



Thirteenth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 24 March 1954, at 2.30 p.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.524 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

54-08312

PARTICIPATION OF THE INDIGENOUS INHABITANTS OF THE TRUST TERRITORIES IN THE WORK OF THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PARTICIPATION OF INDIGENOUS INHABITANTS IN THE WORK OF THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL (T/L.447, L.458)
[Agenda item 9] (continued)

The PRESIDENT: The Council has before it the amendments (T/L.459) proposed by the delegation of Haiti. We are now in a position to proceed to the vote, unless any member of the Council desires to give an explanation of vote.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I should like first of all to pay a tribute to the representative of Haiti for his attempt, in submitting these amendments to the draft resolution, to secure some compromise between the two opposing views in the Council. We are all greatly indebted to him for his effort.

I still feel quite unable to do anything but oppose the reference in the preamble to rule 61 of the provisional rules of procedure. If that remains in the draft resolution, I shall have to vote against it.

As regards the amendments proposed by the representative of Haiti, I would suggest that in paragraph 4, which refers to operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, the words "give consideration to granting" should be substituted for the word "grant". The paragraph would then read: "it will immediately give consideration to granting a hearing to all appropriate representatives ...".

If that amendment to the Haitian amendment is accepted, and the reference to rule 61 of the provisional rules of procedure is deleted from the draft resolution, my delegation will not oppose the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): I should be grateful if the President would ask the Secretary to read to the Council the amendment proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom. I was unable to take it all down.

The SECRETARY: The amendment proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom to paragraph 4 of the Haitian amendments seeks to substitute for the words "it will immediately grant a hearing" the words "it will immediately give consideration to granting a hearing". This refers to operative paragraph 3 of the Syrian draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT: I think that I should inform representatives for their guidance that according to our rules of procedure, at any rate with regard to oral hearings, the Council's jurisdiction is discretionary.

Mr. McKAY (United States of America): I, too, would like to express my appreciation to the representative of Haiti for his efforts to make this draft resolution meet some of the points raised by my delegation. I should, however, be unable to accept the paragraph recalling rule 61 of the provisional rules of procedure. I should have to vote against that because it was rejected in this Council on an earlier occasion and my delegation's position on it remains what it was then.

With regard to the last paragraph, the position of my delegation has always been that we are sympathetic to the granting of oral hearings, and we vote for the granting of such hearings whenever we feel that they are merited. That very fact makes it imperative for us to consider whether a hearing is merited or not. Therefore, if the proposal of the representative of the United Kingdom were accepted -- that is to say, if the paragraph were made to read "immediately give consideration to granting a hearing" -- and if the reference to rule 61 were deleted, my delegation also would not oppose the Syrian draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT: Does any other representative wish to speak on the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom?

Mr. ASHA (Syria): Before I speak on the United Kingdom amendment, and before I reply to the representative of the United States, I should like first to address myself to the draft amendments proposed by the representative of Haiti. I had a few moments of discussion with Mr. Dorsinville, and I gladly accepted some of his amendments after consulting my delegation. I was, however, quite reluctant to accept the amendment proposed in paragraph 4 of his document (T/L.459). Now that two delegations representing Administering Authorities have opposed this fourth amendment submitted by Haiti, I shall certainly not accept the proposal made by the representative of the United Kingdom and the representative of the United States at all. I shall, therefore, accept only the first three amendments, and will reject the proposed deletion of the reference to rule 61 of the provisional rules of procedure.

The PRESIDENT: I think I should draw the attention of members of the Council to rule 80 of our rules of procedure. I am concerned here only with what are the actual rules. Rule 80 says:

"The Trusteeship Council may hear oral presentations in support or elaboration of a previously submitted written petition...The Trusteeship Council, in exceptional cases, may also hear orally petitions which have not been previously submitted in writing..."

Members of the Council can consider for themselves for the moment what is the relevancy of that rule to the amendment proposed by Haiti which says that the Council "will immediately grant a hearing".

If I may address myself to the representative of Syria, I understood him to say, although I cannot be sure, that he was not prepared to consent to the amendment proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom to paragraph 4 of the amendments submitted by Haiti.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): I said that I would not accept the proposed amendment to the Haitian amendment, but I am quite prepared to accept the representative of Haiti's amendment as it is embodied in paragraph 4 of document T/L.459.

The PRESIDENT: In other words, the representative of Syria accepts the Haitian amendments but not the amendment proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): That is correct.

Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation has examined with the greatest of care the suggestions which have been submitted as formal amendments by the Haitian delegation. We shall support them, but we should like to say that we cannot support the second amendment proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom since it does not accord with the point of view which we have maintained throughout the whole development of this question.

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): I should like to request that the draft resolution be put to the vote in parts if it is the intention of the President to proceed to the vote now.

The PRESIDENT: Unless I hear any objection it is my intention to put the draft resolution to the vote paragraph by paragraph. When we come to any paragraph to which an amendment has been proposed by the representative of Haiti or the representative of the United Kingdom I shall, of course, put the amendment first.

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): I should like to be perfectly clear about what I have to vote on. I understood that the representative of Syria had accepted the amendments proposed by the representative of Haiti. In that case the Syrian proposal is presented to us as amended by the representative of Haiti.

The PRESIDENT: That is what I propose to do.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): I am sorry if I allowed myself to be misunderstood in some measure. I accepted the amendments proposed by the representative of Haiti, but I did not accept the United Kingdom amendment. If there is to be a vote also on the United Kingdom amendment I do not quite know how I can vote on the Haitian amendments -- particularly on paragraph 4.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Syria need have no concern on that score. I shall put to the Council his draft resolution as amended by the representative of Haiti.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I have done my best by making an offer. If that is not acceptable, I shall vote against the draft resolution as a whole, and it may save the President a great deal of trouble if I withdraw my amendment. I offered that amendment in the hope of effecting a compromise, but I see that that is impossible.

The PRESIDENT: In those circumstances, it may be preferable for the Council to vote on the Syrian draft resolution as a whole, as amended; the representative of Syria has accepted the amendments submitted by the representative of Haiti. I am, however, in the hands of the Council in this matter.

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): In the light of the statements which have just been made, I am quite agreeable to the Council's voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

The PRESIDENT: Since there is no objection, I shall put to the vote the Syrian draft resolution, with the amendments which have been proposed by the representative of Haiti and accepted by the representative of Syria.

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 votes against.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the rules of procedure, I again put the draft resolution, as amended, to the vote.

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 votes against. The draft resolution, as amended, was not adopted.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): Since the very mild draft resolution presented by my delegation has not been adopted, I feel obliged to tell the Trusteeship Council that the whole matter will be brought before the General Assembly. We reserve our right to deal with the question at length, if necessary, and to present to the Assembly the original text of our draft resolution, without the amendments submitted by the representative of Haiti.

Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): I do not think that it is necessary for me to give an explanation of vote now, because my delegation has spoken at great length on this matter. I should simply like to say that El Salvador reserves its right to present this draft resolution to the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly, or to present another draft resolution calling for a solution of the problem.

Mr. McKAY (United States of America): In explaining my vote, I should like to say that, in the Committee on Indigenous Participation, my delegation indicated its willingness to support a reasonable and moderate draft resolution. I had thought that in the Committee we were coming very close, at one time, to finding a reasonable and moderate proposal which would meet certain of the legal and practical objections raised by my delegation at previous sessions of the Council and the General Assembly. Other delegations, however, were unable to accept proposals which seemed reasonable and moderate and which my delegation would have been able to accept. I should like this statement to appear in the summary record of this meeting.

Mr. PIGNON (France)(interpretation from French): I should like to express my very sincere regret at the fact that the United Kingdom amendments were not accepted. For our part, we had very much hoped that there would be a spirit of conciliation as regards this subject; we had very much hoped that some compromise might be reached. I can only repeat that I sincerely regret that the efforts in that direction have failed.

Mr. SCHEYVEN (Belgium)(interpretation from French): I voted against the Syrian draft resolution because it contained two kinds of proposals to which I objected. The first kind was, in my opinion, contrary to the interests of the populations of the Trust Territories, and the proposals, if implemented, would have been very dangerous. The second kind referred to practices which are already in force and have been in force for some time in the Trust Territories; those practices should therefore not be the subject of a new draft resolution.

Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand): I should like to explain why my delegation voted against the Syrian draft resolution, as amended.

We should have been willing to vote for the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom representative. Had that amendment been accepted, we should not have voted against the draft resolution as a whole. We believed that it was objectionable in principle for the Trusteeship Council to recall a rule of procedure which it had previously rejected.

