importance and equal in importance to these resolutions. The care with which representatives have been interrogating special representatives shows in itself the significance which they attach to these debates.

But that alone is not the end of the matter. Until we have dealt with the report on Ruanda-Urundi -- until we have completed the interrogation and the general debate, and heard the special representative -- we cannot set up a drafting committee, and the Council is in no position to conclude its work until it has the report of that drafting committee.

It is true that, as the representative of India has said, our work has been somewhat slow. That is purely the responsibility of members of the Council. If they feel -- and I have no criticism to offer whatever in this respect -- that they must take a considerable length of time in debate, and if they feel that, having regard to the importance of the subject and to their varying views, they must take a considerable time over the discussion of draft recommendations, then that is both their privilege and their responsibility, and it holds up the work of the Council accordingly.

I repeat that I am making no criticism whatever in this respect, but am merely stating that the procedure which I have described results in the fact that we cannot complete our work in accordance with the time table. That is inconvenient for many people. It is inconvenient for me because I have many responsibilities apart from my duties as President of this Council, but I make no complaint at all on that score.

It may be inconvenient in other respects to adopt the proposal of the representative of India.

Let us consider the situation as regards the examination of the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi. We have spent a good deal of time on that item. I am sure that the rest of our meeting this morning will be devoted to further questioning of the special representative; indeed, I am not at all sure that we shall finish with that this morning. Then, members of the Council will have to make their general observations on the Territory at the meeting on Monday afternoon. Some members may not be prepared to speak at that time. In any case, I doubt whether we shall be able to complete the general debate on Monday.

For all those reasons, I, as President, consider that, before the Council begins the consideration of the General Assembly resolutions -- and I say this with the greatest respect for the representative of India -- it must complete the examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): With great respect, I would say that, so far as we are concerned, the President has not in his statement -- which I am sure it was his duty to make -- presented any new factors. I should still like to move that, on Monday, the Council should begin the consideration of the General Assembly resolutions, for the reasons which I have already set out.

I do not want to take up any more of the Council's time in procedural argument; such a course would only defeat my own purpose. I do not wish to present arguments answering the statement which you, Sir, made in your capacity as President. I do, however, believe that the only way to expedite the Council's work is to set a time for considering particularly important items.

We are sent here by our Governments. Some of those Governments have their own views about the importance of the items on the Council's agenda. At the beginning of the session, we were presented with a time table. If that time table is not being adhered to, then we must make the best arrangements we can to carry out our responsibilities. It is quite impossible for my delegation to attend this session indefinitely. I am now told that it may take ten days to complete the session; at least, that is my understanding of the position. That is an impossible state of affairs.

I should like to state now that, on every possible occasion before the end of this session, my delegation will raise the matter of having the items on the agenda considered in a way that we think is appropriate.

I therefore move that, on Monday, the Trusteeship Council should consider the items referred to it by the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council have heard the proposal made by the representative of India. I have nothing to add to what I have already said. I would only repeat that, as President, I think we should proceed with the examination of the report on Ruanda-Urundi.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I have not said that we should not proceed. All I have said is that other items should be considered. It is up to the Council to complete the consideration of Ruanda-Urundi today, or meet on Monday morning for that purpose. All I have said is that, for the reasons set forth, the Council should on Monday consider the General Assembly resolutions. This session is to end on Thursday. There is so much on the agenda that I do not know if we can finish even if there are two or three meetings on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. We must still consider reports on the statements made before the Council. Unless we do something on the lines I have suggested, we are not likely to finish our work.

The PRESIDENT: We shall be able to consider all the items on the agenda, because the session will not end next week.

Mr. PIGNON (France) (interpretation from French): I quite understand the arguments of the representative of India, but I believe that there is a better solution than the one he has proposed.

Having in mind the motives of the position held by the representative of India, I think that the best solution would be to start the consideration of the General Assembly resolutions at Tuesday's meeting, on the understanding that all representatives undertake to make their observations on Monday on Ruanda-Urundi. At the beginning of Tuesday's meeting, the special representative of Belgium would make his final remarks, and we should have several hours at our disposal to consider the General Assembly resolutions. I believe that that plan can be followed if representatives observe a certain amount of restraint and strive to finish the consideration of the report on Ruanda-Urundi on Monday, except, as I have said, for the final remarks of the special representative. On Tuesday, a drafting committee on Ruanda-Urundi could be appointed, and the members of that committee could leave the Council's meeting and start their work immediately.

I am sure that, in that way, the Council could proceed very satisfactorily. I believe that that suggestion should meet the desire of those delegations which wish the session to be completed as soon as possible.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): (Speaker's microphone not switched on; remarks inaudible.)

The PRESIDENT: Before I call on the representative of Australia, I think I should make it clear that I regard the suggestion made by the representative of France as a good one, provided that it can be carried out. It can be carried out if we are not confronted on Monday with statements by some members of the Council to the effect that they are not prepared to speak on Ruanda-Urundi until Tuesday, or if there are not so many statements on Monday that we cannot finish the general debate until Tuesday -- something which I am almost sure will happen.

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): Since I first indicated that I wished to speak, several other members of the Council have spoken, so that what I had to say is perhaps a little out of date -- especially in view of the suggestion made by the representative of France, which seems to me to offer a good solution to the present difficulty.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I am sorry to inject a personal consideration into this debate, but I cannot attend the meeting on Tuesday, since I shall be detained. If it would be at all possible not to discuss Ruanda-Urundi on Tuesday, I would appreciate it.

The PRESIDENT: If we can conclude the debate on Monday, there will be no need to discuss Ruanda-Urundi on Tuesday. All I can say to members is that I urge them to finish the debate on Monday. I do not know whether it would satisfy the representative of India if we proceeded on this basis, that we finish the interrogation of the special representative this morning, and that every member of the Council determines to conclude the debate on Monday, if possible. That debate would include, of course, the reply of the special representative.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): Like the delegation of India, my delegation is quite anxious that the Trusteeship Council should finish its business as soon as it can. Would it be possible for us to agree now to close the observations on Ruanda-Urundi on Monday night, and continue the meeting until those observations are concluded?

The PRESIDENT: It would be possible. Is there any opposition to that suggestion by members of the Council? Could the representative of the Soviet Union indicate whether he will be in a position on Monday to present his observations on Ruanda-Urundi?

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It is rather difficult to set a deadline before we have even embarked upon a discussion. This is the first time, I believe, that we have encountered such a procedure. We have not yet even started the debate, and if all eleven members of the Council wish to speak, how will it be possible for them to do so in the course of one meeting? Normally, every member of the Council speaks on every Territory, and I think that it would be impossible for them all to speak on Monday, and, notwithstanding the considerable ability of the President, I think that even he would not be able to achieve such a miracle.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Since certain delegations seem desirous of discussing the General Assembly resolutions as soon as possible, could we decide to take up Ruanda-Urundi on Monday and that, even if we have not completed our discussion, we would discuss the resolutions of the General Assembly on Tuesday? If the debate on Ruanda-Urundi is not completed on Monday, it could be completed on Wednesday.

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry to say that that really is out of the question, because after the debate is completed, a drafting committee has to be appointed for the preparation of the report, and that would delay it still more. The Drafting Committee on Tanganyika has made absolutely no progress at all, and I imagine that the same interesting story will be repeated with regard to Ruanda-Urundi. The Drafting Committee on Tanganyika has met, but it has a long way to go.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): It is quite obvious we are making no impression on your mind, Mr. President, because all you are telling us is that you have a time-table laid down so far as the sequence of items is concerned, and whatever you say we are going to stick to. Of course, if that is your view, there is another procedure we shall have to adopt, and we will come to that when the time comes. I regret I cannot agree with the representative of the Soviet Union that we cannot fix time-tables for our debates. We are given a certain ration of time, and we shall have to finish our business in that time. Are we going to be told that we must sit here until the end of the year to discuss these items? If the representative of France is willing, we are prepared to agree to a discussion of the resolutions of the General Assembly on Tuesday. I should like this to be put to the Council.

The PRESIDENT: Before I put this proposal to the Council, I can say this: on Monday, if necessary, we can continue our meeting longer than usual.

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): I should like to be clear on one point. Assuming that we are to deal with the resolutions of the General Assembly on Tuesday, is it a decision of the Council that we will finish with Ruanda-Urundi on Monday?

The PRESIDENT: I presume that is the basis of the proposal. If it is, I shall make no opposition to it, but I am in the hands of the Council. I want to make this clear. I placed before the Council the various considerations which were in my mind as to the proper disposal of the business of the Council. Having done that, I am absolutely in the hands of the Council, and if it is a proposal to the Council that the debate on Ruanda-Urundi should be concluded on Monday and that we should proceed on Tuesday afternoon with the consideration of the resolutions of the General Assembly, I will put that to the Council. Is that the proposal of the representative of France?

