



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Thirty-second Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Wednesday, 23 June 1965,
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

C O N T E N T S

Agenda items 4 and 6:

<i>Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1964:</i>	
<i>(b) Nauru (continued)</i>	
<i>Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1965:</i>	
<i>(a) Nauru (continued)</i>	
<i>Request concerning the special representative's opening statement (concluded)</i>	145
<i>General debate (concluded).</i>	146
<i>Appointment of the Drafting Committee on Nauru</i>	148

Agenda items 4 and 5:

<i>Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1964:</i>	
<i>(a) Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)</i>	
<i>Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda (continued)</i>	
<i>Report of the Drafting Committee on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)</i>	148

President: Mr. André NAUDY (France).

Present:

The representatives of the following States: Australia, China, France, Liberia, New Zealand, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

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

AGENDA ITEMS 4 AND 6

Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1964:

(b) Nauru (T/1631, T/1641, T/L.1091 and Add.1, T/L.1098) (continued)

Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1965:

(a) Nauru (T/1636 and Corr.1) (continued)

REQUEST CONCERNING THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE'S OPENING STATEMENT (concluded)

1. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia), recalling the Soviet representative's proposal at the previous meeting that part of the opening statement of the special representative for Nauru should be issued as a Council document, said that his delegation agreed to that proposal on the understanding that the whole of the special representative's statement, i.e. the opening statement made at the 1256th meeting and annexes I and II, ^{1/} which he had not read out, would be issued.

2. After an exchange of views with Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) and the PRESIDENT, Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet delegation was concerned with the fate of the Nauruan proposals and sought to ensure that they should not be lost among the numerous unofficial documents of the Council. In view of the fact that the special representative's opening statement was already given in the verbatim record and in the summary record of the 1256th meeting, the Soviet delegation maintained its original proposal and requested that only annex I to the statement should be issued as a Council document.

3. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that the various parts of the documentation submitted to the Council by his delegation formed a whole and should be issued as a Council document in their entirety.

4. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) said that, contrary to what had been said by the representative of the Soviet Union, his delegation had not expressed any doubt as to the desirability of issuing the document in question. The United States delegation supported the Australian amendment to the Soviet proposal. The Soviet representative was trying to give the impression that the Australian delegation had withheld from the Council something of value to the Council. The fact was that the Australian delegation had originally taken the initiative in putting the document in question before the Council.

5. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained, for the benefit of the Australian representative, that in making its proposal the Soviet delegation had had no ulterior motive; its only object was the issuance of an official Council document containing the points of view and arguments of the Nauruan people as submitted to the Australian Government by the Nauruans themselves, and not as inter-

^{1/} Circulated by the Australian delegation to members of the Council.

preted by the representatives of the Administering Authority.

6. It was not the Australian delegation which had taken the initiative of proposing the issuance of the document in question, as the United States representative had implied, but the Soviet delegation, which had taken that step at the previous meeting. There were, moreover, many arguments in favour of the Soviet proposal, including precedents in the Council and in the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, not to speak of the instructions which the Secretariat had concerning the limitation of documentation. It would be pointless to issue as Council documents all the documentation that had been submitted by the Australian delegation.

7. Mr. SWAN (United Kingdom) said that the Council should take a decision on the two proposals before it.

8. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that neither the Council nor any other United Nations organ had ever issued an isolated section of a statement or an official document without making appropriate reference to its context.

9. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew the Council's attention to the fact that the Australian Government had been able to make known its position on the questions relating to the Trust Territories under its administration to the Trusteeship Council, the Special Committee and the General Assembly, whereas the Nauruan people had rarely been able to present their point of view in that way except through the Australian representatives. Thus, while the Administering Authority's position on the question of Nauru was well known, the same could not be said of the Nauruans' position. It was because Australia had often sought to conceal the truth from the Council and other United Nations organs that the Soviet delegation had requested that the proposals submitted to the Australian Government by the Nauru Local Government Council should be issued as a separate document for the information not only of Council members but also of all Member States.