Furthermore, my delegation had great difficulty in understanding exactly what was meant by the various paragraphs of the draft resolution, and in particular paragraph 3 of the operative part.

Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador)(interpretation from Spanish): I should like to refer to the statement just made by the United States representative. My delegation was more or less in the same position as the United States delegation; that is, we were seeking the most constructive means of reaching agreement. In view, however, of the positions held by some delegations in this Council, we had no choice but to vote as we voted. Representatives will remember that I stated my delegation's position in presenting the Committee's report yesterday. I should like that statement to be included in the summary record of the meeting.

SPECIAL INFORMATION REQUIRED CONCERNING THE ACTION TAKEN ON CERTAIN PETITIONS:
73rd REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS (T/L.444) Agenda item 47

The PRESIDENT: The Standing Committee on Petitions has circulated to members of the Trusteeship Council a report on information furnished by the Government of France in connexion with resolutions adopted by the Council at its twelfth session; those resolutions concerned the Cameroons under French Administration and Togoland under French Administration. That information from the French Government has been circulated in document T/OBS.5/22.

I would suggest that the Council should take note of the report of the Standing Committee on Petitions.

It was so decided.

ADMINISTRATIVE UNIONS AFFECTING TRUST TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE STANDING
COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE UNIONS (T/L.449) Agenda item 77

The PRESIDENT: The Standing Committee on Administrative Unions has submitted to the Council a report concerning the work it has done during the Council's thirteenth session. In paragraph 5 of that report, the Standing Committee informs the Council that it has:

"also studied the procedure to be followed in the study of administrative unions affecting the Trust Territories and decided to transmit to the fourteenth session of the Trusteeship Council its suggestions on this matter".

I suggest that no action is required on that report and that the Council should simply take note of it.

Mr. TSARAËKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I should like to ask a question about the Standing Committee's report. What rules of procedure are applicable to the consideration of administrative unions? Or are new rules of procedure being prepared? What is the matter which it is intended to submit to the Trusteeship Council's fourteenth session?

Mr. MCKAY (United States of America): The Standing Committee on Administrative Unions operates under certain terms of reference given to it by the Council. Those terms of reference were drawn up several years ago. As the situation in certain of the administrative unions has changed since that time, some members of the Committee felt that as the circumstances in the Territories had changed since the date on which the terms of reference of the Committee were set up, it might be helpful to the Council if the Committee were to consider whether there might be any modifications which it would be worth while for the Committee to suggest for the Council's consideration. If the Committee did decide to suggest such modifications in order to improve the Committee's and the Council's study of administrative unions, then the Council would consider those suggestions and if it felt that they had any merit, the Council might wish to give new terms of reference to the Committee.

I am not able to go into any of the particular points which were raised because that, I think, would not fall within my province as Chairman of the Committee at this time, but I hope that what I have said meets the point missed by the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I would like to know whether the rules which govern the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions cover consideration of the question of its own scope of competence. In other words, under its terms of reference, is the Committee competent to make and consider a proposal to revise its rules of procedure?

The PRESIDENT: Before I call on the representative of the United States, I might say that it is clear that only recommendations could be made, which would have to be dealt with by the Council itself.

Mr. MCKAY (United States of America): That is the position.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): I take it, then, that the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions can only make recommendations. I did not for a moment think of the possibility of the Committee changing its own rules of procedure and adopting new rules, but I should like to know whether its terms of reference permit the Committee to propose amendments to its own rules of procedure to apply in future consideration of questions relating to administrative unions.

Mr. MCKAY (United States of America): The terms of reference of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions require the Committee to apply what are called the four safeguards, which the Council has laid down, to each of the administrative unions and, through a change which was made in the terms of reference over a year ago, a new phrase was added, namely, "to take into account the interests of the people". Representatives will doubtless remember that small change being made. The Committee, I think, approached this in a pragmatic way, feeling that its only interest was in doing a good job on administrative unions and believing that the Council might appreciate receiving some suggestions. They would, of course, be only suggestions. The Committee was trying to take a little initiative in order to help the Council to do the best possible job in its examinations. If the Council felt that the Committee had over-stepped its terms of reference, that would put a new light on the matter.

The PRESIDENT: It is perfectly clear that we are only taking note of the report and that the Council is not bound by what the Committee does but will hear recommendations at the next session of the Council. Therefore, I propose that, as no action is required, the Council should simply take note of the report.

It was so decided.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON CREDENTIALS (T/1101 AND CORR.1, Add.1)

Agenda item 27

The PRESIDENT: Before we proceed to the debate on this item I wish to give some explanation of it.

It will be appreciated by representatives that this is the report of the Secretary-General, and not of the President. The point to which I wish to direct attention is sub-section (c) of the report, headed "Observers of States Members of the United Nations", and I propose to read the words of the Secretary-General's report:

"The following members of permanent delegations have been designated as observers to the thirteenth session of the Trusteeship Council on behalf of their permanent missions:"

Then follows "ARGENTINA Observer:", followed by the name of the gentleman who is designated as observer; after that, "BRAZIL Observer:", and the name of the gentleman who is designated as observer to the United Nations.

At the outset of the session I met the representative of Brazil and discussed this matter with him. I want to say that, speaking for myself and, no doubt, for all representatives on the Council, I am delighted to see that representatives of various delegations are interested in the work of this Council, and it has been a source of pleasure to me to see not only the representatives of these two mentioned delegations present, but also representatives of other delegations, one or two of whom, I think, I see here at this time. It is important that, in the various organs of the United Nations, of which the Trusteeship Council is not the least important, there should be present, watching and taking note of our deliberations, representatives of other Members of the United Nations.

Now I come to the use of the term "observer", and in this connexion I would refer to rule 12 of the rules of procedure, which reads as follows:

"Members of the United Nations which are not members of the Trusteeship Council but which have proposed items on the agenda of that Council shall be invited to have present at the appropriate meetings of the Council representatives who shall be entitled to participate, without vote, in the deliberations on those items."

The next rule provides for the invitation of representatives of specialized agencies to attend our meetings and, again, to participate without vote. These are the only rules that provide for Members of the United Nations to attend as observers or to attend, at any rate, without a vote, and to participate in the discussions. I am not, of course, referring to the position of the representative of Italy. These are the only rules that provide for Members of the United Nations who are not members of the Trusteeship Council but who have proposed items on the agenda to be entitled to be present, and it was on account of those rules that I felt, in my capacity as President, that I could not provide a seat here for a representative of another delegation with the word "observer" placed in front of his seat. I am only here to watch the observance of the rules, but I hasten to add that I have been delighted to see these ladies and gentlemen present.

I did suggest to the representative of Brazil that I would be happy, subject to the authorization of the Council, to provide seats along the table where the specialized agencies are represented, which would have in front of them the words "Seats reserved for members of the United Nations". But I have not had any observations made to me on that particular matter by the representative of Brazil. It is also clear, from what I have heard, that while that gentleman has a very proper interest in the affairs of the Trusteeship Council, he is not asking for such a seat. As I understand it, he is not requesting any special privilege but he is asking, I presume -- I may be wrong -- to be called "Observer".

I want to carry the members of the Council a little further in their study of these rules. If I may recapitulate, there are only certain Members of the United Nations who are entitled to take part in our deliberations. They are those who have placed items on the agenda. They can participate in our debates but they cannot vote. Rule 14 of the rules of procedure says the following:

"The credentials of representatives on the Trusteeship Council shall normally be communicated to the Secretary-General not less than twenty-four hours before the meeting at which the representatives will take their seats."

Then paragraph 2 of rule 14 says that "the credentials shall be examined by the Secretary-General" -- that is, the credentials of the members of the Council -- "who shall submit a report thereon to the Trusteeship Council for approval". That report is before the members in document T/1101.

But these gentlemen who have been designated as observers by their respective delegations are in another category. In my opinion, as President, we cannot approve this particular section of the report because we have no power to do so under the rules. There will be other matters in this report which will be open for discussion and there may be members who desire to comment on the credentials. No doubt, it will be preferable to vote on this matter part by part. Rule 14 of the rules of procedure provides that the Secretary-General shall submit a report on the credentials of the members of the Council for approval. Unless I hear anything to the contrary I shall, first of all, submit part (a) of the report for the approval of the Council.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The most important statement in the report appears in part (a). In connexion with the report of the Secretary-General with regard to the credentials of the members of the Trusteeship Council, the Soviet Union delegation deems it necessary to state the following: the legitimate and legal representative of China can only be a representative appointed by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. For the above-mentioned reason, the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will vote against the approval of the report on credentials, inasmuch as the report mentions as the representative of China a person of the Kuomintang who is illegally occupying the seat of China in the Council.