Mr. Krishna MENON (India) (speaker's microphone not switched on, remarks inaudible).

The PRESIDENT: I shall be unable to call a meeting of the Council for Tuesday morning, since I have other business to attend to and I cannot sit at that time.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India) (speaker's microphone not switched on, remarks inaudible).

The PRESIDENT: Well, there it is. I shall put the proposal of the representative of France.

Mr. PIGNON (France) (interpretation from French): There was one basic element in my proposal, and that was that some time should be given to the special representative after the members of the Council have made their comments. I suggested that the members of the Council should complete their observations on Monday, and not later than Monday, but I did not propose that the special representative should be called upon to reply straight away. At least one night

should be made available to him so that he can prepare his statement in reply and present it the next day. I certainly should not want my proposal to deprive the special representative of his opportunity to look over the statements made by the various representatives.

The PRESIDENT: The special representative indicated some time ago that he wished to speak. Normally, the special representative would reply on Tuesday, but if he wishes to reply today, I would be very happy.

Mr. SERRANO-GARCIA (El Salvador)(interpretation from Spanish): I have asked for the floor only to seek some clarification. I should like to know what would happen if, on Monday, we had some very lengthy statements so that only five or six representatives had an opportunity to speak. What would happen with regard to a delegation which would not have had a chance to speak by 6 p.m. on Monday if the Council decides that the debate on Ruanda-Urundi will come to an end on Monday? What will be the situation if certain delegations do not have an opportunity to make their statements? We will have taken a decision in the Council -- and then we will actually be led to flout a decision we have taken. That is why I do not think it appropriate to limit our time in this way.

The General Assembly set up a Committee to study procedures for limiting the duration of Assembly sessions, but no result was achieved because all the members of the Committee agreed that under no circumstances whatever should the time allotted to speakers be curtailed. That is why it seems to me that the representative of India is very much in the right.

With all due respect to the representative of India, it seems to me that the personal considerations of the representative of India should not lead us to exert pressure on the Council to complete its work within a set period of time, at the same time curtailing the right of certain delegations to speak. My delegation does not know whether its statement will be a lengthy one or a very brief one, and that is why we cannot commit ourselves to completing the subject on Monday.

The PRESIDENT: This is precisely the situation which I thought would develop. It is quite clear to me that there are at least three representatives who will not be ready to speak on Monday. Let us be candid with ourselves: they will not be ready. Now, there is one method of dealing with it, which is not a method that I propose: that the debate be closed on Monday. As I say, that is not a proposal which is to come from the Chair, and actually I do not think it is a correct proposal. Under those circumstances, we are going to continue this debate -- let us not deceive ourselves -- on Tuesday.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): I should like to support the remarks of the representative of El Salvador and add one further consideration: There are, of course, different interests at stake -- the interests of those who have to leave, and also other interests of those delegations which have to carry out routine work. It is only a matter of two or three days. If we have not finished by Friday, I do not think that the earth will stop turning if we conclude our work by Tuesday or Wednesday of the following week. I therefore support the views of the representative of El Salvador.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I am sorry that the personal convenience of representatives has been mentioned. My delegation has not raised any point about personal considerations of delegations. In fact, many other representatives raised these personal considerations, saying that they have other things to do in the morning -- and saying that we should not meet, for example, this morning. My Government sends a delegation here on the understanding that the session of this Council will last for a certain period. We have not kept to that time-table. What is more, we are not working a full day on account of the personal convenience of other delegations.

In view of the discussion that has taken place, my delegation has put forward its view that we should speed up this matter and try to get a proper discussion of the General Assembly resolutions. I think we have achieved our object, and I do not wish to press my resolution. If we get no time to discuss this, we reserve our right to propose other methods of dealing with this matter. It may be that this item will have to go over to the next session.

The PRESIDENT: There is no need whatever for the item to go over to the next session. It can be dealt with at this session. But I fully realize that it may be inconvenient for some members to deal with it, say, next week.

We have discussed this very fully. We met at half-past ten, and it is now five minutes past eleven. I have taken up some of that time: I admit that. But I hope that we can now proceed quickly to our subject. I do not think there is any use in my putting a resolution to the Council. I think that what we should do is to endeavour to get on with this so that we can speak, if possible --

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): There is no resolution before the Council, because I have withdrawn it.

The PRESIDENT: I thought that the representative of India had merely said that he was disposed to withdraw it.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I say that I have withdrawn my resolution in order to reserve the right of my delegation to propose other alternatives. My delegation does not propose to find itself, without protest, in the position of having no adequate time to discuss what we regard as a very important item on this agenda. If it came to that, we would have to move that this go over to the next session instead of getting on the tail-end of this session. We confess that, on account of our lack of familiarity with the work of this Council, we did not challenge the time-table of the Council when it came up. If we had not been newcomers, we would have said that the order of business should be altered. But that is our own fault; it is due to our lack of experience. I have therefore withdrawn my resolution, and I believe the point of view we have put forward is quite adequate. We have been able to make no impression on the President; we regret that, and therefore we leave it.

Mr. TSARAPOKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Why cannot the Council on Monday start the general debate on Ruanda-Urundi; then discuss on Tuesday what is being suggested by the representative of India, namely, the General Assembly resolutions; and then, after we have discussed the General Assembly resolutions, revert to the general debate on Ruanda-Urundi and conclude it? We have adopted a similar procedure before in regard to other Territories. We did not finish the discussion of the British Cameroons and we switched over to the French Cameroons; having interrupted the discussion on the French Cameroons, we switched over to British Togoland. We have done that many times before, and I should like to know why we cannot do it this time. Since the representative of India is urging that we take up the General Assembly resolutions, why must we absolutely insist on finishing with Ruanda-Urundi? Particularly since all this confusion has already

arisen, why should we suddenly take a rigid stand in regard to Ruanda-Urundi? I think that the suggestion of the representative of India is acceptable. Once we have finished with the question he is urging us to discuss, we shall revert to the discussion of Ruanda-Urundi.

The PRESIDENT: We interrupted our previous proceedings mainly because one or two representatives, including the representative of the Soviet Union, were not ready to proceed with their addresses. On this occasion, I am hoping that on Tuesday all representatives will be able to proceed with their addresses. My desire to complete the discussion of Ruanda-Urundi on Tuesday arises from the fact that I feel that, if we do not, we will be postponing the work of the Drafting Committee, and the result will be that we shall not complete our work until the end of the week after next.

Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand): The discussion has become somewhat diffuse. I think that the sole and important point at issue is the point originally raised by the representative of India. I think there is general agreement in the Council that we could, on Tuesday, discuss the resolutions of the General Assembly. Perhaps we should proceed to expedite our work as much as we can on Ruanda-Urundi, with the understanding that, whatever else happens, we will discuss the resolutions of the General Assembly on Tuesday.

The PRESIDENT: All I want to say, as President, is that I do not agree with that. I do not desire to interrupt the debate on Ruanda-Urundi.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I move the next business, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: I shall be happy to proceed to it.

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF RUANDA-URUNDI (T/1091, T/L.420):

- (a) ANNUAL REPORT (T/1081) [agenda item 3 b]
- (b) PETITIONS (T/PET.3/L.1, L.3; T/COM.3/L.2, L.3) [agenda item 4] (continued)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Leroy, special representative for the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, took a seat at the Council table.

Economic advancement (continued)

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French):
Before questions are put to me, I should like to answer three requests for information which were made yesterday by the representative of India.

First, he wanted to have additional information on the years 1952 and 1953 in connexion with the table on page 35 of the report, which deals with the development of the expenditures of the ordinary budget.

In order to clarify these figures, comparisons should be made between the expenditures actually made in 1951 and the tentative estimates for 1952 and 1953. It was not possible for me to act in any other way because the budget of 1952 was closed on 31 October 1953. I have here only the over-all results and the totals which I gave in my preliminary statement.

In order to make possible the following comparisons it is necessary, from the total of 253,625,687 francs, which is shown on page 35, to deduct the sum of 71,359,478 francs which represents the equalization fund for indigenous coffee, because I do not have the figures for 1952 with relation to the equalization fund. Bearing this in mind, in deducting the payments made to this fund of indigenous coffee, there remains for the other posts for 1951 a total of 182,266,209 francs and 84 centimes; for the 1952 estimates 237,799,000 francs; and for the 1953 estimates, 297,146,000 francs.

It is difficult, as I have said, to compare actual expenses with estimates. But one can be reassured on learning that the estimates for 1952 for the total budget were 441,000,000 francs, whereas, 513,000,000 francs were effectively expended. Thus, all the figures that I have cited as expenditures in favour of the natives constitute minimum figures.

