



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Twenty-sixth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 3 May 1960,
at 3.10 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Western Samoa: annual report of the Administering Authority for the year 1959 (continued)</i>	
<i>Questions concerning the Trust Territory and replies of the representative and special representative of the Administering Authority (continued)</i>	117
<i>Question concerning the petitioners from the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands</i>	122

President: Mr. Girolamo VITELLI (Italy).

Present:

The representatives of the following States: Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, China, France, India, Italy, New Zealand, Paraguay, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Western Samoa: annual report of the Administering Authority for the year 1959 (T/1512, T/L.966) (continued)

[Agenda item 3 (h)]

At the invitation of the President, Mr. McEwen, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Western Samoa, took a place at the Council table.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY AND REPLIES OF THE REPRESENTATIVE AND SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY (continued)

Political advancement (continued)

1. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) said that the reply which the special representative had given him on the subject at the previous meeting was satisfactory but he wondered why the Legislative Assembly had given its opinion on the treaty of friendship if its decisions had no legal force. He also wished to know whether the Administering Authority intended to present the draft treaty to the Trusteeship Council or whether that was subject to the Territory's attainment of independence.

2. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) recalled that discussions on the subject would be held between the New Zealand and Samoan Governments. The question could also be taken up at the next session of the General Assembly if the item he had proposed was included in the agenda. The discussions between the two Governments would be helpful in specifying the possible contents of the treaty but since the immediate preoccupation of the Samoan people was their Constitution, the drafting of the treaty was a secondary consideration. Some sort of preliminary draft, however, could probably be ready for the Assembly's forthcoming session.

3. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) wondered whether it was thought that the "matai" system might evolve into some form of local or municipal administration since, until the organs of local administration were firmly established, the creation of a higher body would seem premature.

4. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) felt that it was very difficult to make any predictions in that field. He stressed that the annual report of the Administering Authority^{1/} has used the word "evolution", which implied that a fairly long period of time would be necessary. The existing form of local organization had done quite remarkable work: hospitals and schools had been constructed, and water supplies installed, at the expense of the local district organizations, which had also supplied the labour. It was likely that some more formal type of local government would in the course of time become established, but, in view of the strength of the existing district organizations, it was doubtful whether at the present stage any good purpose would be served by imposing a formal system of local administration.

5. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) said that he understood that the existing social structure was deeply rooted in Samoan traditions and that it could not be changed to a more modern form of organization. He asked how it happened that the old traditional institutions were gradually disappearing in American Samoa.

6. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) replied that, for various historical reasons, the circumstances were quite different in that Territory.

7. In reply to a further question from Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia), Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said that the "matai" was the head of an extended family group and was chosen by the members of that group. The title was not necessarily given to the oldest members and it did not remain in the same branch of the family. Moreover, it was possible to depose an unsatisfactory "matai" by taking the matter before the Land and Titles Court, which dealt with such questions.

^{1/}Report by the New Zealand Government to the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Administration of Western Samoa for the Calendar Year 1959 (Wellington, R. E. Owen, Government Printer, 1960). Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by a note of the Secretary-General (T/1512).

8. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) asked what exactly was the position of the "matai" in relation to the family group and what were his judicial, administrative and economic powers.

9. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said that the "matai" system was one of mutual obligations and responsibilities. The "matai" had no judicial powers; his duties consisted mainly in allocating plots of land to different members of the family, who were obliged to support him to some extent. It was the duty of the "matai" to see that the members of the family group were properly cared for.

10. There was, moreover, no obligation in Samoan custom on any person to stay within any particular family group; if an individual felt that a "matai" was not carrying out his duties properly, he was at liberty to join another family to which he was related.

11. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) remarked that the system was a patriarchal one and that the "matai's" functions resembled those of the Roman *paterfamilias*. He wondered what happened when the family grew in size and there was no more land for distribution to meet their needs.

12. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) replied that there were some 5,600 "matai" in Samoa in a total population of 105,000 people; the family groups were therefore relatively small. He did not think that the "matai" system could be compared with the Roman system. A better comparison would be the relationship of a father to his family in a more modern society. If a particular family group became short of land, people could transfer their allegiance to another "matai" since all Samoans were related to several "matai".

13. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) thought that the figures given by the special representative indicated that a paternalistic minority dominated the whole Samoan population; but the information he had given seemed to show that the people had very good relationships with the "matai".

14. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) inquired whether there existed any community of feeling between the people of Western Samoa and those of American Samoa, and whether they contemplated any sort of union. In addition, he wished to know whether in the Citizenship of Western Samoa Ordinance there were any provisions according special treatment to the residents of American Samoa.

15. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said that there were naturally very friendly feelings between the two populations, movement between the two Territories was practically unrestricted, people continually passed back and forth from one to the other and there were regular shipping and air services. He did not believe that the people of Western Samoa had given great consideration to a possible union of the two Territories. The citizenship legislation did, however, contain special provisions regarding the residents of American Samoa: the minister in charge of immigration and citizenship could take residence in American Samoa into account as a qualification for naturalization as a citizen of Western Samoa.

16. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) asked whether there were traditional, racial or historic bonds between the two Territories dating from the period prior to the European administration, whether there

had ever been a community of interests between them and whether the people would welcome a revival of the unity that had existed in the past.

17. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said that there was traditionally a strong association between the people of the two Samoas. They traced their ancestry back to common sources; they were in constant contact; and intermarriage between the people of the two Territories was quite common. The question of union had perhaps been sometimes thought of in the past, but at the moment there was no suggestion of any political union.

18. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) wondered whether it would not be better to defer the negotiations regarding the proposed treaty of friendship between Western Samoa and New Zealand until after the Territory had attained independence, in view of the fact that in any case the treaty could not be ratified until then.

19. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) thought that that course was a possible one. Nevertheless, it was the responsible chiefs of Samoa who had said that the nature of the relationship with New Zealand should be defined by a treaty of friendship negotiated before independence, and the New Zealand Government could only acknowledge that view. The conclusion of a treaty before independence had not been envisaged. The point made by Mr. Rifai would certainly be considered during the discussions which were to be held between the two Governments with regard to the treaty.

20. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic), referring to paragraph 7 of the working paper prepared by the Secretariat (T/L.966), asked what were the few "reserved enactments" that had been maintained in force by the Samoa Amendment Act 1959.

21. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said that the reserved enactments were almost entirely concerned with the existing constitutional position and with certain international commitments which New Zealand had made, as Administering Authority, on behalf of Western Samoa. The present constitutional provisions must obviously continue to be reserved enactments until Samoa became independent and had a new constitution; but under the Samoa Amendment Act 1959, all the remaining reserved enactments could be unreserved without delay merely by a decision of the New Zealand Executive Council.

22. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) said that he did not see how the Territory's new Executive Council could influence Cabinet decisions, as it had neither powers of decision nor a right of veto. He wondered why it had been established.

23. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) replied that the new provisions regarding the Executive Council had been introduced at the request of the Samoans. The Samoan political leaders had felt that there would be some advantage, during the interim period, of the Cabinet being able to rely on the experience of the members of the Council. The procedure was as follows: when the Cabinet made a decision, that decision was referred to the Council of State; if the Council of State felt that it should be modified in some way, it could call a meeting of the Executive Council and make suggestions to the members of the Cabinet. That had happened on two occasions and in each case the matter had been settled to the satisfac-

tion of all concerned. It was only an interim arrangement to help the Cabinet, which was still relatively inexperienced.

24. Mr. VELLODI (India) asked for information concerning the "matai" system; in particular, he wished to know what happened when two extended families, each having a "matai" as its chief, combined, through marriage for instance. Did the new extended family have two "matai"? The question was of some importance from the point of view of voting rights.

25. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said that in fact the number of "matai" was steadily increasing; it had increased by about a hundred in 1959. Marriages between families did not affect the number of "matai", as the new couple could follow the "matai" of either the husband or the wife. The representation of the people by the "matai" was, therefore, not diminishing. Moreover, marriages did not upset the balance of the extended family, for while such a family lost some members through marriage, it also gained others.

26. In answer to a further question from Mr. VELLODI (India), Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said that there were a few women "matai" but that, so far, none had been elected to the Legislative Assembly.