Mr. S. S. LIU (China): Of course, as usual, the statement of the Soviet Union representative is out of order and I am sure you will rule him out of order, Mr. President. I want to add that my delegation is in no doubt, of course, as to whom the Soviet Union delegation would like to see seated here in my place. But unfortunately for that delegation, and fortunately for the free world, the puppet regime which the Soviet Union delegation is sponsoring is not the legitimate Government of China and cannot become so as long as the Chinese people reject it, as has been amply proved by recent events of world-wide significance. Besides, the Soviet representative used a name which is not the proper designation of my delegation and, as usual, I ask you, Mr. President, to rule him out of order on both counts.

The PRESIDENT: I have dealt with this matter before and the remarks of the representative of the Soviet Union are out of order.

Mr. SINGH (India): I merely wanted to request a separate vote on the representation of China.

The PRESIDENT: I shall do that. The Trusteeship Council will now vote on the credentials of all States except those of China, as contained in part (a) of the report.

The credentials were approved unanimously.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now proceed to vote of the credentials presented by the head of the State of China.

The credentials were approved by 10 votes to 2.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now proceed to vote on the credentials dealing with the representation of Italy as the Administering Authority of the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration, as contained in part (b).

The credentials were approved unanimously.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now consider part (c) of the report, and the members have heard what I have said regarding it. In my view, I do not see how we can take any action on this section. Unless I hear anything to the contrary, I shall take it as approved that no action be taken in respect of this part of the report.

Mr. PIGNON (France) (interpretation from French): I entirely agree with what you have stated, Mr. President, that the rules of procedure seem to prohibit us from including in a report on credentials the section dealing with observers. However, I think that we are all happy to have the presence in our work this year of several eminent members of other delegations of Member States. It constitutes a proof of interest which not only flatters us but is also an excellent augury for us. We think that our colleagues who have come here and followed our discussions will recall this when the same questions come up again in the Fourth Committee.

I therefore think that it would be appropriate, in some way, to show that we have approved this initiative on the part of certain Governments. I think there is a very obvious place indicated for it. Every year we address to the General Assembly the report of the Trusteeship Council which covers our two sessions. In the first part of the report there is a chapter called "Organization of the Council". In my opinion it would be a simple and quite legitimate matter to add to this report, in its customary form, a final paragraph which would state approximately the following:

"Several Governments of Member States have designated qualified representatives of their permanent delegations in the United Nations to follow the work of the thirteenth and fourteenth sessions. The Council was unanimous in showing its satisfaction at this initiative and this proof of interest."

I think that if we added this in our report to the General Assembly, we would have taken into account an initiative which has really and sincerely been very pleasant for us.

MA/ich

Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador)(interpretation from Spanish): Mr. President, I greatly respect your opinion. I esteem it highly. I also respect the provisions of the Charter and of the rules of procedure and all other matters which bind us. However, this is an exceptional case, so to speak. This is one of the most pleasant occasions, and my delegation is in favour of having this paragraph retained as it now stands.

We should like to make this statement so that it will appear in the record; namely, that my delegation views with the greatest pleasure the presence of observers from the various States Members of the United Nations and we hope that there will be more and more observers with us. On the other hand, although the rules of procedure state in rule 12 that only those "which have proposed items on the agenda...shall be invited", we must not lose sight of the fact that, in the Fourth Committee, all countries intervene directly or indirectly in matters dealt with by this Council. Therefore, I believe that we cannot fail to make special mention here of those who have sent in credentials.

The PRESIDENT: It seems to me that what the representative of France is proposing is more in the nature of a proposal which expresses pleasure at the presence of these representatives here. What the representative of El Salvador is proposing is that we approve of the presence of these gentlemen as observers. I do not know whether I have stated the precise words of the representative of France. Perhaps he would repeat them.

Mr. PIGNON (France)(interpretation from French): I was proposing that we add in the chapter which will be drafted by the Secretariat as chapter I of our report to the General Assembly, a final paragraph. Of course, I am not the author of any special draft. I am simply trying to follow the style of this part of the report. This paragraph, which will be neutral enough to fit in with the report, would say:

"Several Governments of Member States have designated qualified representatives from their permanent delegations to the United Nations

to the Trusteeship Council in order to follow the work of the thirteenth and fourteenth sessions.

"The Council was unanimous in showing its satisfaction at this initiative and this proof of interest."

The PRESIDENT: That is the motion which is before the Council and I shall put it to the vote. It is not an amendment, of course, because we cannot amend the report.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): This must be clarified. We should interpret this point as not involving any juridical consequences.

The PRESIDENT: As I understand the position, it does not involve any juridical consequences, nor could it because we are bound by the rules of procedure and by the Charter. That is my interpretation.

Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador)(interpretation from Spanish): I have listened with the greatest interest to the proposal of the representative of France as well as to the observation of the representative of the Soviet Union. I have two questions. The first is whether the French proposal is not an amendment to this document and does not become a formal proposal calling for the addition of a special mention in the report to the General Assembly. The second is whether it is a proposal referring to the document which we have before us, namely, document T/1101. However, I should like to draw the Council's attention to the fact that we have a formal proposal from El Salvador to the effect that this paragraph should remain as it stands. Therefore, there are two proposals. If possible, I should like some clarification with regard to this matter.

The PRESIDENT: I will clarify it for you very easily. There is part (c). Now, it can be approved by this Council if there is any power to approve it. Actually, in my opinion, there is no power to approve it. But it can be approved if we see fit because "the credentials of representatives referred to in the paragraph immediately preceding and of any representatives appointed in accordance with rule 74 shall be examined by the Secretary-General who shall submit a report thereon to the Trusteeship Council for approval". These two do not come under that category. I can put this proposal to the Council for its approval. However, I think it would be better, more gracious and more sensible, if I may respectfully say so, to put first of all the proposal of the representative of France. But if the representative of El Salvador suggests to me that I put part (c) to the Council for its approval, of course I am bound to do so.

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): It would seem to me entirely proper that the motion of the representative of France be put first for the reason that that motion was made first in point of time. If I recollect aright, the representative of France made his proposal before the representative of El Salvador made his motion for approval of this section of the report. I think it is by now accepted by the Council that the proposal of the representative of France is not an amendment since we are not in a position to amend a report presented by some other authority.

Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador)(interpretation from Spanish): In reference to the statement made by the representative of Australia, I regret that I must say that my delegation was the first to suggest that we maintain this paragraph in the report. Therefore, my delegation believes that if we were to proceed to a vote it would be the proposal of El Salvador which should be voted on first. I should not like to press this point and make a great issue of it. Therefore, in order to avoid difficulties and in order to put an end to this debate which need not be further prolonged -- although I think it is of some importance, if you will pardon my saying so -- I shall leave this matter up to the decision of the President with this reservation. If he were to decide to take a vote on the French proposal because he felt that the proposal of El Salvador was out of place, I would take the liberty of making an amendment to the French proposal. I leave this in his hands.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I entirely agree, if I may say so, with the President's view of the procedural position. It seems to me that we are all extremely happy to have with us the representatives of Argentina, Brazil and the other countries that are represented here. But the proposal of the representative of France seems to me to be a very happy way of escaping from a difficult position. None of us wants to vote against the acceptance of paragraph (c) and, if we were to accept the proposal of the representative of France, we would evade that unpleasant necessity. I shall therefore be very happy to see the French proposal put to the vote.

The PRESIDENT: I propose to put it to the vote now.

Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): In that case, my delegation would propose an amendment to the French proposal. That proposal, according to the Spanish interpretation as I heard it, was that there should be a paragraph somewhere in the report which would say: "Several Governments have designated qualified representatives". My amendment would insert the words "among them Argentina and Brazil" after "Governments", so that the passage would read: "Several Governments, among them Argentina and Brazil, have designated qualified representatives".

Mr. PIGNON (France) (interpretation from French): I accept with very great pleasure the amendment of the representative of El Salvador. I entirely agree with him and I regret that I myself did not propose the inclusion of those words.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): But in the French proposal we intend to mean only Governments representing States Members of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT: I think that is clear, because the statement, as I now have it, would read: "Several Governments of Member States, among them Argentina and Brazil, have designated qualified representatives from their delegations in the United Nations". That could only be Member States, if I may mention that to the representative of the Soviet Union.

Unless there is objection, the proposal will be considered approved.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We now come to paragraph (d), and I shall put to the vote the approval of the credentials of the representatives of the specialized agencies.

The credentials were approved by 11 votes to none.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the report as a whole, omitting paragraph (c), on which there is a separate resolution.