I was also asked to give an idea of the general allocation of the budget. I will cite briefly this information which is given in document T/PV.510.

For 1952, administrative, judicial and military services: 111 millions or 21.60 per cent; for 1953, 135 millions or 21.60 per cent, in other words the same percentage.

In 1952, for social services, 156 millions or 30.40 per cent; in 1953, 208 millions or 33.50 per cent.

In 1952, for economic services, 224 millions or 43.59 per cent; in 1953, 265 millions or 42.50 per cent.

In 1952, for the other expenditures, 22 millions or 4.41 per cent; in 1953, 15 millions or 3.40 per cent.

Finally, with respect to the third question which the representative of India asked me to explain yesterday -- why, in the 1951 budget, which is contained on pages 32 and 33 of the report, agriculture accounted for 26.75 per cent whereas, in the estimates of expenditures for 1952, it amounted to only 10.42 per cent -- my answer is that here there is a comparison between actual expenditures and old estimates and that I will give today the clarifications on this point. They are:

In 1951, the total expenditures amounted to 430,648,948 francs and 18 centimes and the expenditures for agriculture amounted to 115,226,000 francs and 45 centimes, which represents 26.75 per cent.

In 1952, the total of expenditures amounted to 513,868,139 francs and 39 centimes, of which agriculture accounted for 115,009,813 francs or 22.38 per cent. You see, therefore, that the sums expended in 1951 and 1952 remained the same for agriculture but the percentage in regard to the over-all budget was reduced by 4.37 per cent. This is explainable by the fact that the expenditures for agriculture remain stationary, whereas those for social services increased from 113 million francs to 156 million francs, which was translated into a diminution, on the whole, of the percentage for other activities.

Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) (interpretation from French): On page 119 of the report of the Administering Authority, mention is made of the production of electric power in the Territory. Could the special representative tell me if the electric plant at Ruzizi is to replace the three existing plants at Usumbura, Kigali and Ruhengeri? It is stated in the report that the plant of 1,500 horsepower will be replaced when the Ruzizi plant has been completed.

I should like to know whether all the existing plants which have a rather low production capacity are to be replaced by this new plant at Ruzizi. What are the needs for electric power which the Administration believes will be met by this new plant?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): Until now, no decision has been taken on the fate of the existing electric plants, which are private enterprises. The plant which will be created on the Ruzizi will not come into operation for some time and, in the meantime, the three existing plants provide considerable service.

The Ruzizi plant will certainly help to meet the electric energy needs of all Ruanda-Urundi and perhaps even more. At the beginning of its operation, arrangements will very probably be made between the organ at Ruzizi and the existing companies, so that the rights of all will be properly respected.

Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) (interpretation from French): I am very happy to learn that the Ruzizi plant will meet the needs of the entire Territory. Could we be told by the special representative if, in the plans for the electrification of the Territory, the Administration envisages the provision of light to all cities so that the Administration can then abrogate the measures taken with regard to the travel of the indigenous inhabitants at night? We have been told by the special representative that, to a large extent, these measures were taken because there was no electric lighting system in the streets of the cities and thefts had a tendency to increase. I should like to know whether the streets will be lighted as soon as the hydro-electric plant at Ruzizi has been set up, so that the Administering Authority can then suppress measures of this character which are obnoxious to the population.

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): The light to be provided in the cities is, of course, one of the ends which will be attained by the electrification of the Territory. The actual manner in which this will be done is rather difficult to outline. Very probably, the cities closest to the hydroelectric plant will be the first to be lighted. However, it will be necessary to make additional plans before the electricity can be extended to more remote cities. This is a question of economy, of technique and its realization will begin at the moment that this plant begins to function.

Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) (interpretation from French): The reply of the special representative does not entirely meet the question posed by my delegation. I fully appreciate the fact that certain priorities have to be established, but I should like the special representative to recall that a certain measure has been taken vis-à-vis the indigenous population, and we have been told by the special representative that this measure has been taken because of the fact that the cities are not sufficiently lighted; and it was in order that the Administering Authority would bear this point in mind that I raised this question. I hope that the special representative fully appreciates the purport and intent of that question and that the Administration will give urgent consideration to it. I do not ask for any further reply. I simply wanted to make this point of clarification.

I now pass to another point. It is indicated on page 59 of the report that the "Régie de distribution d'Eau et d'Electricité du Congo belge et du Ruanda-Urundi" provides the water and electric power of the Territory. We should like to know whether this company intends to establish other water supply systems in other cities of the Territory besides the cities mentioned here, the cities of Usumbura and Astrida?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French):

As far as I know; this company intends to provide for the water supply in all the important population centres of the Territory particularly, in the very near future, in Kitega and in Kigali which are the two most heavily-populated centres after Usumbura and Astrida.

Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) (interpretation from French): On page 99 of the report reference is made to the failure of chemical fertilizers in the Territory. Could the special representative tell us if the Administration has carefully studied the reasons for this failure?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French):

In general, the reasons for this failure and the question of soil conservation are being considered by the experimental centres and experimental farms. The reason for the failure of chemical fertilizers is still under study. Pending the attainment of some tangible results the Administering Authority has suggested the use of natural fertilizer which is easy to obtain because of the large number of livestock available for this purpose.

Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) (interpretation from French): Reference is

made to meat production in the Territory on page 107 of the report. It states that Ruanda-Urundi also has slaughter-houses in the larger centres, that public slaughter-houses are to be found in the less-important centres and that it was in these establishments that the slaughter of animals destined for the feeding of indigenous inhabitants takes place. I should like to know under what conditions this slaughter takes place and what steps have been taken by the Administration with regard to the handling of meat produced in these slaughter-houses.

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French):

We have slaughter-houses in the large centres, as is stated in the report, and we have smaller and less-important slaughter-houses having less equipment, which provide for the needs of the smaller population centres. I take it that the question of the representative of Haiti refers specifically to health considerations, to the steps which are taken in connexion with the handling of meat and the slaughtering of cattle. We have ordinances which stringently regulate the slaughtering of cattle, the handling of the meat, etc. These ordinances are rather similar to ordinances prevailing in other countries with regard to this subject. I do not suppose that it is necessary for me to read out at any length the steps taken in this regard as it would not really serve any useful purpose and would tax the patience of the Council. However, I could, if necessary, give some further information to the representative of Haiti if he so desires.

Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) (interpretation from French): I should like to thank the special representative for having suggested that he individually give me some information, but it seems to me that the matter is one of general interest to all the members of the Council.

The special representative has told us that there are regulations governing the processing of meat in these public slaughter-houses. I suppose that certain hygienic regulations are observed. Does not the Administration think that it would be proper to have, if not the most modern slaughter-houses, at least the sort of slaughter-house already set up in the Territory? Then would it not be better to do away with these public slaughter-houses?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): As I have stated, these public slaughter houses may give rise to some misapprehension because of the actual term used. In French the "tueries publiques" means slaughter-houses, and in these slaughter-houses the general regulations applying throughout the Territory are respected. The equipment available in these slaughter-houses are not as complete as the equipment which the larger slaughter-houses, handling the needs of the greater population centres, possess. The Administration, of course, intends to set up the most modernly-equipped slaughter-houses in all places where this may prove desirable. This, of course, is a question of time and of financial resources.

The PRESIDENT: I should have given the representative of India the opportunity of commenting on the answers of the special representative.

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): I merely wished to thank the special representative for the very full answers which he gave to my questions.

Mr. SERRANO-GARCIA (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): Each year the mine workers receive equipment which, according to the report, consists of pants and blankets. I should like to know whether the equipment which is given to the miners is paid for by the worker through some deduction from his salary or wage.

Mr. DEROY (special representative) (interpretation from French):

No, this is not taken from their wages. This is a payment which is in addition to their regular wages.

Mr. SERRANO-GARCIA (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish):

Besides the monopolies enumerated in the report, which have been granted to the dairies and to the Ruzizi Corporation, I would like to know whether any further monopolies have been established or granted by the Administering Authority.

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): No further monopolies have been set up. The policy of the Government is to grant monopolies only when this proves absolutely essential for the introduction of a given industry or for the development and economic advancement of the country as a whole. I might say, parenthetically, that the dairies are not, properly speaking, to be considered as a monopoly. As a matter of fact, this is explained in the report. There is no obligation on the part of the natives inhabiting a dairy area to provide milk to that dairy. The only advantage for the dairy itself is that no competitor will set up a rival company within a given radius. But nothing prevents the natives from taking their milk elsewhere. In an area which is half-way between two dairy centres, the native can choose to which centre he will take his milk. As a matter of fact, he is quite free to dispose of his milk as he wishes. As regards the dairies which may not be monopolies but which derive certain privileges, how many such dairies are owned by the indigenous inhabitants and how many are owned by Europeans?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): I will have to check that information. I know that there are not a very large number of dairies and that one of the major dairies is exclusively under the control of the indigenous inhabitants, namely the Nyanza Dairy.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): On page 12 of the annual report, in section B, it is stated that Ruanda-Urundi is in a customs union with the Belgian Congo. However, no details are given as to this customs union. I would like to know whether, in keeping with the general rules which prevail in customs unions, the two Territories are considered as one territorial unit with regard to custom duties, as applies, for instance, to the Benelux Customs Union which dates back to 1951?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): No, that is not the case. There is no customs barrier and there are no customs collected at the boundary point between the two Territories. Merchandise flows freely from one Territory to another.