10. He read out part of the section entitled "Resettlement proposals of the three Governments" in the memorandum submitted by the Nauru Local Government Council (T/1636 and Add.1, annex I) from which it was clear that the Australian representatives had interpreted the Nauruan leaders' statements in their own way and that if the Trusteeship Council had been better informed of the Nauruans' wishes, certain delegations, including that of Bolivia, would probably have adopted a different position on the question at the Council's twenty-seventh session. It was therefore clear that the Australian delegation had often kept silent about documents expressing the point of view of the Nauruan people, thus trying to make the members of the Council and of the General Assembly forget the position of the Territory's inhabitants in regard to problems which concerned them first and foremost and which should be solved by giving their wishes priority.

11. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) observed that the Nauru Local Government Council was well aware

of the value of its freedom to express its opinion, whether favourable or unfavourable, to the Administering Authority. That freedom of expression was jealously guarded by the Australian Government on behalf of the Nauruan people and the other peoples for whom it was responsible.

12. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Australian amendment to the Soviet proposal and noted that according to that amendment the opening statement by the special representative of the Administering Authority at the 1256th meeting and the two annexes to that statement would be issued as a Council document.

13. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that her delegation would not participate in the vote.

At the request of the Australian representative, the vote was taken by roll-call.

China, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: China, France, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia.

Against: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The Australian amendment was adopted by 6 votes to 1.

14. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Soviet proposal, as amended.

At the request of the USSR representative, the vote was taken by roll-call.

Liberia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Liberia, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, China, France.

Against: None.

The proposal, as amended, was adopted by 7 votes to none.

15. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had refrained from taking part in the vote in order to protest energetically against the machinations of the colonialist majority, which were made possible only by the nature of the Council's membership. The Soviet delegation's position of principle on the situation in Nauru was well known, both in the United Nations and in the Territory. The colonial Powers would gain nothing from the fact that they had once more been able to achieve their objective. On observing the way in which those Powers behaved in United Nations organs, it was easy to imagine the methods and means they resorted to in their relations with the colonial peoples.

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Marsh, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Nauru, Mr. de Roburt, and Mr. Detudamo, advisers to the special representative, took places at the Council table.

16. Mr. MARSH (Special Representative) noted that the members of the Council had seen no necessity at the present session to ask the questions which they usually asked the representative of the Administering Authority regarding education, health, the courts, Nauruanization of the Public Service, etc. That suggested that they accepted the conclusions in the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1965, that standards of living were high in Nauru and that social, medical and educational conditions were excellent (T/1636 and Corr.1, para. 94). The members of the Council had been more interested in the matters which had recently been the subject of discussions between the representatives of the Nauruans and the Australian Government. He thought that the members of the Council were now fully informed on those matters and in a position to make recommendations on the problems which the Visiting Mission had felt needed consideration in the light of the results of the conference which had recently been held at Canberra.

17. As Head Chief de Roburt had said at the 1257th meeting, the Nauru delegation had been reasonably satisfied with the results of that conference. In addition to the Nauruans' financial gains, amounting to some \$2.5 million for 1964-1965 and to nearly \$4 million for 1965-1966, the Australian Government had accepted the principle of joint enterprise for the phosphate industry, which presupposed the establishment of a fundamentally different relationship between Nauruans and the Administering Authority than that which had existed in the past. The vast sums which would accrue from the application of new royalty rates were regarded by the Nauruans not as income but as capital. However, the Nauru Local Government Council would have to apportion the royalties between the various current accounts and the capital investment fund. As to the practical application of the principle of joint enterprise, Head Chief de Roburt had told the Council that his delegation was satisfied with the timing which had been envisaged for the discussions on that point.