The report as a whole, omitting paragraph (c), was approved by 10 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Soviet Union voted against approval of the report as a whole, and I must repeat our reasons for so doing. We did so because the legal representative of China is not here. The President ruled out of order my first statement on this matter, but I must declare that my statement was quite in order since it affected a point of the agenda which we were in the process of discussing. My statement referred to credentials -- in particular to the credentials of the legal representative of China, who should be here. Therefore, while I view my statement as being quite in order, I view as being out of order the situation which prevails in the Council, whereby the mighty Power of China is not represented and its seat is illegally occupied by a person of the Kuomintang.

The PRESIDENT: I have heard the representative of the Soviet Union and, as I say, he is out of order.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR A VISITING MISSION TO TRUST TERRITORIES IN EAST AFRICA
(T/1103, 1104) [Agenda item 6]

The PRESIDENT: As the members of the Council will no doubt remember, the Council decided at its 511th meeting to request the delegations which had been invited to nominate persons as members of the Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa for 1954 to propose, after consultation with the representatives of the Administering Authorities concerned and members of the Secretariat, the date of departure and the duration of the Mission for the Council's approval. My understanding is that the members have met, and I wish to call on the Assistant Secretary-General to report to the Council on the matter.

Mr. HCO (Assistant Secretary-General): At its 511th meeting, on 9 March 1954, the Trusteeship Council requested the delegations which had been invited to nominate persons as members of the 1954 Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa to meet together in consultation with representatives of the Administering Authorities concerned and members of the Secretariat and to make proposals to the Council as to the date of departure and the duration of the Mission.

Two informal meetings were held on this matter and, in accordance with past practice, I am communicating the results of these meetings to the Council in the form of my present statement.

First, it was agreed that the date of departure of the Mission should be 20 July 1954.

Secondly, on the basis of information supplied by the representatives of the Administering Authorities on climatic conditions at that time and transportation factors, it was agreed that it was preferable that the Territories should be visited in this order: Ruanda-Urundi, Tanganyika, and Somaliland under Italian Administration. The representative of Belgium indicated, however, that certain contingencies might arise which would make it inconvenient for the Mission to be received in Ruanda-Urundi at the end of July. The Belgian delegation would not know for certain, however, for a week or two, whether these contingencies would arise. If it should turn out to be inconvenient for the Belgian authorities to

receive the Mission at the end of July, the meeting considered that Tanganyika could be visited first, followed by Ruanda-Urundi and then Somaliland. The Secretariat could inform all delegations concerned of the change, if any change proves necessary, as soon as it is so informed by the Belgian delegation.

Thirdly, subject to one matter which was left over for a later decision by the Mission itself when formed, the meeting approved in principle an itinerary put before it by the Secretariat and acceptable to the representatives of the Administering Authorities concerned.

According to this itinerary, the Mission would spend nineteen days in Ruanda-Urundi, thirty-seven days in Tanganyika and twenty-one days in Somaliland under Italian administration, with necessary travel and visits to the capitals of the Administering Authorities for consultations. This would entail a total absence for the Mission from Headquarters of ninety-one days. In brief, the proposals of the delegations concerned are that the Mission should leave on 20 July 1954, that it should visit Ruanda-Urundi, Tanganyika and Somaliland under Italian administration in that order unless this should prove inconvenient to the Belgian authorities, in which case Tanganyika would be visited first before Ruanda-Urundi; and that the duration of the Mission's absence from Headquarters should be three months.

The PRESIDENT: The members of the Council have heard the proposals that the Mission should leave on 20 July of this year, that it should visit Ruanda-Urundi, Tanganyika and Somaliland under Italian administration in that order unless it should prove inconvenient to the Belgian authorities, in which case Tanganyika would be visited before Ruanda-Urundi; the duration of the Mission's visit would be three months.

I take it that, as there appears to be no objection, these proposals are approved.

It was so decided.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR A VISITING MISSION TO TRUST TERRITORIES IN EAST AFRICA

(T/1103, 1104) [Agenda item 6]

The PRESIDENT: As shown in these documents, the Government of India has nominated Mr. R. Jaipal as a member of the Mission, and the Government of El Salvador has nominated Mr. Rafael Eguizabal. It is necessary for the Council to approve these nominations, and I am sure the Council will take pleasure in approving them. As there seem to be no objections, those nominations are approved.

It was so decided.

Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): Before concluding this item, we, those of us who are going to be members of the Visiting Mission, would like to have some assurances -- which we do not doubt will be forthcoming but which we should like to have right here in the full Council -- that each and every member of the Mission will have all the necessary services available so as to be able completely to carry out its mission. I should like to ask this question now before the Council and to have the Council answer me.

Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories): I have heard the request of the representative of El Salvador and have understood it. I can assure him that the Secretariat will do all that is necessary to provide the required facilities.

Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Assistant Secretary-General and to you for this assurance which has been given me. We can now be very sure that no possible element will be lacking which might be necessary to us for our work. I refer to interpreters and everything else.

The PRESIDENT: I can give no answer about interpreters and the expression "everything else" seems to me to be a rather all-embracing one, if I may say so.

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF TANGANYIKA: (a) REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON TANGANYIKA (T/L.419 and Add.1, L.451, L.455, L.456) [Agenda items 3a, 4]; (b) REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE UNIONS (T/L.448) [Agenda item 7]

The PRESIDENT: We also have before us document T/L.460, a draft resolution submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union.

Before voting on the draft recommendations contained in paragraphs 7 to 44 of document T/L.451, I shall call on the representative of Australia, the Chairman of the Drafting Committee.

Mr. LOGGIES (Australia) (Chairman of the Drafting Committee): As Chairman of the Committee, I should like to present to the Council the report of the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of Tanganyika which, as the President pointed out, is circulated as document T/L.451.

This report was adopted unanimously by the Committee after a very careful examination of the statements of the members of the Council. The conclusions and recommendations which are contained in the report reflect, in the view of the Committee, the opinions of the majority of the members of the Council.

It will be noted that no draft conclusions or recommendations on the subject of the inter-territorial association involving Tanganyika, Kenya and Uganda were formulated by the Drafting Committee, although some reference to it was made in the course of the general debate in the Council, since this subject was under separate study by the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions whose report is before the Committee. As the report indicates, the Committee recommends to the Council that it adopt the working paper on conditions in Tanganyika (T/L.419 and Add.1) as the basic text for the chapter on that Territory for inclusion in the next report of the Council of the General Assembly; and also that it adopt the conclusions and recommendations set out below on pages 3 to 15 inclusive of the document to which I have referred (T/L.451).

The PRESIDENT: I ask the members of the Council to turn to page 3, paragraph 7, of document T/L.451.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with paragraph 7 the Soviet Union delegation wishes to state that it cannot accept the substance of this paragraph even though it is the first paragraph entitled "General considerations". This is a chapter which contains the general idea of this report. This point, coming under this heading, states:

"The Council notes with satisfaction the harmony which has existed and continues to exist in the relationships between these three main population groups."

What are these three main population groups? We know that in Tanganyika there is an indigenous population of eight million, eighty thousand persons of Asian origin and eighteen thousand Europeans. How then can you speak of three main population groups when you have such figures? There is only one main group of population and that is the indigenous population. To put emphasis, therefore, on these three main population groups seems to place all three groups on the same level. As a matter of fact, it is noted in the report that the overwhelming majority of the eight million natives is denied all rights while the eighteen thousand inhabitants of European origin enjoy all rights. This paragraph, therefore, is erroneous and distorted in its political implications and we cannot vote in its favour.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now proceed to the vote on the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.451).

Paragraph 7 was adopted by 11 votes to 1.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I think that, at the end of this paragraph, a statement should be added to the following effect: The Administering Authority should submit statistical data regarding the number of children of the indigenous inhabitants of school age.

The PRESIDENT: I shall treat that as an amendment, to be added at the end of paragraph 8.

The amendment was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I just wish to say that I abstained in the vote only because I was not sure whether it would be possible to get this information. If it is possible, I can assure the Council that there will be no objection to providing it.

Paragraph 8 as amended was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 9 was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 10 was adopted unanimously.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I request a separate vote on the following phrase of paragraph 11: "The Council notes further, in this connexion, the need for developing the general political education of the indigenous inhabitants".

The PRESIDENT: The Council will vote on paragraph 11 in three parts, as follows: the first part beginning with the words "The Council recalls" and ending with the words "a satisfactory solution found", the second part beginning with the words "The Council notes" and ending with the words "of the indigenous inhabitants", and the third part beginning with the words "in particular" and ending with the words "in territorial affairs".