With regard to imports and exports, as stated in the last paragraph of the section referred to by the representative of Syria, entry duties on the merchandise imported from the Belgian Congo to Ruanda-Urundi, as well as outgoing duties collected in the Belgian Congo on commodities coming from Ruanda-Urundi, all these are transferred to the budget of the Trust Territory.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): Along the same line, I should like to know whether the products of Ruanda-Urundi and the Belgian Congo can freely enter each other's Territory?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): Yes.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): In the tables appearing on pages 32 and 33 of the report, dealing with the budget of Ruanda-Urundi for 1951, we find a general breakdown of expenditures. In connexion with administrative expenses, under section I, reference is made to the judiciary and to the territorial police force. Then there is a reference to the fact that the wages of the European staff amounted to some 30 million odd francs, whereas the wages for the native staff amounted only to about 3,899,000 francs. This is the same with regard to all services. I would like to know the reason for the substantial discrepancy between the figures representing the wages of European staff and the figures for the indigenous staff.

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): This is due to the fact that at present important administrative posts in the Territory are in the hands of Europeans. I do not have the exact figures

for the number of Europeans, but it is approximately equal to that of indigenous staff members. However, the Europeans, as I have just pointed out, occupy the higher posts in the Administration and these, of course, are better paid.

Mr. TAPAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): On page 39 of the report, paragraph 35, we find a reference to taxes and a list of the persons who are tax exempt. In this list there are civil and commercial enterprises, and at least one establishment is indicated for Ruanda-Urundi or the Belgian Congo. Since these companies are commercial or civil enterprises which seek profits, I should like to know what are the reasons which led the Administering Authority to grant tax exemption to these companies.

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): May I be permitted to reply a little later to this question? I do not have the information clear in my mind at the present time.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I believe that the reason for this is simply that these civil and commercial companies are taxable on their profits as a whole and therefore the revenue from a building would fall within the broader framework of all profits, and that is why the company would be taxable on the profits as a whole.

Mr. TAPAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): Continuing with page 39 of the report, under section III, which deals with professional tax, we read that companies not having their main branch in the colony or in Ruanda-Urundi, and which are not subject to the law of 21 June 1927, do come under the decree of 10 September 1951 as regards the profits yielded by their companies in the Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi. I would like to know what is the tenor of this decree and who collects the taxes in these cases.

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): The decree of 10 September 1951 is one which regulates the income tax. I would have to explain this point at a later stage when I have the time to look over my text.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The decree of 21 June 1927 is a metropolitan statute which was voted by the Belgian Parliament. It makes taxable in Belgium all companies having an administrative office in Belgium. A case in point would be a corporation incorporated in Belgium and engaging in activities in the Belgian Congo. The Belgian Treasury retains one-sixth of the tax collected, and the remainder is returned by the Belgian Treasury to the Congolaise Treasury. In other words, companies earning a profit in Africa are taxable in Belgium, if they have an administrative headquarters in Belgium, but five-sixths of this tax is repaid by the Belgian Treasury to the Congolaise Treasury. Companies not having an administrative headquarters in Belgium are taxed only in the Congo, since they cannot be taxed elsewhere. Companies are taxed either in the Belgian Congo or in Belgium, depending upon whether or not they have their headquarters or a central office in Belgium.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): I wish to thank the representative of Belgium for his explanations. I have always had great admiration for his clarity. However, the law of 21 June 1927 is mentioned in the report on page 41, where we read that the portion of these taxes for Ruanda-Urundi is deposited in the Treasury by the Department. Can the special representative tell us whether the proportion of taxes relevant to Ruanda-Urundi is equal to the amount paid into the metropolitan treasury? Is the tax-rate similar in both cases?

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I do not quite understand the question. The representative of Syria would like to know whether the tax-rate is equal for companies paying taxes in the Belgian Congo and in Belgium. Is that his question?

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): I would like to know whether the rate is equal for companies that are active in Ruanda-Urundi. In such cases, are these companies taxed in Ruanda-Urundi in the same amount as they are taxed in the metropolitan territory? If a company made 100,000 francs profit in Ruanda-Urundi and it made the same profit in Belgium, is it taxed equally for the profit made in the metropolitan territory and the profit made in the Trust Territory?

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I shall have to check those facts. However, the system which prevails is the following. The company pays its taxes in Belgium. I do not think that the profits made in Belgium and Ruanda-Urundi are broken down. The one-sixth which is collected by the Belgian Treasury covers the tax collected by the Belgian Treasury and part of the profit made in Belgium. If the company purchases products of Ruanda-Urundi and resells them in Belgium, then of all the profits taxed in Belgium, Belgium would receive one-sixth and Ruanda-Urundi would receive five-sixths. I shall check this matter further for the representative of Syria.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): Pages 44 and 45 of the report refer to the currency and banking system. Page 45, paragraph 39, refers to exchange control. Am I to understand that, as regards exchange control, the metropolitan territory is considered as a foreign territory in trade relations between the metropolitan territory and Ruanda-Urundi? Is there still need for exchange controls?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): The representative of Syria has put a number of rather awkward questions to me, and again I must request to reply at a later date. These are matters which with I am not well acquainted, and I should like additional time in which to examine them.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): The special representative may certainly take all the time he needs for his reply.

As regards the system of land tenure in the Territory, I should like to know why the Administering Authority has not considered application of the Grand Buch system, which was applied in Germany, that is to say, the system inspired by the Thorenz Act, to the land occupied by the indigenous inhabitants?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): The Administering Authority has not considered extending the system to the indigenous inhabitants for a two-fold reason. The land occupied by non-indigenous inhabitants is rather small in amount. The overwhelming majority of the land is in the hands of the indigenous inhabitants. If the system mentioned by the representative of Syria were to be applied, it would involve many difficulties. One can well imagine the number of various types of experts that would be needed to set up any type of register of the land held by the indigenous inhabitants.

Beyond this difficulty, there is still another one. The present land tenure system for the indigenous population is such that exclusive ownership, in the sense of the French Civil Code, does not exist. This system provides certain guarantees. The land remains in the ownership of those occupying it, and this ownership is not challenged so long as the land is actually used and developed by the indigenous inhabitants. If land were just distributed to certain persons, it might be that some of them would simply allow this land to remain unattended, which would be very detrimental to the production of food crops in the Territory.

These are the two main reasons for which the Administering Authority so far has refrained from establishing any such registry of land holdings and individual land ownership. However, as the situation in the Territory develops, this may eventually come into being.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I now have before me the text of the law of 21 June 1927 and it is in accord with my statement to the representative of Syria. Companies whose administrative centres are located in Belgium and which operate branches in the colonies are subject to income tax without distinction as to the Belgian or territorial origin of taxable income. The tax amounts to 16 per cent and applies to every kind of investment. On other types of income the rate is 12 per cent.

A further article states that when these companies have branches abroad or handle Belgian Congo or Ruanda-Urundi products in Belgium, the profits derived thereby are subject to regular taxation. One-fifth is turned over to the Belgian State, and the remainder to the treasury of the colony. As regards the dividends handed over to the Belgian Congo, therefore, the amount is four-fifths. In other words, in the case of companies having their headquarters in the Congo, four-fifths of all the taxes collected in Belgium are turned over to the territorial treasury; while, in the case of companies having industrial centres in Belgium and trading in territorial products, the tax is collected by the Belgian Government. But here, again, one-fifth of the tax thus collected is refunded to the colony. The legislation applies equally to both.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Belgium for his explanation, and now I should like to revert to the question of native land holdings.

The special representative said that the Administering Authority did not envisage the application of the régime de cadastre to these lands. In spite of that, I wonder whether it is possible for the people occupying these lands to record their rights, or to have their right of occupancy registered with any kind of local legal authority.