18. In the political field, the Administering Authority had accepted all the target dates proposed by the Nauruans for the establishment of a legislative and an executive council, and it had already taken action so that those bodies could be brought into being at the agreed time. Since that was so, it was difficult to understand the doubts expressed by one delegation concerning the target dates. It was also difficult to understand why the same delegation had declared that Australia was still striving to foist resettlement on Curtis Island upon the Nauruans. The Australian Government had not only publicly stated that that project had been dropped but had released the Queensland Government from the undertaking which it had made in that connexion and had advised all those concerned that the resettlement plans had been dropped.

19. Even more unfortunate was the suggestion that attempts had been made to isolate the Nauruan leaders from the people. The Nauru Local Government Council fully represented the Nauruan people, and its members were in close contact with their electors.

It was for that reason that the Australian Government had dealt with delegations of the Local Government Council in the same way as it would have dealt with the people themselves. It had never bypassed the Council. The only time that matters had been discussed directly with the people had been during discussions arranged by the Local Government Council, for example, during the visit of the Visiting Mission and when he himself had explained the Curtis Island proposal to the people. He was entirely satisfied in that connexion that the Local Government Council's decision was fully in accord with the will of the people.

20. The reckless assertions which had been made in the Trusteeship Council could not be supported when faced with the fact that the Australian Government had agreed that a sum of about \$2 million for resettlement should be available for the Nauruan people on Nauru, that that Government had accepted the request of the Local Government Council and had dropped the acquisition of Curtis Island, and that it had accepted proposals for the establishment of a legislative and an executive council. Even more serious was the accusation that Australia would carry out a plan of de facto liquidation of the Nauruans as a nation and as a people. It was well known that several proposals had been submitted at various times to the Australian Government and that in each case it had done all that was necessary to implement them, patiently renewing its efforts each time that one formula was dropped for another. He failed to see how that could be considered as evidence of a plan of liquidation of the Nauruans, whose numbers had doubled in eighteen years and whose representatives were speaking in the Trusteeship Council and frankly stating their views on all the matters that concerned them.

21. With regard to resettlement, the Visiting Mission had unanimously stated, in paragraph 41 of its report, that the idea should not be abandoned. At the Canberra conference it had been agreed that the Administering Authority, in co-operation with Nauruan representatives, would pursue any proposals that might give promise of enabling the Nauruan people to resettle. No one would dream of questioning the Visiting Mission's motives. The Canberra agreement, which had been freely accepted by the Nauruans, contained two vital qualifications, namely, that if any resettlement proposal was to be viable it had, first, to be acceptable to the Nauruans and, secondly, to preserve their national identity. That was evidence of the efforts which had been made to arrive at a satisfactory solution.

22. He thanked the President and the members of the Council for their courtesy towards him. The excellent quality of the verbatim and summary records had also greatly facilitated his work and that of his Nauruan colleagues.

23. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the statement which the special representative of the Administering Authority had just made was basically negative in nature. It contained no positive elements which would enable the Soviet delegation to agree with the view which the special representative had attempted to defend, namely, that the Administer-

ing Authority was really interested in the well-being of the people of Nauru.

24. However, the Local Government Council documents before the Trusteeship Council made it possible to learn the opinion of the Nauruans. At the Canberra conference, the Nauruan delegation had made specific proposals. Yet nothing in the special representative's statement proved that the Australian Government accepted the date of 31 January 1968 proposed by the Nauruans for accession to independence. In accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Nauru should, of course, accede to independence immediately, but since the people of Nauru themselves had fixed a date of their own, his delegation would defer to their wishes.

25. Furthermore, there was nothing in the special representative's statement to indicate that the Australian Government recognized the Nauruan people's ability to govern themselves or that it was ready to give up its imperialist policies and to recognize the sovereignty of the Nauruan people over their natural wealth: phosphates. In particular, the special representative had not said—and for good reason—that the British Phosphate Commissioners would pay the royalties which the Nauruans had requested on the basis of world phosphate prices. The special representative's statement merely confirmed the impression that, as in the past, the Australian Government was attempting to speed up the rate of phosphate extraction, thus reducing the time during which the Nauruans would be able to live on Nauru and benefit from the island's resources. Moreover, nothing which the special representative had said indicated that the Administering Authority was ready to carry out the restoration of the top soil of Nauru immediately at its own expense nor that it would pay the Nauruans a royalty for every ton of phosphate ever extracted from the island, on the basis of at least the prices established at the Canberra conference.