27. Mr. VELLODI (India) recalled that the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of Western Samoa, 1959, had noted in paragraph 61 of its report (T/1449) that for certain purposes, the inhabitants of Western Samoa possessed two forms of domestic status. Persons who were less than half Samoan were deemed to be of European status and those of full Samoan blood were deemed to be of Samoan status. He asked whether there were really only two types of domestic status and, if so, what was the status of persons who were more than half Samoan but not of full Samoan blood.

28. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said that there were only two types of domestic status. The people with what was called European status were of various nationalities and some of them had no European blood whatever. The great majority of persons with Samoan status were of full Samoan blood, but there were several thousands who were not. The present position was that people with less than half Samoan blood were deemed to be of European status, while those who were half Samoan or more could choose between Samoan and European status. In fact, two or three thousand people who were part-European and part-Samoan had Samoan status. At the present time, the number of people of European status living in Western Samoa who were not of Samoan birth or descent was approximately 660. In addition, there were people of Samoan status who had another nationality, through a European grandfather, for instance. There were also some cases of people from other islands who lived in Samoa and had Samoan status but who might be citizens of another country. That was true of some nationals of American Samoa or New Zealand citizens from the Manihiki, Tokelau and Cook Islands, who had foreign nationality in Western Samoa.

29. Mr. VELLODI (India) recalled that, under the Citizenship Ordinance of Western Samoa, there were four ways of becoming Samoan. He asked for clarification regarding the third and fourth of those ways—naturalization and registration—mentioned on page 15 of the annual report. He also asked how many people there were in those two categories.

30. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) explained that the persons who would be required to opt for citizenship included the 660 Europeans of non-Samoan origin and an unknown number of persons from other Pacific Islands, who might have United States or New Zealand citizenship. Owing to the intricacies of the citizenship laws in most countries, some of those people did not themselves know whether they had any other nationality. The Administering Authority was therefore giving the matter as much publicity as possible so as to enable the people of Western Samoa to discover whether or not they had a nationality other than Samoan citizenship.

31. Mr. VELLODI (India) asked what conditions other than those relating to the length of residence had to be satisfied in order to secure citizenship by naturalization.

32. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) replied that, to obtain Samoan citizenship, the person concerned must be a resident of Western Samoa and have lived there for at least three years during the four years preceding his application. He must also take an oath of allegiance to the State of Western Samoa and undertake not to exercise any rights he might have as a national of another country.

33. Mr. VELLODI (India), referring to the comments of the 1959 Visiting Mission in paragraph 58 of its report (T/1449), asked whether, if some of the persons mentioned had not made up their minds by July 1960, the Administering Authority would give them an extra month or two to consider the provisions of the draft Constitution in detail so that if they opted for Samoan citizenship, they could take the oath of allegiance in good conscience.

34. Mr. McEWEN (Special representative) explained that the reason why the option expired in July was that time was running out in Western Samoa; it was necessary that, at the next elections, only citizens of Western Samoa should have the vote and it would take some time to compile the electoral rolls. However, there was nothing to prevent anyone who had not opted for Samoan nationality by July from applying for naturalization later if he fulfilled the necessary requirements.

35. Mr. VELLODI (India) asked whether the Administering Authority had considered the possibility of making the provisions concerning the deprivation of citizenship less severe, as recommended by the Visiting Mission in its report (T/1449, para. 52).

36. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) enumerated the cases in which a person could be deprived of Samoan citizenship under the Citizenship Ordinance.

37. Mr. VELLODI (India) asked when nominations of candidature must be filed for the elections to the Legislative Assembly. In 1957, elections had been held in only ten out of the forty-one Samoan constituencies; in all the other cases, there had been only one candidate, who had been declared elected automatically. If nominations for candidates were filed early enough, there might be more candidates.

38. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said that he would ask for information on that point and communicate it to the Council.

39. Mr. VELLODI (India) asked whether the five European members of the Legislative Assembly were elected from the forty-one Samoan electoral constituencies or from outside them.

40. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) replied that the five European members of the Legislative Assembly were elected by all the Europeans living in the country.

41. Mr. VELLODI (India), noting the progress achieved during the deliberations of the Working Committee on the question of titles and land, asked whether non-Samoans of European status would be included in the category of persons related to a family possessing rights to Samoan land and would be eligible for the title of "matai".

42. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) replied that approximately 90 per cent of the people of European status, i.e. all those having any Samoan blood, would be included in the category of persons related to the owners of Samoan land.