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): At present the registration of the rights of indigenous inhabitants to land takes place only if such rights are contested. If there is a dispute between two persons in regard to their right to a piece of land, their claims are brought before the civil tribunals, the decisions of which constitute, to some extent, official title to ownership or occupancy.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I should like to add a few words in reply to the representative of Syria, since this was a question which arose when I was the Resident in Ruanda-Urundi. It was a question of allowing the natives to record their rights to lands which were used for the cultivation of sweet potatoes, which was a new type of agriculture at that time. In order to encourage the natives to grow this product, we conceived the idea of allowing them to register their rights and receive the benefit of such production. The danger was that certain chiefs argued that such land titles either meant nothing at all, or meant something. If they meant nothing, it was unnecessary to grant them, and if they meant anything, then all land holdings to which no title existed became uncertain. The chiefs would, therefore, have deprived the farmers of land on which they had been living for generations, claiming that these people had no title. They would then be in a position to expel the farmers from these lands. Now the rule is applied in every case, whether it be ordinary real estate or agricultural land, and if there is a claim, the claimant has to prove that the alleged owner is not the actual owner of a piece of land.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): On page 116 of the report, in connexion with the contracts for the exploitation of mineral resources, it is stated that when the lands are held by indigenous inhabitants, or when there is a mortgage against them, their occupation must be allowed by the Governor, who fixes the amount of compensation to be paid. Have the indigenous inhabitants any right of appeal in regard to this indemnity if they are not satisfied with the amount? Have they a right of appeal before their local tribunals?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): In every case there is a right of appeal to the tribunals. The natives are consulted regarding the rights which they claim, and this is done in the presence of an independent magistrate who has not been appointed by the Administering Authority. The magistrate gives his opinion, and I am not aware of any case in which the indemnity claimed by the native was refused.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We are told in the report that Ruanda-Urundi's balance of payments in 1952 was unfavourable, and that this was due to a falling off in the production of coffee. Could the special representative give us comparative figures for exports of coffee from Ruanda-Urundi in 1950, 1951 and 1952?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): I am not able at the moment to give the Council the figures for exports of coffee during those three years. There is a table on pages 313-314 of the report showing exports for 1951 and 1952, but these exports are listed under the countries of destination so that, in order to arrive at the total amount of coffee exported, it would be necessary to extract all the figures appearing under the heading "arabica coffee" and make the addition. I am quite willing to do that, but obviously I cannot do it here and now.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The report also contains a table showing that there is a head tax in existence. In 1952 the rate of this tax ranged from 85 francs to 175 francs. How is this rate calculated? Is it based on salary or on property owned, or does it derive from other considerations?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): Before replying to this question relating to the head tax, I should like to point out to the representative of the Soviet Union that on pages 316 and 317 of the annual report there is a table showing the principal exports for the years 1948-1952 inclusive and giving the weight, the value and the percentage of the total value. This table also includes exports to the Belgian Congo, and it is possible to calculate from it, in conjunction with the preceding table for 1951 and 1952, the figures for total exports.

With regard to the head tax, it is a lump sum tax which varies from one region to another. The Administration takes into account the minimum resources which can be obtained by the indigenous inhabitants in their environment, and the tax is thus assessed individually and is larger or smaller according to the resources of the region in which a particular indigenous inhabitant is living. Sometimes the tax is calculated on a territorial basis. If, in a given territory, a chiefdom, or even a sub-chiefdom, is poorly off economically, then in its case the head tax would be lower.

Mr. TSAPAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Reverting to the question of coffee exports, I have examined the table on pages 316 and 317 of the report and should like to draw attention to one point since I have been unable to calculate therefrom the figure for the total coffee exports. According to the table the Territory exported in 1952 105 tons of commercial coffee valued at about four and a half million francs and 1,100 tons of coffee "en parches" valued at approximately 33 million francs, which gives a figure of roughly 37 million francs for total exports.

If one then turns to another table reproduced on page 49 of the report, one reads, "

"Principal products exported to foreign countries, including Belgium: coffee, 10,790 tons, valued at 561,827,000 francs".

In this case the exports of coffee represent slightly more than 500 million francs. Thus there is a considerable difference between the two tables. On the one hand, on pages 316 and 317, exports of coffee are shown as representing about 37 million francs; on the other hand, on page 49, we find that coffee exports reached just over 561 million francs. How would the special representative explain the fact that the figures given in these two tables are so different?

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The figures given on pages 316 and 317 of the report are those of exports between the two members of the customs union, Ruanda-Urundi and the Belgian Congo. In fact,

they represent exports from Ruanda-Urundi to the Belgian Congo. The figures for other coffee exports are given in the table on pages 313 and 314, from which it will be seen that the Territory exported more than 13 million francs' worth of arabica coffee to Germany, 150 million francs' worth to Belgium, 518 million francs' worth to the United States, and so on. I assure that the total will correspond to that of just over 561 million francs shown in the table on page 49, unless the latter takes into account only the annual production whereas the customs duty figures apply only to the amount exported.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In other words, the figures given by the special representative before Mr. Ryckmans spoke referred not to the total figure of exports but only to exports to the Belgian Congo. Is that correct?

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The special representative began by saying that it would be possible for him to calculate the total of the various figures appearing under the heading "arabica coffee" in the "Table of Principal Exports listed by Country of Destination" given on pages 313 and 314. Then, in perusing the report, he discovered another table of principal exports giving the percentage of the total value in each case. He then said that he appeared to have made a mistake, and that there was this table giving the overall figures. I pointed out to him, however, that the table on pages 316 and 317 was not a table of overall figures but one showing the principal exports together with the percentage of the total value for each item. But the special representative said, quite correctly, that the table on page 313 and the pages following made it possible to calculate the total of the figures given under the heading "arabica coffee". He added that he was perfectly prepared to make that calculation, but that it was impossible for him to do so during the meeting. Contrary to the special representative's understanding, however, the table on pages 316 and 317 deals only with exports to the Belgian Congo within the framework of trade between the two members of the customs union.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): On page 50 of the annual report, there is a table giving figures for exports, by tons and by value in francs, for the years 1951 and 1952. According to that table, 82,037 tons were exported from Ruanda-Urundi in 1951, and the value of those exports was 1,519,780,000 francs. In 1952, 186,296 tons were exported, but the value of those exports was only 1,352,000,000 francs. In other words, in 1952, the tonnage increased, but the value decreased. The report states that that was due to an unsatisfactory position as regards coffee. I should like to have an explanation for the increase in tonnage of exports in 1952. Approximately 4,000 additional tons were exported in that year, as compared with the year 1951, and I should like to know what products were responsible for that increase.

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): Once again, I shall have to take some time to find the relevant figures.

I may say this: The representative of the Soviet Union will be able to find the information which he has requested on page 313 of the annual report, where there is a table in which the tonnage and value of products exported in 1951 are compared with the tonnage and value of products exported in 1952. For instance, in 1952, there was a slight increase in the tonnage of hides exported; there was a slight decrease in the tonnage of coffee exported; there was a considerable increase in the tonnage of fibres exported; and so forth. As I have said, however, it is very difficult for me to find these figures quickly, because the tables were compiled, in accordance with the new questionnaire, on the basis of the receiving countries. I should therefore have to make many calculations to answer the question put by the representative of the Soviet Union, and I am afraid that would take some time.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): According to the annual report, the amount of land owned by the Administering Authority increased in 1952, as compared with 1951. The same was true of the land owned by the non-indigenous inhabitants. I should like to know why more land was purchased by the Administering Authority and the non-indigenous inhabitants in 1952, and for what purpose that land was used.

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): I have already stated why the Administration and private individuals are buying more land in the Territory.

The Administration needs land for hospitals, roads, the expansion of communities, airfields, and so forth. As regards private individuals, it is the Administration's policy very strictly to limit the concessions to non-indigenous inhabitants, particularly those for agricultural land. Of course, we could not think of entirely eliminating concessions to non-indigenous inhabitants, because, very often, small concessions for industrial purposes must be granted in order to expand the country's economy. In an area where very little land is held by non-indigenous inhabitants, it may be worth while to grant further small concessions to such persons in order to attract manpower and to furnish an example of community life to the indigenous inhabitants. That is why it is not possible radically to curtail the granting of concessions in the Territory. As I have already pointed out, however, non-indigenous inhabitants hold only 85 square miles of land.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to revert to the tax system of the Territory.

In the annual report, we see that the head tax in 1952 was larger than in 1951. What is the explanation for that situation?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): The head tax is always based on the resources of the indigenous inhabitants in a given area. The increase in 1952 was due to the fact that investigation proved that the resources of the indigenous inhabitants had increased over the figure for 1951.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The report indicates that the head tax increased throughout the Territory in 1952. In 1951, the minimum head tax was 75 francs, and the maximum 150 francs. In 1952, the minimum head tax was, not 75 francs, but 85 francs;

the maximum was, not 150 francs, but 175 francs. In other words, the head tax, increased throughout the Territory, and not merely in one or two areas where the resources of the indigenous inhabitants had increased.