26. He read out a draft resolution (T/L.1098) in which his delegation set forth the arguments which it had continually put forward concerning conditions in Nauru, and he expressed the hope that that draft resolution would be adopted by the Trusteeship Council, which had a duty to defend the interests of the Nauruan people.

27. Mr. EASTMAN (Liberia) regretted that the special representative of the Administering Authority had not made it clear whether his Government intended to implement the provisions of the Charter and of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), with a view to complying with the request of the Nauruan people, who had a viable economy, enjoyed a high standard of living and were already capable of managing their own affairs, that independence should be granted by 31 January 1968. In his opinion, it was now for the Council to take the steps necessary to ensure that the wishes of the Nauruan people were honoured.

28. Mr. MARSH (Special Representative) recalled that in his opening statement (1256th meeting) he had said that agreement had been reached on a number of points: royalties, the future management of the phosphate industry, and the establishment of a legislative council. In particular, with regard to the de-

pletion of the phosphate mines, the parties concerned had agreed that an expert committee should be set up to study the problem of soil restoration and other related matters. In addition, they had decided to continue discussions on questions which were still outstanding.

29. The Administering Authority was awaiting with great interest the establishment of a Nauruan legislative council and executive council, for it was with those bodies that it proposed to work out further measures designed to accelerate the Territory's political advancement.

30. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the Australian Government was prepared to grant independence to Nauru in January 1968, in accordance with the wish expressed by the Nauruan delegation to the Canberra conference.

31. Mr. MARSH (Special Representative) replied that the date of the granting of independence would be determined in agreement with the future Nauruan legislative council.

32. The PRESIDENT thanked the special representative of the Administering Authority, as well as Mr. de Roburt and Mr. Detudamo, advisers to the special representative, for their active participation in the work of the Council.

Mr. Marsh, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of Nauru, and Mr. de Roburt and Mr. Detudamo, advisers to the special representative, withdrew.

APPOINTMENT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON NAURU

33. The PRESIDENT suggested that the representatives of the United States and of France should be appointed members of the committee to draft the report on the Trust Territory of Nauru.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEMS 4 AND 5

Examination of annual reports of the Administering Authorities on the administration of Trust Territories for the year ended 30 June 1964:

(a) Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T/1633, T/1638, T/L.1089 and Add.1) (*continued*)

Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda (T/PET.10/L.8, T/PET.10/L.9 and Corr.1) (*continued*)

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/L.1096, T/L.1097/REV.1) (*continued*)

34. Miss BROOKS (Liberia), referring to the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1096), drew attention to an error in the last sentence of paragraph 10: the words "local unity" should be replaced by the words "local activities".

35. The PRESIDENT informed the Council that the Soviet Union delegation, bearing in mind certain suggestions made by the Liberian representative, had submitted a revised version (T/L.1097/Rev.1) of the amendments it had presented at the previous meeting.

36. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the beginning of paragraph 10 of document T/L.1097/Rev.1 should read: "Replace the present paragraphs 22 and 23 by the following:".

37. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider, paragraph by paragraph, the draft conclusions and recommendations contained in the annex to the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1096).

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

38. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on each of the two sentences of paragraph 3.

The first sentence of paragraph 3 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The second sentence of paragraph 3 was adopted by 5 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 3 as a whole was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

39. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on the expression "with satisfaction", in the first sentence of paragraph 5, and on the third sentence of the paragraph.

The expression "with satisfaction" was adopted by 7 votes to 1.

The third sentence of the paragraph was adopted unanimously.

Paragraph 5 as a whole was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

40. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote first on the Soviet amendment (T/L.1097/Rev.1, para.1) to paragraph 6.

41. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) took exception to the statement that the powers of the Administering Authority reduced the possibility of Micronesians becoming effectively seized of the problems concerning the Territory and finding solutions thereto. On the contrary, the recent executive and legislative reforms introduced were such as to widen the participation of the indigenous population in the management of the Territory's affairs. Furthermore, as he had said during the general debate, it was necessary that the Administering Authority should retain certain powers in order to be able to discharge its responsibilities to the United Nations with regard to the Territory. The Australian delegation would therefore oppose the Soviet amendment.

The Soviet amendment (T/L.1097/Rev.1, para. 1) to paragraph 6 was rejected by 4 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

42. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on the first two sentences and on the last sentence of paragraph 6 (T/L.1096, annex).

The first two sentences were adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The last sentence was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 6 as a whole was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

43. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on the beginning of the first sentence of paragraph 7, up to and including the words "to exercise those powers".

The phrase in question was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 7 as a whole was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

44. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that paragraphs 8 and 9 should be put to the vote together.

45. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) opposed that procedure.

Paragraph 8 was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 9 was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 10 was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

46. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union had proposed an amendment (T/L.1097/Rev.1, para.2) to paragraph 11, not because it had not given sufficient attention to the documents submitted to the Council, as some delegations had claimed, but because, according to paragraph 11 of the draft conclusions and recommendations, five district legislatures had revised their charters. However, as those charters had not been made available to the Council, the Soviet delegation wished to have the text of its amendment included in the conclusions and recommendations.

47. As the representative of the United States had said that he would vote against all the Soviet amendments, he assumed that the United States probably intended to continue its policy of not making the most important documents concerning the Territory available to the Trusteeship Council.

48. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) recalled his statement at the previous meeting that the annual reports of the Administering Authority as far back as 1959 contained the texts of the charters of each district and that in the future the texts of new charters, as well as those of any revisions, would be included. He therefore failed to see the purpose of the Soviet amendment.

49. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to know whether any changes had been made in the text of the Charter of the Mariana Islands District Legislature. That Charter had not included the word "independence" two years ago, an omission which, according to the United States representative, had been due to an oversight. If the United States was really prepared to provide information to the Trusteeship Council, the Soviet delegation did not see why it

did not agree to the request contained in the Soviet amendment. If the United States refused to submit the text of the Charter of the Trusteeship Council, the Soviet delegation would make efforts to obtain it by other means. It considered, however, that it was the duty of the Administering Authority to transmit such documents to the Council.

50. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) said that the representative of the Soviet Union was trying to cover up his initial error. The fact was that the United States had submitted the charters in the annual reports. It would continue to submit them, or submit amendments if they were only amended. The Soviet representative was shifting his argument to what the charters should contain. Mr. Dickinson pointed out that the text of the Charter currently in force in the Mariana Islands District was to be found on page 156 of the annual report on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for 1963.^{2/}

51. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether that Charter had been revised and, if so, whether he could obtain a copy of the new charter and of the charters in force in the other five districts.

52. Mr. DICKINSON (United States of America) said that all the charters as they now stood were before the Council. He had given the Council the pertinent page numbers at the previous meeting.

53. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that, in view of the statements of the United States representative, the Soviet Union amendment was superfluous. The Australian delegation would therefore vote against the amendment.

The Soviet Union amendment (T/L.1097/Rev.1, para. 2) to paragraph 11 was rejected by 3 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

Paragraph 11 (T/L.1096, annex) was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

54. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) observed that the statements made in the Soviet Union amendment (T/L.1097/Rev.1, para. 3) to paragraphs 12 and 13 (T/L.1096, annex) were not in accord with the facts as indicated by the statements of the representative of the Administering Authority and the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1964 (T/1620). Moreover, the amendment did not properly reflect the Council's debate on the matter.

The Soviet Union amendment (T/L.1097/Rev.1, para. 3) to paragraphs 12 and 13 was rejected by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

55. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) stated that, if the two sentences of the amendment had been put to the vote separately, she would have voted against the first and abstained on the second.