The first part of paragraph 11 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The second part of paragraph 11 was adopted unanimously.

The third part of paragraph 11 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 11 as a whole was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 12 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 13 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I move an amendment to paragraph 14 to delete the words "as soon as practicable" at the end of the paragraph.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the Soviet Union amendment to paragraph 14.

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the rules of procedure, the Council will vote again on the Soviet Union amendment to paragraph 14.

There were 6 votes in favour and 6 against. The amendment was not adopted.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I request a vote on paragraph 14 by parts, the first part up to the words "as soon as practicable", and the second part to consist of those words.

The PRESIDENT: The amendment to delete the words "as soon as practicable" was rejected. I am therefore bound to put the whole of the paragraph to the vote.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Since the final phrase of this paragraph has been retained as the result of the last vote I have no question, but I had asked for a separate vote on the words "as soon as practicable". I wish to vote in favour of the paragraph down to that point, and against that final phrase itself.

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry, but I have to put to the vote paragraph 14 as a whole. That is my ruling.

Paragraph 14 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 15 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with paragraph 16 I should like, if possible, some clarification of the last sentence, which reads:

"The Council expresses the hope that continued and extended experience in elective methods at this level will help to facilitate the introduction as soon as possible of universal suffrage based on a common roll, which it considers essential to the balanced development of all sections of the population."

I should like to know what is meant by this sentence. What is meant by the phrase "balanced development", and to what field does it apply?

The PRESIDENT: Perhaps the Chairman of the Drafting Committee would care to comment on this matter?

Mr. LOOMES (Australia) (Chairman of the Drafting Committee): I am at a loss to understand the difficulty experienced by the representative of the Soviet Union in understanding this phrase. As I mentioned in my opening statement, these conclusions were drafted on what we considered as the majority views expressed in the Council. I had little to add. I should have regarded this phrase as self-explanatory. If the representative of the Soviet Union could point out rather more specifically the difficulty he experiences I would endeavour to help him.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not understand the meaning of the phrase. Could the representative of Australia divulge its meaning?

The PRESIDENT: I am not quite aware of what is the difficulty of the representative of the Soviet Union. The phrase "balanced development" means that a balance is held between all sections and that they are developed having regard to the individual needs of each section. That is how I would appreciate the approach here.

Mr. SINGH (India): I would give it a different interpretation. The development has to be balanced, but that does not mean that it should be balanced between the various sections. We should oppose this strongly if that were the interpretation.

The PRESIDENT: It is only my interpretation.

Mr. PIGNON (France) (interpretation from French): I wonder whether the representative of the Soviet Union has a correct text. Could he not borrow an English text of document T/L.451 from one of his neighbours and verify it therein? The French text speaks of "développement harmonieux de tous les groupes de la population". The representative of the Soviet Union did not refer to "all groups of the population", a phrase which, of course, gives complete significance and meaning to the paragraph.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I am in fact using the English text. I have not the Russian version here. It has not been prepared by the Secretariat, so that I am obliged to use the English text.

The PRESIDENT: Perhaps it would help the representative of the Soviet Union if we handed him a French text?

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As I understood Mr. Pignon I do not believe that there is any discrepancy between the French and English versions.

The PRESIDENT: We are now able to hand the representative of the Soviet Union a copy of the Russian text, but very soon we shall have to vote on this paragraph.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not understand the Russian text either. I do not understand the meaning of this phrase. That is why I asked my question, and the representative of India seems also to have some doubts as to the meaning.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of India only doubts my interpretation.

Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): In an attempt to dispel the darkness in which the representative of the Soviet Union finds himself, together with the representative of India, I would say that this is closely connected with paragraph 7 of the general considerations where we take into account the balance which does obtain between the three sectors which exist alongside one another in the Territory. Consequently, one has to take account of this general statement in paragraph 7 when considering paragraph 16.

Mr. SINGH (India): I do not quite understand what the import of this phrase will be, or what it does to the meaning of the rest of the sentence. Therefore I would propose as an amendment that this part of the sentence should be deleted.

The PRESIDENT: I take "this part of the sentence" to mean from the word "which" to the word "population".

Before calling upon the representative of the Soviet Union I would call his attention to this proposal for the deletion of the final clause of paragraph 16.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I had not had time to move such a proposal myself. I was simply asking for clarification of the meaning hidden in this phrase. Now that the representative of El Salvador has linked it with paragraph 7, and bearing in mind the statement by Sir Oliver Lyttleton which I mentioned during my observations on Tanganyika, I have some misgivings because the idea seems to be so to construct the electoral system that the whites would control the legislative organs. The idea seems to be that 18,000 whites should send to these legislative organs so many representatives that they would have a majority control over the African population of 8,000,000. That is what this formulation boils down to. It is foggy, and despite the good intentions we have had some indication as to the kind of electoral system which is actually contemplated.

The PRESIDENT: We have a motion for the deletion of this phrase. Sometimes a meaning is not quite clear, because meanings differ. The representative of the Soviet Union has asked for an answer, and he is not the only one who has never had an answer in some of these matters.

Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador)(interpretation from Spanish): My delegation was a member of the Drafting Committee on Tanganyika. That is why I should like now to attempt to make an explanation in connexion with the present difficulty, although my previous explanation does not seem to have been sufficiently clear.

I should like to assure the Soviet Union representative that in the Drafting Committee we were concerned above all with the interests of the indigenous population of Tanganyika.

Mr. ASHA (Syria): As a member of the Drafting Committee, I should like to inform the Trusteeship Council that the point now in question was discussed very carefully in the Committee. I can assure the Soviet Union representative that what we had in mind was the interests of the indigenous inhabitants. If, however, he and Mr. Singh have any difficulty about accepting the present text, I am prepared to vote for the deletion of the last phrase. I do not, however, think that that phrase has any sinister meaning whatever.

Mr. TSARAPOKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The last phrase of paragraph 16 is contrary to the democratic principle that the majority of the population should have a commensurate representation in the legislative organs of the Territory. That last phrase reads: "which it considers essential to the balanced development of all sections of the population". What balance can there be between eight million Africans and eighteen thousand Europeans? The eight million Africans are the masters of their own country. The two figures cannot be balanced, unless artificial measures are introduced or unless the kind of exotic constitution mentioned by Sir Oliver Lyttleton is established.

The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the amendment to delete from paragraph 16 the phrase reading, "which it considers essential to the balanced development of all sections of the population".

The amendment was adopted by 5 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

Mr. ECUIZABAL (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to explain my vote.

I should very much have liked to be able to support the position taken by the representative of India and other representatives. I found it necessary, however, to abstain from the vote on the amendment to paragraph 16, because that seemed to be the logical thing to do in the light of the Council's adoption of paragraph 7 of the Drafting Committee's report.

Paragraph 16, as amended, was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The meeting was suspended at 4.15 p.m. and resumed at 4.40 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now take up paragraph 17 of the report.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I propose that a separate vote should be taken on the clause, "While appreciating both the intentions of the Administering Authority in this matter and the difficulties involved," and also on the clause, in the last sentence of the paragraph, "to be supplemented where appropriate by expatriation allowances and efficiency differentials,".

The PRESIDENT: The Council will vote first of all on the first sentence of the paragraph, beginning with "The Council" and ending with "civil service".

The first sentence of paragraph 17 was adopted unanimously.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the first part of the second sentence, beginning with "While appreciating" and ending with "the difficulties involved".

The first part of the second sentence was adopted by 11 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on that part of paragraph 17 beginning with the words "and recognizing" and ending with the words "junior services".

This part was adopted unanimously.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on that part of paragraph 17 beginning with the words "to be supplemented" and ending with the words "efficiency differentials".

This part was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the remaining part of paragraph 17 commencing with the words "awaits with interest" and ending with the word "undertaken".

This part was adopted unanimously.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on paragraph 17 as a whole.

Paragraph 17 was adopted unanimously.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now consider paragraph 18.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): This paragraph raises the question of the separation of the judicial and executive powers. At the same time this problem is linked with the problem of higher education. It seems to us that this link-up is not a well-advised one. In fact it might even result in further delay in bringing about a proper separation of powers. We are therefore unable to support this paragraph and will abstain in the vote.

Paragraph 18 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 19 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 20 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 21 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 22 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

AW/ich

The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider paragraph 23.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, I request that you put to the vote the following amendment: delete the words "wherever applicable", and then put to the vote separately the last sentence of the paragraph.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the amendment of the representative of the Soviet Union to delete the words "wherever applicable".

The amendment was rejected by 7 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the part of the paragraph commencing with the words "The Council" and ending with the words "harmful to the land".