Could the special representative give us any explanation for that overall increase in the head tax during 1952?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative)(interpretation from French): There has been an increase in the maximum rate, but it is not correct to say that the head tax has been increased everywhere. To arrive at the figures, one would have to find out the position in all the native areas where the indigenous inhabitants pay the head tax. I have already pointed out that we are studying the social situation and that salaries were increased in 1951 and 1952. That has built up the national resources and, therefore, it has enabled the authorities to increase the head tax.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The special representative has told us that the savings of the indigenous population in the banks total 21,000,000 francs. Could the special representative tell us how many persons have savings accounts?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative)(interpretation from French): I am afraid that I cannot give the exact figure, since I do not have it, but I believe that the number of savings accounts is approximately 15,000.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The special representative has told us that in December 1953 there were 1,606 native plants or firms in Ruanda-Urundi. Could the special representative tell us what types of industrial undertakings are owned by indigenous inhabitants? what products are manufactured and what goods are processed?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative)(interpretation from French): I did not speak of industries and enterprises, but of native establishments. I said that these native establishments were mostly on a very modest scale, and I quoted figures in order to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that more and more indigenous inhabitants were becoming interested in trade and in handicrafts, and were diversifying their occupations. This is a good sign. With regard to the type of business they are engaged in, it can be said that there are a fairly large number of indigenous inhabitants working as traders on their own. There are

hotel owners, restaurant owners, shoemakers, tailors, truck drivers, transport workers, stone workers, construction workers and brick workers. I have just enumerated these as the occupations which seem to be most favoured in the Territory.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Bearing in mind the hopes and recommendations which have been reiterated by the General Assembly and by the Trusteeship Council, I should like to know what steps the Administering Authority is taking in order to replace the head tax with a progressive income tax.

Mr. LEROY (Special representative)(interpretation from French): It is the purpose and the intention also of the Administering Authority to replace the head tax with a better type of taxation, such as an income tax. A head tax, of course, is always somewhat arbitrarily assessed, but hitherto it has been very difficult and it would have been ruinous for the Territory to attempt to ascertain the incomes and to control the collection of an income tax. The Administration, therefore, decided to adopt the head tax system, basing it upon the minimum income in any given area.

On the other hand, this head tax is to some extent amended by a tax on livestock. In the Territory there is a large number of herds of livestock, and the animals number approximately 900,000. The tax is assessed on each animal, and forms a proportionate tax which corrects the blind elements in the head tax. But, I would repeat, the Administration considers that the head tax is a purely temporary form which has to be maintained for the time being, but which we hope to improve upon in the future.

A form of income tax exists already in the case of those indigenous inhabitants whose income is higher than a given minimum figure.

Mr. TSARAFKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Could the special representative tell us what measures have already been taken and what measures are envisaged to put an end to the exploitation of child labour in the Territory?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative)(interpretation from French): To my knowledge, there are no cases of abuse of child labour in the Territory. Children are not employed in the non-native enterprises. Children are often used as shepherds for the herds owned by the indigenous inhabitants. This work is not particularly fatiguing and we have had no reason to interfere in this practice. If we could immediately make education compulsory and provide the facilities so that every child could go to school, then undoubtedly we should have to enact legislation so that children would be freed from all obligation to work. However, since we cannot ensure full and compulsory education, we believe it is not a bad idea to allow these children to co-operate with their families by taking care of the animals. This is a normal procedure for children, whether in Africa or elsewhere.

Mr. TSARAFKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Can the special representative tell us what is the position with regard to child labour in industry, for instance, in cotton-processing plants or similar industries?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): To my knowledge, child labour is not employed in industrial plants in Ruanda-Urundi. Those who recruit native workers have to issue medical certificates to their employees, and the certificate has to testify to the ability of the native worker to do the job that he is called upon to do. It is possible that at certain seasons, and particularly in native circles, children are called upon to help in the coffee harvest. But the work carried out is never very arduous and, so far as I know, there is no urgent need to interfere with it.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We read in the report that in 1952 agricultural machinery was imported into Ruanda-Urundi. Could we be told how this agricultural equipment was distributed? Was it distributed among the native African population, too?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): I have no knowledge of the distribution of imported farm equipment among natives. Most of this equipment was given over to the experimental farms of l'Ineac, and I think that in the areas of Nyanza and Kigali these implements assisted native agricultural ventures. They were placed at the disposal of the native authorities, the chiefdoms, for experimental purposes and for purposes of demonstration.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Do the natives make use in agriculture of artificial fertilizers, of chemical fertilizers?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): Hitherto, the natives have not used chemical fertilizers. Considerable propaganda on the part of the Administration was required to persuade them to make use of natural fertilizers. The natives used to employ very primitive methods in order to rejuvenate land of low productivity. It is the Europeans who taught them to use natural fertilizers. Chemical fertilizers are not used because they are very expensive, having to be imported. In any case, as another representative pointed out a while ago, these fertilizers have not offered very satisfactory results in these areas.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It appears from the report that there are 2.8 hectares of land for an average native family, and in some areas only 1.5 hectares, while an average non-native family has approximately 75 hectares of land, and in some areas 200 hectares. How can this uneven distribution of land between the natives and the non-natives be explained?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): There are natives who have considerable acreage. Of course, if one bases his figures and his averages on the few hundred non-natives and the 4 million natives, one arrives at results such as those just cited by the representative of the Soviet Union. I would remind him, however, that the non-natives hold a total area of 224 square kilometres, and that is really hardly anything at all when one considers the over-all area of the Territory.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): On page 91, there is an indication that alienation of native-owned land is being carried out. What are the motives of this land alienation? We know that these lands belong to the natives, and therefore it would be interesting to know for what reason they are being alienated. Is it done with the consent of the population and, in general, how is it organized?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): I think I have already replied to that question twice. The Administration has a policy of restricting land alienation as far as possible. Better than anyone else, we know that the area is densely populated and the possibilities of land alienation are small. Nevertheless, there is a quota of non-native activities which is absolutely indispensable in order to promote the progress of the native population. We need land to build airfields, we need land for roads, we need land in order to build industrial plants, we need land for hospitals and schools. Even from an agricultural point of view, there are certain areas where native activities are not very well developed, where the population is more scarce --

because we know that the population is less scarce on the tablelands. In those areas where the population is fairly scarce, it is worth-while to farm out land to non-native settlers because, wherever there is a non-native settler, there is the beginning of a social life, the beginning of a community life, there is a possibility to occupy manpower, and there is also a direct economic benefit. The Administration is restricting this, in any case, but in some areas it is indispensable. I think I have already explained this at length.

Political advancement

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): It is with some hesitation that I approach this task of asking questions on the political affairs of Ruanda-Urundi because in that Territory political life, as it is usually understood and as it obtains in most of the other Territories in Africa is conspicuous chiefly by its absence. Nevertheless, there are some points on which clarification would be useful and which might dispel our misgivings.

According to resolutions 558 (VI) and 752 (VIII) of the General Assembly, the Administering Authority is expected to fix a date for the granting or the achievement of independence by the Trust Territories. Despite the well-known attitude of the Administering Authority on those two resolutions, I wonder whether the special representative could now indicate that date. If this could not be done in terms of any particular year being mentioned, could we at least be told in which decade, the fifties, the sixties or the seventies, that the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi is likely to attain independence.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I cannot reply to this question. However, to a large extent, the answer to the question is dependent upon the indigenous inhabitants.

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): I will not press for an answer.

The Visiting Mission, in paragraph 66 of its report, expressed the opinion that the Administering Authority should try to bring about closer co-operation between the two areas of Ruanda and Urundi. In the following year, however, the system of political reforms, was promulgated in July 1952 and is contained on page 21 of the Administering Authority's report. It begins with the statement that the Territory remains divided into two sections according to tradition.

We share the Visiting Mission's opinion that these two sections ought to be brought closer together. We should like to be informed by the special representative what steps must be taken to effect this or whether it is the fixed policy of the Administering Authority to keep these two areas apart for all time to come. Would we be correct in saying that, though administratively divided, these two sections are racially and linguistically homogeneous?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French):

The existence of these two States of Ruanda and Urundi has been a traditional fact. The division between the two Territories would be complete were it not for the presence of the Belgian Administration. This Administration has always exerted all possible efforts to bring about a union of the Territories and to try to enable the indigenous inhabitants to further their common interests. However, here we are confronted with a great deal of opposition on the part of the population. The Urundi considers himself a Urundi and a Ruanda considers himself a Ruanda. Neither is prepared to consider any sort of a merger.

The steps which we have taken in order to try to bring about this union have been the following. For instance, in the school group of Astrida, Ruanda and Urundi students both attend. There is also the existence of Usumbure which has become a sort of federal capital where the interests of Ruanda and Urundi come together. We have to bear in mind that each one of these indigenous States considers itself entirely independent from the other.