Paragraph 12 (T/L.1096, annex) was adopted by 6 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

^{2/} United States of America, 16th Annual Report to the United Nations on the Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, July 1, 1962 to June 30, 1963, Department of State Publication 7676 (Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1964). Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by a note of the Secretary-General (T/1624).

Paragraph 13 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

56. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China), referring to the fourth Soviet Union amendment (T/L.1097/Rev.1, para. 4), which was a proposal to add a new sub-section entitled "Judicial system" after paragraph 13, said that he was well acquainted with the judicial system of Micronesia and that it was a fact, as the United States representative had said, that all local court judges were Micronesians. The members of the High Court were, to be sure, not indigenous judges; however, the Chief Justice of the Territory was not only a highly competent and completely independent judge but also a very progressive thinker who had introduced new ideas into the Territory, particularly with regard to fishing rights and land tenure. By his competence and his political wisdom, the Chief Justice had gained the affection of the Micronesians.

57. Since the Soviet Union's proposal was not in conformity with the actual facts of the situation in the Territory, his delegation would be unable to vote in favour of the amendment.

58. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that his delegation opposed the Soviet Union amendment not because it did not favour the holding of the important posts in the judicial system by Micronesians—quite the contrary—but because it believed that being a good judge required not only wisdom and integrity but also a high degree of legal training. There were undoubtedly many Micronesians with the desired qualities of wisdom and integrity, but they did not have the necessary legal knowledge and experience. An attempt to apply some political theory at the sacrifice of basic principles could lead only to disaster.

59. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that she would support the Soviet Union amendment although she would have preferred to see it worded differently. In supporting the amendment, she was not considering any particular personality but merely the principle that the Micronesians should manage their own affairs. It was not for the Trusteeship Council to judge whether or not they were capable of doing so.

60. She recalled that the inhabitants of the Marianas had asked for the introduction of the jury system. The people of Micronesia should be encouraged in their efforts, and the best way to do so would be to entrust them with the key posts in the judiciary. It was for the inhabitants of the Territory to decide whether they wished to assume the entire responsibility, but it was quite probable that they could perform their functions with the same competence as outside officials.

61. Mr. Chiping H. C. KIANG (China) said that his opposition to the amendment was due not only to his high regard for the Chief Justice. It was not correct to say that the judicial system was controlled entirely by the Administration. Although the representatives of the Administering Authority had done a great deal for the progress of the Territory, his delegation would be happy to see the Micronesians occupy all the important posts, particularly in the High Court; however, in all frankness, he did not believe that a Micronesian could be found today who met the requirements of the post of Chief Justice.

As to the Micronesians' desire to introduce the jury system, referred to by the Liberian representative, the Soviet Union amendment had nothing to do with that point.

62. Mr. FOTIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he was not surprised that the representative of Australia supported the position of the United States and categorically opposed the Soviet Union amendment, since the delegations of those two countries joined hands and praised each other when the Territories under their administration were discussed. The Australian representative was no doubt familiar with the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, since he was casting doubt on the accuracy of the statements made in the Soviet Union amendment. He wondered, however, whether that representative could mention to the Council the name of even one Micronesian judge in the High Court of the Territory.

63. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that his explanation of his delegation's position on the Soviet Union

amendment had been made not in support of the United States but merely to inform the Council, in all sincerity, of Australia's point of view on the matter.

64. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) agreed with the Chinese delegation that the representatives of the Administering Authority were contributing much to the progress of the Territory of the Pacific Islands, often at the cost of great effort. It was not for the Liberian delegation, as it had always maintained, to determine whether the people of Micronesia were ready to take over the judicial system, but the people themselves must be given the opportunity to show what they were capable of. That was the reason for Liberia's support of the Soviet Union amendment.

The Soviet Union amendment (T/L.1097/Rev.1, para. 4) was rejected by 5 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.