This part was adopted unanimously.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the final sentence of the paragraph, that part commencing with the words "The Council, conscious of the extent" and ending with the words "co-operative movement".

This part was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now consider paragraph 23 as a whole.
Paragraph 23 was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 24 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider paragraph 25.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): At the end of this paragraph, which deals with land and land alienation, the following is stated:

"...notes the explanation of the Administering Authority and recalls the assurance which it has given that it fully acknowledges its responsibility for observing the necessary caution and ensuring that the land problem of the Africans receives full consideration."

We consider that this wording fails to reflect the true state of affairs. In particular it fails to reflect the fact that the 3,000 members of the Wa-Meru tribe were shorn of their lands, that they were expelled, that their lands were sold to thirteen Europeans, that their crops were burned and that their houses were torn down. But now the whole matter is disposed of in a nutshell by the statement that the Administering Authority fully acknowledges its responsibility for observing the necessary caution.

Not only is this inadequate, but in fact it would bespeak lack of good faith to pass over in silence the intolerable acts of the Administering Authority concerning the Wa-Meru people who now find themselves in appalling difficulties. For these reasons, my delegation will vote against paragraph 25.

Paragraph 25 was adopted by 11 votes to 1.

Paragraph 26 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider paragraph 27.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I would like to submit the following amendment with regard to paragraph 27: delete the phrase "and noting the progress which has been made in this direction".

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the amendment moved by the representative of the Soviet Union.

The amendment was rejected by 7 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 27 was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 28 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With respect to paragraph 29, I request a separate vote on that part of the paragraph which begins with the words "urges the Administering Authority" and ends with the words "people concerned".

The PRESIDENT: I shall therefore put this paragraph to the Council in two parts: first of all, that part of the paragraph which commences with the words "The Council, recalling" and which ends with the words "preparation, and"; and secondly, that part of the paragraph which commences with the words "urges the Administering Authority" and ends with the words "people concerned".

The first part of the paragraph was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The second part of the paragraph was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 29 as a whole was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 30 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 31 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 32 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 33 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With respect to paragraph 34, Mr. President, I request that you put to the vote separately the first part of the paragraph commencing with the words "The Council" and ending with the words "in the Territory", and then the second part.

The PRESIDENT: Very well. I shall put to the vote first the first part of the paragraph commencing with the words "The Council" and ending with the words "in the Territory"; and then I shall put the rest of the paragraph commencing with the words "urges the Administering Authority" and ending with the words "the Trust Territory".

The first part of the paragraph was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The second part of the paragraph was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 34 as a whole was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 35 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 36 was adopted unanimously.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With respect to paragraph 37, I propose the deletion of the last phrase "to continue its endeavours to surmount the difficulties which have thus far prevented their full implementation" and the replacement of these words by the phrase "to take immediate measures for the implementation of these recommendations".

The PRESIDENT: The proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union is that paragraph 37 be amended by the deletion of the words at the end of the paragraph, namely, "to continue its endeavours to surmount the difficulties which have thus far prevented their full implementation" and by the substitution therefor of the words "to take immediate measures for the implementation of these recommendations".

The amendment was rejected by 6 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 37 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 38 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 39 was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 40 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With respect to paragraph 41, I request a separate vote on the phrase at the beginning of the paragraph, "while noting the steady progress achieved in the expansion of middle and secondary school facilities".

The PRESIDENT: In respect of paragraph 41, we shall vote first of all on the first part of the paragraph commencing with the words "The Council" to the words "school facilities"; and then, we shall vote on the rest of the paragraph

commencing with the words "recommends that" and ending with the words, "by each such school".

The first part of the paragraph was adopted by 11 votes to 1.

The second part of the paragraph was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 41 as a whole was adopted unanimously.

The PRESIDENT: We now come to paragraph 42.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I would request the authors of the report to explain to us the implications of this paragraph. I do not understand its scope or meaning. What is being proposed to the Administering Authority? What are the concrete inferences which the Administering Authority is expected to draw from this? Or is it suggested that there is only a philosophical meaning to this sentence?

The PRESIDENT: I shall ask the Chairman of the Drafting Committee to elucidate that question.

Mr. LOOMES (Australia): In the course of our discussions, the representative of UNESCO put forward these views, and I think they were also included in the statement of UNESCO which was circulated to the Council. In the course of the general discussion, certain delegations drew attention with approval to these observations by UNESCO and suggested that the importance of teacher-training should be stressed -- in other words, that the view of UNESCO that the funds devoted to teacher-training are an investment comparable with other forms of capital expenditure should be a matter which the Administering Authority should take into account.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): All of that is most praiseworthy, but it is given in a general form. The paragraph has no material content; it would not seek to impose any material obligations on the Administering Authority. It is purely academic. My delegation will therefore abstain in the vote on this paragraph.

Paragraph 42 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: We come next to paragraph 43.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Paragraph 43 contains the words: "and noting the consideration being given to this problem by the Administering Authority". I should like to learn from the authors of the report what they had in mind when they incorporated this phrase into the paragraph. I am not aware of the meaning of that phrase, and I thought that perhaps I might obtain some elucidation from the members of the Committee.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the Chairman of the Committee.

Mr. LOOMES (Australia): As I understand it, the representative of the Soviet Union wishes clarification of the phrase "and noting the consideration being given to this problem by the Administering Authority". The representative of the Soviet Union will, of course, recall that the Administering Authority has made provision for higher education -- for example, at Makerere College -- and is otherwise taking steps to consider the possibility of establishing some kind of higher education facilities in the Territory. As the representative of the Soviet Union will be aware, it has not yet been possible for the Administering Authority to establish any such facilities -- whether it was a branch of Makerere College I cannot remember -- but consideration has in fact been given to it. The Drafting Committee took note of the fact that some thought was being given to it. If I recall correctly, information on that matter was referred to in the report of the Administering Authority -- but perhaps the representative of the United Kingdom may be able to be a little more specific than I in this connexion. However, I can assure the representative of the Soviet Union that reference was certainly made to this matter in the course of the debate, and it is on that that these recommendations are founded.

Paragraph 43 was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 44 was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The PRESIDENT: I wish to draw the attention of the Council to the recommendation contained in paragraph 6, on page 2 of the report, to the effect that the working paper, documents T/L.419 and Add.1, should be the basic text for the chapter on Tanganyika for inclusion in the Council's next report to the General Assembly. I shall put that recommendation to the vote.

The recommendation was adopted by 11 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT: I should now like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document T/L.455, which contains amendments to the working paper, document T/L.419. There is a misprint in the fifth line of the first suggested amendment: the figure of £130 should be £310.

If there is no objection, the amendment will be considered adopted.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I now wish the Council to pass to the consideration of the report of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions on Tanganyika, document T/L.448. The report contains, in paragraphs 3-16, the observations and conclusions of the Committee. But, first of all, I think I should draw the attention of the Council to the fact that a draft resolution in respect of this matter has been proposed by the Soviet Union in document T/L.460. I think it might be advisable in the first instance to consider that draft resolution.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It appears to us that the report of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions on Tanganyika should be examined with due deliberation. We should not examine this in rapid-fire order, since the matter of administrative unions is an important one with respect to Trust Territories. The report of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions on Tanganyika touches on an issue of great moment for the progressive advancement of the Trust Territory toward self-government and independence. A study of the report, however, indicates that the Committee has not carefully studied this important issue. It has confined itself to a superficial examination of information supplied by the Administering Authority. It has failed to draw the necessary conclusions and recommendations.

This charge is supported by the circumstance that, according to the Committee itself, the social and economic consequences of the inter-territorial organization in East Africa require study. But the report does nothing of the sort. It does not explain what circumstances have stirred the Committee's misgivings, what circumstances have impelled the Committee to continue its study of the development of the administrative union which affects Tanganyika.

The Committee draws no conclusions and makes no recommendations in this respect. The paramount political aspect of the problems created by the administrative unification of the Territory with neighbouring colonies is passed over in silence in the report, which in fact does not even suggest that this aspect requires study.

The report of the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions can only be appraised as an unsatisfactory piece of work. Conspicuously absent from it are recommendations designed to ensure the independent ^{development} of the Trust Territory as an independent entity in the economic, political, social and cultural fields and its development towards self-government and independence; this, despite the fact that the virtual merger of the Territory with neighbouring colonies is being carried out by the Administering Authority in violation of the United Nations Charter and of the Trusteeship Agreement, has virtually frustrated any such independent development of the Trust Territory in the direction of self-government or independence.