We were told a moment ago that they had the same ethnic and linguistic background. It is true that the two States are very similar ethnically and linguistically but they are not identical. Linguistically, it has not been possible to carry out any union between the States although many specialists have endeavoured to do this.

Mr. ALI-KHAN (India): We note that out of the twenty-two members of the Council of the Vice Governor-General, only three are representatives of the local people, whether ex officio or nominated. Could we be informed as to whether the Administering Authority has any steps under consideration to increase the local representation on this Council? Can the Administering Authority also specify the matters in which advice is given by this Council?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French):

It is true that up to 1953 only three natives sat on the Council. In my preliminary statement, I made it clear that five natives would very probably be sitting on the Council from 1954 on. However, it is not accurate to state that in the Council there are only three representatives of the indigenous inhabitants. There are three Africans sitting on the Council but the Governor

of Ruanda-Urundi, the King's Procurer, the two Residents, the persons selected for their competence in this field and the representatives of the indigenous inhabitants -- all these persons are directly concerned with the interests of the indigenous inhabitants. These interests are frequently much more ably defended by the Governor, the heads of the Protestant Missions, the King's Attorney etc. than by the indigenous inhabitants themselves.

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): The special representative has not answered the second part of my question. I wanted to know in what matters the Council's advice is taken.

Mr. IEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): The Council gives its views on all budgetary matters. This is compulsory. Moreover, it also gives its views on all questions submitted to it by the Governor of Ruanda-Urundi or by three members of the Council.

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): I wonder if it would be possible for the special representative to tell the Council how many days the Council of the Vice Governor-General met during 1953, for instance?

Mr. IEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): I think that the Council of the Vice Governor-General sat for one week, over a period of five days. I am not quite certain on this point. If I am mistaken at all, it is by half a day.

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): It is noted that these political reforms were promulgated in July 1952 and entered into force in August 1953. If my memory is correct, they were first mentioned in the report of the Administering Authority in 1948. In spite of the fact that these so-called reforms are modest, it has taken some five years to enact them. Could the Administering Authority indicate the difficulties which may have led to this delay which could be of interest to us when taking into account the possibilities of future political advancement?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): It was stated a priori that these were very limited reforms. That does not happen to be the case. This political reform will radically alter the political structure of Ruanda and of Urundi. Previously, there was a Mwami and his chiefs, and he enjoyed very extensive powers. The Mwami was assisted by an advisory council in the State which could not, however, go counter to the decisions of the Mwami. There was a council in the chiefdoms for the chiefs, and these councils also provided advisory opinions to these chiefs. At present a whole series of councils have been set up, and in a large number of cases decisions can be taken by the Mwami only if the councils concur in this decision. The delay was caused by the careful study which was made of the texts involved, the study of the reform itself; the delay was also due to accustoming the native population to this decrease in the power of the Bami and in the powers of the chiefs. They had to be accustomed to this democratic system according to which a council can impose its will upon the chief. Those are the major reasons for the delay mentioned.

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): Paragraph 23 of the report of the Administering Authority states quite flatly that the right of vote is not recognized for any section of the population, -- presumably on a national scale. It appears from the reports of other Administering Authorities that an electoral system, advanced to a greater or a lesser degree, has been established in other Trust Territories in Africa. Could the special representative indicate the factors distinctive to the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi and not common to other Territories which have so far rendered impracticable the establishment of even the most elementary electoral system?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): The only factor which, to my mind, should be taken into consideration in this respect is that the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi is a territory which has a hierarchical structure, a much more feudal territory, very probably, than any other African Territory. This Territory of Ruanda-Urundi had contact with democratic ideas

only since the Mandate of 1924-1925. Since this time the Administering Authority, in accordance with the recommendations of the Visiting Missions and the Trusteeship Council, has repeatedly endeavoured to have the indigenous inhabitants take part in some of the local elections so that they might be educated along this line. You may remember that I mentioned these elections to the Council. They were particularly disappointing. They took place in the extra-tribal centre of Usumbura. Here the natives, even the literate natives, considered that the ballots were lottery tickets and came forward to claim their prizes. We met with a similar failure in Ruhengeri. In 1953, after having trained the population very extensively, we did carry out elections in the extra-tribal centres which were properly and regularly carried out. The elections which took place in the various chiefdoms for the election of the Council now take place in a very regular and orderly manner.

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): We have noted that there are two parallel and quite distinct administrations in this Territory, the European and the local, with the latter executing the decisions taken by the former. The Belgian administration has stated in previous sessions that it was its policy to achieve independence for the Territory at some future date by the gradual transfer of power from the European administration to the local administration and not by the introduction of local persons into the European administration. My delegation would like to know if the Administering Authority is still of that view.

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): This is a rather complex matter. Last year in the Council I was asked how the Administering Authority viewed this development for self-government and independence. At that time I stated that it was difficult for me to depict the approach of the Administration but, speaking in a strictly personal capacity, I felt that there were two means of following this course. One would be the gradual transference of power from the European authorities to the local indigenous authorities; the other would be to have Europeans in the present

Administration replaced little by little by indigenous employees, keeping, however, the original structure of the Administration. I pointed out at that time that if the second course were followed we would be confronted with a serious difficulty which would arise because of the co-existence of an indigenous customary hierarchy, which is very strong and powerful, and also an indigenous hierarchy which would have replaced the European Administration and which would have adopted many of its methods and views. I simply mention these two examples as possibilities and not as a decision on the part of the Administration that this or that process would be followed. In point of fact -- and here again I am speaking in my personal capacity and what I say is not to be construed as an ex cathedra statement on the part of the Administering Authority -- personally, I believe that this evolution will have to take place through a combination of these two courses I have mentioned. There can be no doubt that we cannot at this time foresee all the problems which will crop up and arrange for a solution to these problems beforehand.

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): The description of the political reforms given on page 21 of the Administering Authority's report states that members of the Sub-Chiefdom Councils, as well as the Chiefdom Council and the Territorial Council, would all be notables chosen by their peers. The special representative merely described them as members in his opening statement. Are all these members notables?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): At present all members are notables. Because in the Sub-Chiefdom Councils there is the Sub-Chief and five to nine notables chosen by their peers from a panel of the notables in the Sub-Chiefdom. However, we should not take the word "notable" as having the usual connotation. The Administration has endeavoured to have the chiefs and sub-chiefs consider as notables not only the notables, according to the local customs, but all those who in one way or another carry certain weight and who have some influence and authority in the chiefdom. That is why not only the heads of families under customary law were considered to be notables but also artisans and persons who had attained a certain standing and who showed some interest in public matters.

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): In the light of this answer, would we then be correct in saying that the only people taking part, in however remote a way, in the Government of Ruanda-Urundi, on its political side, who are not chiefs, sub-chiefs or notables, are the four people designated to be members of the Superior Council who have to be holders of the Civil Merit Certificate or registered?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): As I just stated, in the sub-chiefdom Council certain persons who are going into customary law, who have no qualifications, can still become members of the sub-chiefdom Council. That is how it happens that certain artisans have become members of the Council, as well as medical aides and natives who, within the limited radius of the chiefdom, have manifested interest in public matters. All these persons can become members of the chiefdom Council since the chiefdom Council comprises five to nine notables elected by an electoral college comprised of three notables per sub-chiefdom, appointed by the sub-chiefdom Council. Therefore they can, from the sub-chiefdom Council, go on to the chiefdom Council and then higher up to the other councils. Thus, some of these persons who have no standing in customary law can be found active among the eighteen notables of the Council elected by the Territorial Council, that is, one per territory.

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): According to the special representative, all these councils merely have the right to give opinions on questions of interest to the territorial area concerned, and the higher Council of the country is merely consulted concerning the draft decrees of the Mwami. Does this mean that none of these councils have any executive power?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): The influence and the role of these councils is much more extensive and weighty than the representative of India seems to believe. When the Mwami reaches

a decision, this decision can be taken only with the concurrence of the Council, and therefore the Council can prevent the Mwami from taking any given decision. For instance, considering the decree at random, we will find that "with the concurrence of the Council, the chief may decide that all men must take part in collective work for a period not to exceed forty days". If the Council does not concur in this decision then it binds to its view the chief and the Mwami. In almost any page of the decree we will find the wording that

"the Mwami or the chief, with the concurrence of the Council, may decide", and so on.

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): I am interested in that. Is there any possibility of forming the present local authorities, namely the two Bami, the eighty-seven chiefs and the 1,127 sub-chiefs, most of whom we are told are illiterate, into some sort of local parliament or assembly, with some degree of executive power? What would be the practical obstacles of some such step towards representative government?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): The establishment of the councils, as provided for under the decree of 14 July 1952, is a first step towards a change in existing institutions. We do not consider that this decree is the last word but we consider that it is a new step towards a democratization of existing institutions.