43. Mr. VELLODI (India) asked whether a person of European status who was related to a family possessing customary land rights and who was accordingly eligible to hold a "matai" title could be elected to the Legislative Assembly as a "matai".

44. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) replied in the affirmative. Any person of present European status who became a "matai" would be entitled to have his name placed on the register of "matai" and could stand for election to the Legislative Assembly.

45. Mr. VELLODI (India) asked whether relationship to a Samoan family included relationship by marriage, a point which was of considerable importance.

46. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said that he would try to obtain that information.

47. Mr. VELLODI (India) asked whether the time-table which the New Zealand Government had given the 1959 Visiting Mission (T/1449, para. 174) of the steps to be taken with a view to terminating the Trusteeship Agreement could be adhered to or would have to be amended.

48. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) said that the time-table had already been amended in that, at the request of the Samoans, the Constitutional Convention was to be held earlier than had been anticipated. For the rest it was hoped that the time-table, which provided for the attainment of Samoan independence by the end of 1961, could be adhered to.

49. Mr. VELLODI (India) asked how many European Ministers there were in the Cabinet.

50. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said that there were two, one of them being Mr. Eugene Paul.

51. Mr. VELLODI (India) asked what was the present composition of the Working Committee on Self-Government.

52. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said that the Committee consisted of the nine members of the Cabinet, the two Fautua and seven elected members of the Legislative Assembly. Originally there had been seven Samoan Ministers and two official Ministers. The latter had not been members of the Working Committee, but since the introduction of cabinet government all Ministers were members of the Working Committee.

53. Mr. VELLODI (India), turning to the question of the proposed treaty of friendship between Samoa and New Zealand, asked what would be the nature of the

working paper to be put before the General Assembly at its next session in the absence of a draft treaty. That was an important point, for the questions to be put to the electorate in the plebiscite would presumably include one concerning the treaty, and the General Assembly would be called upon to consider the arrangements for the plebiscite. He would like to know if the document to be put before the Assembly would set forth the final decision arrived at by the New Zealand Government and the Samoans on all important aspects of the future relationship between those two countries.

54. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) explained that, because of the number and importance of the tasks laid down in the time-table, the Samoan authorities and the New Zealand Government had tacitly agreed to give priority to the Constitutional Convention. Only after that would consultations take place between New Zealand and Samoa concerning their future relations. It would naturally be desirable that the General Assembly should have before it at its next session a complete and detailed document on the subject, but there was some doubt whether that would be possible. Accordingly the New Zealand Government intended to submit a document which would at least give a general outline of what was anticipated.

55. The Council would certainly acknowledge that such a treaty should not be concluded until after the Territory's accession to independence; thus it would be for the Samoans, once they had become independent, to signify their final acceptance of the treaty either in the form in which it had been drawn up or in an amended form, regardless of the document submitted to the General Assembly.

56. Mr. VELLODI (India) said that if the 1961 plebiscite was to include the question of the future relationship between the Government of New Zealand and Western Samoa he thought it was not only desirable but necessary that the General Assembly should know what conclusions they had reached in that regard. He asked when the negotiations between the New Zealand Government and the Working Committee, which would apparently represent the Samoans, were to begin.

57. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) said that he did not wish to anticipate the decision of the Samoan Government but he thought that the Working Committee could be considered the most representative Samoan body and the most competent to speak on behalf of the Samoan population.

58. Mr. VELLODI (India) asked the special representative what he had meant when he had said at the previous meeting that there was less evidence of political party activity now than in 1959; he did not know that there had been any political parties in the Territory in 1959.

59. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) explained that what he had meant by his remarks was that there had been some indications of political groupings in connexion with the votes taken in the Legislative Assembly.

60. Mr. VELLODI (India), referring to appendix I (E) of the annual report, asked what were the reasons for the large-scale migratory movement which took place in the Territory each year and whether that movement had anything to do with employment.

61. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said that the population movement could be explained in large part by the Samoan custom known as the "malaga", in accordance with which large groups of people went visiting from one village or part of Samoa to another or even to New Zealand. It should also be remembered that many Samoans went to New Zealand to study.
62. Mr. VELLODI (India) asked what was the number, or at least the percentage, of "matai" in the civil service and why so many of the senior civil service posts were held by "matai".
63. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said that he would give the Indian representative those figures later if they were available.
64. Mr. VELLODI (India) observed that progress with regard to the civil service was perhaps not as satisfactory as it should be, considering that independence was to be attained within two years. He asked how long it would take to bring about the complete "Samoanization" of the civil service on the basis of the present scholarship scheme and in-training programme.
65. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said that he thought the rate of progress would differ according to the profession or occupation concerned. Hence he could not give an exact answer, but he felt sure that where public health and agricultural services were concerned "Samoanization" would be achieved quite rapidly.
66. Mr. VELLODI (India) noted that there were Samoan assistant judges but no Samoan judges. He asked what were the qualifications of the assistant judges and whether they could expect to become judges.
67. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) replied that the assistant judges were chosen for their good character and reputation. It was not likely that any of the present assistant judges would become judges of the Supreme Court when it was set up, because the latter would be required to have legal training, but the Samoans who were now studying law in New Zealand might well become judges.
68. In reply to another question from Mr. VELLODI (India), Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) said that as far as the item to be inscribed on the agenda of the General Assembly's fifteenth session was concerned it was for the Council to decide whether "The Question of Western Samoa" or "The Future of Western Samoa" was the more appropriate title.
69. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) observed that in view of the competence and mature outlook of the Prime Minister of Samoa, Mr. Fiame Mata'afa, his inaugural address on 1 October 1959 was extremely important. He asked if the New Zealand delegation could make its text available.
70. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) replied that the tape recorders of the Western Samoan Broadcasting Service had failed and there was consequently no verbatim record of the speech. A summary of the speech which had been published in the local newspapers could, however, be provided.
71. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) asked why persons who did not wish to choose Samoan nationality should emigrate to New Zealand. In his opinion such foreigners, or those who would become foreigners, should be able to remain in Samoa as foreigners and continue to carry on their activities and retain their property.
72. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said that he thought there was no reason why such persons should not remain in Samoa if they so wished. As a matter of fact there appeared at present to be very few who wanted to emigrate to New Zealand.
73. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France), turning to the question of suffrage, asked if the idea of having two electoral registers, as suggested by the Visiting Mission—a "matai" register and a non-"matai" register—had been abandoned.
74. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) replied that the Working Committee had discussed the matter in recent weeks and had considered the views of the Visiting Mission, but the discussion of that point had not yet been concluded.
75. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) asked whether there was any political significance in the composition of the new Cabinet, a parliamentary-type government, or whether the principal change was simply the transition from a government comprising both politicians and official members to a purely cabinet government.
76. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) replied that there had been few changes in portfolios or, in fact, in the composition of the Cabinet. There had been a considerable change, however, in regard to the latter's responsibilities, since the Ministers now had to initiate policy instead of leaving that task, as previously, to the official members.
77. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) recalled that the Samoa Amendment Act 1959 provided for the review of ministerial decisions by the Council of State, a body made up of the High Commissioner and the "Fatua", which could refer such decisions to the Executive Council. He asked whether particularly important matters had been involved in the two cases in which that exceptional procedure had been employed.
78. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) replied that the two cases had not involved any great difficulties—one of them had concerned the purchase of a radio transmitter. The members of the Council of State had merely wished to draw the attention of the Cabinet to certain details which had been overlooked.
79. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France), noting that mention had been made of a new Government newspaper, asked for particulars concerning the Press and the newspaper in question.
80. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said that the newspaper, which was printed completely in Samoan and was well illustrated, was a very large one for that part of the world and was distributed free in all the villages. It sought to explain to the people the nature of cabinet government and other matters of importance at the present time. The Government also operated a transmitting station at Apia, which broadcast news items, talks on constitutional problems, and the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly. In addition, there was a privately owned weekly newspaper which was published in both English and Samoan.
81. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France), turning to the question of the treaty of friendship, said that while in Western Samoa with the Visiting Mission he

had noticed that the Samoans seemed willing to entrust responsibility for their foreign policy and defence to New Zealand. He asked whether there had been any change in Samoan opinion on the matter since then, and whether the New Zealand representative felt that in the event of the Samoans wishing to conduct their own foreign policy or to provide for their own defence, they would have the means of doing so.

82. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) replied that, to his knowledge, there had been no change whatever in Samoan opinion on that point since the Mission's visit to the Territory.

83. As far as the Samoans' ability to manage their foreign affairs was concerned, it must be acknowledged that, for the present, they lacked the necessary resources. The example of other Territories, however, showed that that was not an insuperable obstacle and, if the Samoans really wished to manage their own foreign affairs, they should be able to do so in course of time. It would be possible to reply to the question more fully at the next session of the General Assembly, by which time discussions would have been held between the New Zealand and Samoan authorities.

84. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) said that he understood that the treaty to be concluded between New Zealand and Samoa would not be ratified until after independence. He asked whether the text would be submitted to the people in the plebiscite.

85. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) said he understood that the Samoan authorities still intended to submit the question of the treaty to the people in the plebiscite.

86. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) asked whether the New Zealand representative had any idea yet of the nature and number of the questions to be asked in the plebiscite.

87. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) said that the questions, which had been suggested by the Samoans and were to be found in paragraph 164 of the Visiting Mission's report, were three in number and related to the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, the Constitution, and the treaty of friendship, or, as he preferred to call it, the document of relationship between New Zealand and Western Samoa. The form in which the questions were to be asked would be considered before the General Assembly convened.

88. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) asked whether a representative of Western Samoa—perhaps even the Prime Minister, which would be most desirable—was expected to be present during the discussion of Samoa's future at the next session of the General Assembly.

89. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) said that he earnestly hoped that the Samoan representative would be the Prime Minister himself.

90. Mr. KIANG (China) asked what was the circulation of the newspaper *Savali*.

91. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said he thought it was about 5,000 copies but that, owing to the Samoan custom of gathering to discuss the news, the newspaper reached many more people than its circulation indicated.

92. Mr. KIANG (China) requested information on the several cases of Samoans who wished to emigrate to New Zealand.

93. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand) said that they were persons of European status who did not automatically acquire Samoan citizenship under the provisions of the Citizenship Ordinance. Their position had been discussed with the members of the Visiting Mission, and the New Zealand Government had promised to give sympathetic consideration to their request.

94. Mr. KIANG (China) asked whether, in view of the observations made by the Visiting Mission and the reference on page 29 of the annual report, the special representative could provide some further information on local government?

95. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) said that in each village there was a full-time or part-time official, the "Pulenu'u", who was the official link between the central Government and the district or village concerned. All the "matai" of the village met frequently to discuss village affairs and all the inhabitants were free to attend. Although the system was of the traditional type, it was reasonably effective, particularly because the women's committees were very active. At present, no need was felt for a formal type of organization; that was why the emphasis had been on the formation of bodies with specific functions. The situation would undoubtedly change, however, and a system of local government would eventually be instituted.

96. Mr. KIANG (China) asked whether the Samoan leaders were aware of the importance of the problems of local government.

97. Mr. McEWEN (Special Representative) replied that the Legislative Assembly had already passed an ordinance dealing with district and village government but that it was primarily concerned at the present time with setting up the central Government.

Mr. McEwen, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Western Samoa, withdrew.

QUESTION CONCERNING THE PETITIONERS FROM THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

98. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked what the situation was with regard to the petition from the Marshall Islanders and whether the Council would be able to consider the report of the Standing Committee on Petitions the following day, before the petitioners left New York.

99. The PRESIDENT said that the Standing Committee had just completed consideration of the matter and that its report would be before the Council on 5 May.^{2/}

100. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the petitioners would still be in New York on 5 May to attend the Council meeting and whether the Secretariat could, if necessary, have the document ready by 4 May.

101. Mr. KIANG (China) pointed out that it was not known whether the petitioners wished to appear before the Council again when it discussed the report of the Standing Committee on Petitions.

102. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) associated himself with the Soviet representative in requesting the Secretariat to expedite the preparation of the

^{2/}See document T/L.968.

document. It was, however, for the petitioners to decide whether or not they wished to attend the meeting.

103. The PRESIDENT said that the Secretariat would be able to circulate the English text of the report on the morning of 4 May.

104. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the Secretariat should inform

the petitioners that the report of the Standing Committee on Petitions would be ready on 4 May and that, if they wished, they could attend the Council meeting at which the report was to be discussed.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.