When the report of the Administering Authority on Tanganyika was being examined, the Soviet Union delegation took occasion to point out that the creation of the so-called East Africa Inter-Territorial Organization is tantamount to a subjection of Tanganyika to the neighbouring colonies of Kenya and Uganda. What we face here is an extension to the Trust Territory of Tanganyika of the colonial order which prevails in Kenya and Uganda. Even before the end of the Second World War the process of unifying Tanganyika with neighbouring colonies reached the point where, as the reports of the Administering Authority indicate, the organization then instituted was actually a form of industrial management of a substantial number of common affairs. The reports of the Administering Authority indicate that the East African Organization's High Commission, consisting of the Governors of Kenya, Tanganyika and Uganda, enjoys the customary rights and powers of a territorial government with regard to the common services under its authority. This Commission has under its control such major departments and services as the Defence Service, Civil Aviation, railroads, ports, the Industrial Council, the Council on Production and supply, the Post Office Department, telegraph, foreign exchange, the Statistical Department, the Internal Revenue Bureau and others.

All of this indicates that this Commission, which is a British organ of government in East Africa, actually is in control of the major aspects of the life and activities of the Trust Territory.

In the Legislative Assembly of the East African Organization the Trust Territory of Tanganyika is on an equal footing with the neighbouring colonies of Kenya and Uganda. In this manner, the Trust Territory has been demoted to the status of a colony. One cannot fail to note that the Trust Territory of Tanganyika is doomed to the same fate as Kenya and Uganda, to which it has been attached. It is doomed, in other words, to stagnation and even retrogression in the political, economic and social realms.

The information supplied in the report of the Visiting Mission in paragraphs 119, 125 and 127 supports the notion that the interests of the Trust Territory have been violated in the framework of the Administrative Union. In the operation of the joint services the future development of Tanganyika is disregarded. The securing of new electrical communications equipment, for example, found Tanganyika holding the short end of the stick. It got much less, for example, than Kenya and Uganda.

Paragraph 127 of the report of the Visiting Mission makes the point that in one area in which the Tanganyika Government has surrendered some of its economic control over the Territory was that of industrial licensing. The paragraph further states that the power to regulate the establishment within the Territory of certain industries has been conferred on the East African Industrial Council by a Tanganyika ordinance.

Furthermore, the Standing Committee on Administrative Unions states in its report that it is not quite convinced that the activities of the East African Industrial Council are really in the best interests of the economic development of the Territory. (Paragraph 12).

Incidentally, if the Committee had done its work properly and had carefully studied available information on this topic, it would undoubtedly have reached the conclusion that the operation of the East African Industrial Council -- and this, incidentally, would apply to other organs of the East African Inter-Territorial Union -- is not in the best interest of the economic development of the Territory and in fact hampers such development.

There are ample facts to support the charge that the so-called Administrative Union is in reality a closely-knit political, economic merger between the Trust Territory and the neighbouring British colonies.

If you analyse the relationship that now exists between the Trust Territory of Tanganyika and the neighbouring colonies of Kenya and Uganda in the political, economic and other fields, the conclusion is inescapable that, far from being an administrative union, this is a full political and economic absorption of the Trust Territory by neighbouring British colonies. The delegation of the Soviet Union feels that it is the duty of this Council to take measures that would ensure the retention of Tanganyika's status as a United Nations Trust Territory. It is essential to secure this Territory's independent development towards self-government and independence, as the Charter of the United Nations specifically requires.

Accordingly, the Soviet Union delegation wishes to submit the following draft resolution to the Council, which I shall now read out:

"The Trusteeship Council,

"Considering that the question of administrative unions is of great significance for the progressive development of the Trust Territories towards self-government and independence,

"Recommends the Administering Authority of the Trust Territory of Tanganyika to establish in that Territory legislative and administrative organs not subordinate to any organs established on the basis of a union of the Trust Territory with the colonies of Kenya and Uganda, and for that purpose to take legislative and other measures to ensure the participation of the indigenous population of Tanganyika in the legislative, executive and judicial organs of the Trust Territory."

(T/L.460)

The Soviet Union delegation believes that if the Administering Authority were to institute the measures contemplated here, it would without a doubt foster the progressive development of the Trust Territory of Tanganyika in the political, economic, social and educational fields. This would be conducive to the rapid attainment by the Trust Territory of Tanganyika of the objectives of the International Trusteeship System, namely full self-government and independence.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): It is scarcely necessary for me to reply to the representative of the Soviet Union. Concerning the speech which he has just made, I disagree with it entirely. It is completely incorrect and misleading. For that reason I shall vote against the draft resolution which he has submitted.

The administrative union in East Africa, as the Council knows, is in no way contrary to the terms of the Charter and is well within the provisions of the agreement relating to the Trust Territory of Tanganyika.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the Soviet Union draft resolution (T/L.460).

The resolution was rejected by 6 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): I voted in favour of the Soviet Union draft resolution because I considered that the recommendation set out in it was adopted, in major part, when the Council voted on the report concerning the Territory. Also, there is nothing in the draft resolution which is contrary to the provisions of the Charter or of the Trusteeship Agreement. For these reasons, I considered it my duty to vote in favour of the Soviet Union draft resolution.

Mr. EGUIZABAL (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to explain the vote of my delegation on the Soviet Union draft resolution. My delegation voted in favour of this draft resolution because, in the first place, we consider that administrative unions constitute an obstacle to the Trusteeship System.

Secondly, as explained by the representative of Syria, we believe that the draft resolution was not contrary to the Charter or any of the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement.

Thirdly, this expressed precisely what turns out to be the main objective of the International Trusteeship System.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now proceed to the consideration of the report of the Standing Committee, document T/1.448. The Council will now decide whether it wishes to include these observations and conclusions in the appropriate section of the report on conditions in Tanganyika. It is understood that the Secretariat will make the necessary consequential changes in the text.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): In putting the document to the vote, I should be grateful if the President would put paragraphs 12 and 13 to the vote separately.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now vote on the proposal to include paragraphs 3 to 11 in the appropriate section of the report on conditions in Tanganyika.

The proposal was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 12 was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I should be grateful if the meaning of paragraph 13 could be made clear to me. It is not clear to me from the draft report. Perhaps the Chairman of the Standing Committee would be good enough to explain it? What I want to find out is what "relevant information" is needed.

Mr. McKAY (United States of America) (Chairman of the Standing Committee): In response to the representative of the United Kingdom's request for a clarification of paragraph 13 I would direct his attention to the preceding six paragraphs, 6 to 12, in which two main points are dealt with. One important point which is dealt with, particularly in paragraphs 9 to 12 inclusive, concerns the operations of the East African Industrial Council. The Committee has been concerned for some time with the operations and implications of the administrative union. It is, admittedly, a large and complicated subject, but one of the main aspects on which the Committee felt that it needed further information was this matter of the activities of the Industrial Council.

A second part of the relevant information desired by the Committee relates to the question of the salaries for Africans, Asians and Europeans, which is referred to in paragraphs 6 and 7 of the report now before the Council.

I have tried to be as precise as possible, and I hope that this has been an adequate answer to the representative of the United Kingdom. If other members of the Committee can add anything to the points I have made I am sure that they will do so.

Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom): I am much obliged to the representative of the United States.

Paragraph 13 was adopted by 9 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraphs 14, 15 and 16 were adopted by 8 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I would direct the attention of the Council to the summary of individual observations contained in document T/L.456. If there is no objection, these observations will be included in the appropriate sections of the chapter on Tanganyika.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the report as a whole comprising documents T/L.419 and Add.1, T/L.455, the recommendations as just adopted in document T/L.451, paragraphs 3 to 16 inclusive, and in document T/L.448, and the individual observations in document T/L.456.

The report was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF RUANDA-URUNDI:

- (a) REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON RUANDA-URUNDI (T/L.420 and Add.1; L.452; L.457) [Agenda items 3b, 4]
- (b) REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE UNIONS (T/L.438 and Corr.1) [Agenda item 7]

The PRESIDENT: The Council has before it the documents listed in the agenda under item 7 and a draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union in document T/L.461. In the first instance we shall consider the draft recommendations contained in paragraphs 1 to 14 inclusive on pages 3 to 9 of the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.452). We shall vote on them separately, but before we do so I call upon the representative of India.

Mr. ALI KHAN (India): I had indicated earlier that I should be replying to some of the direct criticism made by the representative of Belgium and the special representative of what I had said in the general debate. Let me say at the outset that to engage in controversy gives us no pleasure, and we do it only because certain statements I made were directly challenged.

I should also like to say here that we acknowledge with respect the great experience of Mr. Ryckmans, the representative of Belgium, and that we defer to his seniority in experience and in years. Therefore, in my remarks there is nothing directed personally against either him or the special representative.