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): The special representative referred to certain political decrees which were put into operation in the Territory in September 1952 concerning the registration of civilized native population. Such registered people enjoyed the rights and fulfilled the duties established by law. What criteria is used to decide whether or not a person is civilized, and what are the rights or duties which are then conferred upon such people?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): The natives who are registered come under the terms of written law and no longer under the terms of customary law. In other words, from a practical point of view, from the point of view of penal law and civil law, they have exactly the same position as non-indigenous inhabitants.

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): Will the special representative be good enough to give us some details of the elections which took place for these various councils. What were the electoral qualifications, how many people were entitled to vote, and how many people did vote? Were there any rival candidates and any electoral campaigns?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): In my preliminary statement I gave some of the first electoral results as well as some of the results of the electoral reform of 1952. These results were available to me before I left Usumbura. It might perhaps be of interest to the representative of India to be informed of the manner in which the elections of the various councils took place. Would this information be of interest to the representative of India.

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): Yes.

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): As I stated, it was in August of 1953 that the decree of 1952 came into force. On 10 July 1953 the Governor promulgated an ordinance in which the following measures are provided: Every three years, on the first Sunday of October, and for the first time before 4 October 1953, each sub-chief will transmit to his chief, in duplicate, a list of notables comprising all persons residing within his sub-chiefdom, who are qualified to express the opinions of the inhabitants.

I would call the attention of the Trusteeship Council to the fact that these notables are considered as able and qualified to express the views of the population, inasmuch as this was introduced in order to avoid a situation in which the customary notables would merely be appointed. This was designed so that all qualified persons could become members of the Council regardless of their traditional customary standings.

This list will comprise at least ten notables in certain sub-chiefdoms, fourteen in other chiefdoms, at least eighteen in other chiefdoms, and at least twenty notables in the sub-chiefdoms which have more than fifteen hundred taxable persons. The chief will cite this list to the administrator of the Territory before the following November. This list must be published and posted. A month after the posting of the list, the notables will select the members for the sub-chiefdom Council. This takes place by means of written ballot and each notable receives a ballot with the seal of the Territory, upon which he inscribes the names of the notables on the list whom he would like to have sit as members of the Council. Illiterate notables are assisted in this by persons of their choice. The ballots are deposited in a ballot box and the voting procedures are presided over the chief of the chiefdom, assisted by the two sub-chiefs, in particular of the sub-chiefdom where the election is taking place.

Two sub-chiefs act as tellers and the results of the vote are transmitted to the Administration. The ballots are deposited in the archives of the Territory, being destroyed six months later. The results of the vote are made public in writing through the administrator of the territory.

The PRESIDENT: May I tell the special representative that we have the most excellent interpreters here, but the rate at which the special representative is reading is a little rapid.

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): I must apologize to the members of the Council and to the interpreters for having inflicted this hardship upon them. I have been reading a text and apparently I was a little carried away by my enthusiasm.

As a matter of fact, I wonder whether it is really necessary for me to read any more of this text. I read the part of the text dealing with the Sub-Chiefdom Councils, and this would also apply to the Chiefdom Council, the Territorial Council and the Conseil supérieur du pays. We have taken every step possible in order that all may express their wishes and to ensure that the secret ballot will be respected. I hope that the representative of India will allow me not to read any more of the text.

The representative of India asked whether there were any rival candidates in the electoral campaigns. There were such electoral campaigns in a certain number of chiefdoms. As a matter of fact, they probably occurred in all of them because the people of Ruanda-Urundi find this type of rivalry and competition very appealing.

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): I am grateful to the special representative for this information.

The special representative has referred to elections which were organized in Usumbura in November 1953. For what body were these elections held?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): In 1953, elections were held to replace six or seven councillors in the extra-tribal centre of Usumbura.

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): Paragraph 89 of the report of the Visiting Mission suggests that the Administration should make every effort to acquaint all the inhabitants of the Territory with their right of petition. Can the special representative give us precise details as to how this is being done?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): The inhabitants are fully acquainted with their right of petition. They make use of it not only with regard to the administrative authorities but also vis-à-vis the Council. No special publicity or propaganda was engaged in with regard to the right of petition, but in 1949 a code was published setting forth all the provisions of the United Nations Charter and information related to the Trusteeship Council.

I have already spoken about this in the Council. The population -- and here I mean not only the natives but also Asians and Europeans -- frequently addresses petitions and requests to the Administration. We receive a substantial number of such petitions and requests.

As regards the right of petition to the Trusteeship Council, it may be stated that at the present time the entire population is fully acquainted with this right. The inhabitants make use of this right of petition, of which the members of the Council are well aware.

All news relating to the United Nations as well as to the Territory in general is very rapidly disseminated throughout the Territory, particularly by word of mouth by the native population.

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): What actual transfer of power has taken place between the European administration and the local administration? Of the 559 local inhabitants listed as taking part in the administration of the Territory, how many occupy executive posts?

Mr. LEROY (Special representative) (interpretation from French): A reply to the first question is given in the report. The decree of 14 July 1952 was to have provided for the transfer of certain powers hitherto held by the European authorities to the Bami and to the native authorities. Thus, for example, the present determination of the limits of the chiefdoms and the sub-chiefdoms in the territorial organization has come within the competence of the Mwami and his Council. So it is also that the distribution of agricultural work and information to combat disease is in the hands of the native authorities. The Governor confines himself to setting up an over-all plan for the two territories, and the native authorities look after the execution of the plan.

This is also true as regards the decisions for the district budgets. Thus, in the decree of 1952, there are four or five instances in which powers heretofore held by the European authorities have become vested in the native authorities.

The second part of the question of the representative of India was: How many of the 559 natives employed in the Administration hold executive posts? I have already, at a prior session, replied to this question. There are two administrations in Ruanda-Urundi: a European administration and a customary indigenous administration. In the European administration, there are approximately 50 posts which can be considered as highly responsible posts. At the present time these are all in the hands of Europeans. In the indigenous administration, there are the two Bami and the ninety chiefs, who can be considered as executive officials. In this case, of course, they are all indigenous inhabitants.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any further questions on this section of the report?

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Might we ascertain how long we are going to sit today?

The PRESIDENT: I had in mind, subject to the approval of the Council, that we should follow the rule that seems to be adhered to in the Committees of the General Assembly which is that, when we meet on Saturday morning we should sit until two o'clock. With the concurrence of representatives of course, I should be very happy to sit even longer so that we may finish the questions. I am, however, in the hands of the Council. There is a most earnest desire on the part of some representatives to sit as long as possible in order to deal with these matters, and I shall be very happy to meet their convenience. I imagine that the representative of the Soviet Union has a certain number of questions to ask concerning this part of the report. Is he ready to ask them today?

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am quite prepared to put my questions today. But it is, after all, Saturday.

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): It might help if we could get some idea as to whether it is possible to finish the questioning on this Territory today. For my part, I think it is rather unlikely, but if it were possible to finish by two o'clock, or even half past two, I would have no objection to remaining. However, if we cannot finish today, it is obvious that we must have another meeting devoted to this Territory, and then the force of the argument for sitting longer today is lost.

The PRESIDENT: I am indebted to the representative of Australia because the implications of this are, briefly, these, that if we do not continue to sit today, then we proceed on Monday, 15 March, and finish our questions then -- and then the possibility of getting on with the debate becomes a little more remote, and so it goes, and some representatives become dissatisfied. Could I have an idea of how many representatives are ready to ask questions today?

Mr. PIGNON (France) (interpretation from French): I have no questions.

Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) (interpretation from French): I have no questions for the time being. I should not like to delay the Council any longer.

Mr. S.S. LIU (China): I have only a few questions.

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): I have no questions.

Mr. SERRANO-GARCIA (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): I have two questions.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): I have no questions.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I have no questions.

Mr. TARAŽI (Syria) (interpretation from French): I have several questions, but I am not prepared to put them today.

Mr. RYCKMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, will you please request representatives to be ready to put their questions on Ruanda-Urundi on Monday, 15 March?

The PRESIDENT: Not only will I ask that, but I will also ask all representatives to be ready to proceed with the general debate after the questions have been asked.

The Committee on Administrative Unions will meet on 15 March at 10.15 a.m. in Conference Room 11. The Drafting Committee on Tanganyika will meet at 10.45 a.m. on 15 March in Conference Room 8. The Committee on Indigenous Participation will meet on Monday afternoon, 15 March, at 2 o'clock in Conference Room 7.

The Council will meet on 15 March at 2 p.m.

58
The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.