The special representative described my speech as a passionate harangue, but the representative of the United Kingdom described it as a thoughtful intervention. I do not see how it could be both. The Belgian representative and the special representative have both been at pains to deny the charge of inertia in the administration of Ruanda-Urundi. Anyone who took the trouble to read the text of my statement, and particularly its second paragraph, would see that I made it quite

clear that the charge of inertia was directed to the political side. So the two representatives have spent time and energy in demolishing an argument which I had never put forward in the first place. I made it quite clear that we acknowledged advances in the fields of economics and education, but that we did not think that they were sufficient. We were not, however, so unwise as to say that nothing had been done. Indeed, the special representative has in his statement acknowledged that the political side was given secondary importance to the economic-- which was what we said. But let us say here that this preference for the economic over the political is typical of the colonial approach which believes that whatever is best administered is best.

The representative of Belgium, with some passion and considerable heat, drew a graphic picture of the difference between Ruanda-Urundi as it was thirty years ago and as it is today. Naturally there is a difference. I do not think that there is a single country in the whole world today which has had the benefits of orderly government which is not very different from what it was thirty years ago. There is a notable movement towards economic improvement, but progress can be counted only as something over and above this inevitable tendency.

As Administering Authorities frequently do, the representative of Belgium raised the point that some representatives here speak without a first-hand knowledge of the area concerned. Since it is not a normal part of our average education to visit East, West and Central Africa, this lack of first-hand knowledge is inescapable. If representatives spoke only about Territories with which they had had first-hand contact, I submit that this organization as a whole would probably go out of business.

Both the Belgian representative and the special representative denied the statement made by me and other representatives that the Administration in Ruanda-Urundi had a disdainful or critical attitude towards the local people. In my statement, I said that I could quote examples which proved that such an attitude did exist, and I am now, reluctantly, compelled to do so.

The Belgian representative said:

"We have never accused the firm political organization of Ruanda-Urundi of being an obstacle to progress." (T/PV.518, page 39-40)

That, however, is precisely what the special representative did on Saturday, 13 March, in reply to a question which I had put. I asked the special representative the following question:

"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?" (T/PV.515, page 71)

The special representative replied:

"The only factor" -- I should like to emphasize the word "only" --

"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." (T/PV.515, page 71)

The following pages of the verbatim record from which I have quoted contain further answers by the special representative demonstrating that the special representative seems to have an attitude towards the firm political organization of Ruanda-Urundi which is different from the attitude of the Belgian representative.

I should like to give some further examples -- this time from the annual report on Ruanda-Urundi -- of what might be called disdainful statements.

On page 14 of the annual report, there are statements to the effect that local persons are not recruited for the local police because they do not have the least taste for a military career, which requires order and discipline, and that local recruits for posts in the police force failed their training courses because they refused to comply with the rules of a regular, ordered and disciplined life.

Then, on page 101 of the annual report, we are told this:

"We cannot repeat often enough that the indigenous inhabitant is feckless, fatalistic and little inclined to effort, even when that is demanded by his own personal interest, or even when it is a question of his very existence." (para. 60)

Here we are asked to believe that the people of Ruanda-Urundi are lacking in the elementary instinct of self-preservation.

Again, on page 138 of the annual report, it is stated several times that the local labourer is a bad worker because he is indolent, apathetic and lacking in application.

Further, on page 230 of the annual report, we find the statement to which I have already referred; namely, that it is difficult for civilized persons to conceive of the kind of intellectual sloth which the local inhabitants of Ruanda-Urundi have.

The special representative, in reply to one of my questions, said:

"One of the main reasons is the poor quality of the work which is performed... The indigenous worker very seldom has any professional pride. He does not attach any importance to his work." (T/PV.511, page 36)

After those statements, we find it a little difficult to believe the special representative when he says:

"The attitude of scorn ascribed to us has never existed on our part. We live among the indigenous inhabitants, and there is a mutual respect between us." (T/PV.518, page 33-35)

I should like to point out that we have not heard such statements from the special representatives of other Trust Territories in which the people are basically the same as those in Ruanda-Urundi, nor have we found such statements in the annual reports of the Administering Authorities of those Territories. We are therefore justified in asking the Belgian authorities to try to change their mental attitude.

The special representative seems to have misunderstood my suggestion about the format of the annual report. I was not suggesting that the annual report should be so reduced as to contain less information. I was merely suggesting that it should be printed in a smaller size and on a lighter quality of paper, if possible, so as to make it more compact but not less useful. We cannot have too much information from the Trust Territories, particularly from a Territory so very distinctive as Ruanda-Urundi.

To conclude, I would say this: A representative of India will be a member of the Visiting Mission to East Africa. We shall be only too happy if that representative can bring back from Ruanda-Urundi information which would dispel some of the misgivings that we have expressed; we sincerely hope that he will be in a position to do so.

Mr. SCHEYVEN (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I should like very briefly to reply to the statement just made by the representative of India.

The representative of India observed that his statement about the question of inertia applied only to the political aspect of the situation in Ruanda-Urundi. I should like to say -- this was already pointed out by the special representative -- that even in the political field one cannot speak of inertia in Ruanda-Urundi. We have introduced profound changes in the political and judicial organization of the Territory. I am prepared to admit that the political progress is perhaps less apparent than the economic progress. We must note, however, that it is easier to teach a man to drive a car than to accept philosophical concepts which he does not see as directly and in which he has less interest. Hence, even if it can be admitted that there has been less political progress than economic or social progress, it cannot be denied that there has been progress. All that can be said is that it is more difficult to accelerate that progress.

I come now to the accusation that we have a disdainful attitude. I strongly deny that we have any disdain for the African populations. If we had any disdain for them, we should not be there. If we are there, it is because we are extremely sympathetic towards those populations and are dedicated to their progress. When we say that the indigenous inhabitants are lazy or fatalistic, we are simply stating a fact; we have no intention whatever of being disdainful. We shall deny the accusation that we have a disdainful attitude just as often as it is made. We have never shown any disdain for an African, either in Africa or elsewhere. I do not see how anyone could have found that we were demonstrating a disdainful attitude in stating that the indigenous inhabitants were fatalistic or lazy, or that they had no taste for a military career. It can be said that many other persons have had no desire to take up a military career. They have not done so because such a career did not attract them. Everyone has the right to do as he wishes. In Ruanda-Urundi, the need for a military career has never been felt, and I do not see why, suddenly, the indigenous inhabitants should want to become soldiers.

I should like to state, once and for all, that we have never had a disdainful attitude towards anyone in Africa.

The PRESIDENT: I ask representatives to turn to page 3 of T/L.452.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria)(interpretation from French): As you will recall, Mr. President, you decided to defer replies to the statements of the special representative and the representative of Belgium until the time when we discuss the report of the Drafting Committee. I do not know whether I should ask to speak today in order to reply to certain allegations in these statements, but I feel compelled to do so nevertheless.

The special representative and the representative of Belgium did not interpret correctly some of the expressions which I used when we were discussing the report. Among other things, the special representative made certain remarks to me which were of a personal nature. He said, for example, that I was a friend of Rousseau. I have never made any profession of faith to him; I have never ^{said} that I was an admirer of Rousseau or any other philosopher. I know why he made this remark; it was in order to discredit my opinion. I do not know if it is possible to discredit Rousseau today, but there are some countries where one goes to the point of discrediting any philosopher who was a progressive, even in the eighteenth or nineteenth century. In this respect may I be permitted to say that I have never had any ill intention when I criticized the report of the Administering Authority. I simply took the facts as they were set down in the report and I have made no statement which was contrary to those facts.

Mr. Ryckmans, whose knowledge and tact I have always admired is, I must say, rather sensitive, more so than other representatives with greater responsibilities. He accused me of having attacked the Belgian Administration. Nothing in my speech proves that I attacked the Belgian Administration. I simply made some criticisms, and criticism is permitted in the Council. I have criticized, but I based it on the report to the Council and on the statements made with regard to the indigenous inhabitants.

I am happy that the representative of Belgium made his statement today; it was a sort of correction of the point of view expressed in the report. That is why the representative of Belgium and the special representative will not be able

to accuse me of having exceeded the limits of the privileges which are granted to representatives. It is up to me, and to my delegation, to define these limits, but I would be grateful if the opinions of representatives on the Council were not distorted.

The PRESIDENT: I think that this might be an appropriate time to adjourn. I propose that we should resume at 10.30 a.m. tomorrow, and it is my hope that, in the course of the morning, we shall be able to conclude our business.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.