

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL
T/PV.976
15 June 1959
ENGLISH

Twenty-fourth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 15 June 1959, at 10.30 a.m.

President:

Mr. VITELLI (Vice-President)

(Haiti)

Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru [3d, 6]

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol T/ST.976 and will be subject to representatives' corrections. It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

59-14807

AGENDA ITEMS 5d and 6

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF NAURU (T/L.911): (continued)

- (a) ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 1958 (T/1446, 1465)
- (b) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORIES OF NAURU, NEW GUINEA AND THE PACIFIC ISLANDS, 1959 (T/1448 and Add.1, T/1460)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Jones, special representative for the Trust Territory of Nauru under Australian administration, took a place at the Trusteeship Council table.

Economic advancement (continued)

Chair Mr. JONES (Special representative): In giving replies to questions asked by the representative of the United Arab Republic on Friday with regard to the appointment and removal of judges and magistrates from the courts of the Territory, there seems to have been some misunderstanding, and I should like to take this opportunity to clarify the position. The final question that was asked by the representative of the United Arab Republic was whether the magistrates of the courts who are also officials may be removed from office for any reasons other than the two which have been mentioned by the special representative. In reply to previous questions I had made it clear what the position was: that the judge of the Appeals Courts and judges and magistrates of the Central Court could only be removed on the grounds of proved misbehaviour or incapacity, whereas in the District Court they could be removed by the Administrator for any reason he thought fit. I interpreted the final question I have referred to to refer to the District Court. My reply was :

"Yes, they may be removed from office by the Administrator for any reason he deems fit." (T/PV.975, page 32)

Reading the verbatim record now, I appreciate that both the question and my reply could be misleading. The position is that regardless of whether the magistrates of the Central Court are officials or not, they can only be removed from office by the Administrator for reason of misbehaviour or incapacity, whereas in the District Court magistrates again, whether they are officials or not officials of the Administration, can be removed by the Administrator for any reason he thinks fit.

Mr. VELLODI (India): My first question to the special representative relates to the banking system in the Territory. The annual report indicates on page 16 that there are certain restrictions on withdrawing money, that a person can only withdraw a certain amount at a time. The reason for imposing this restriction is given in the annual report. I have a very simple question in this connexion: Has there been any protest either from the people or from the Local Government Council regarding these restrictions?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): No, there has been no objection. If the Nauruan people themselves desired to have those restrictions removed, the Administering Authority would have no objection whatever. As far as I am aware, the restrictions have been maintained at the request of the council, which is supposed to be advised to some extent on this particular matter by the Nauruan Affairs Officer.

Mr. VELLODI (India): I have a few questions which relate to the phosphate industry in the Territory. I must confess that I too have some difficulty in following the statistical tables and the information given in the report itself. The representative of the Soviet Union raised this point when we met on Friday. As I listened to the discussion in this Council and as I went through the annual report, I did get the impression that the information given in the annual report is inadequate.

The special representative and the representative of Australia have said that all the essential and necessary information is contained in the report. Now it is possible that with my limited experience in going through the annual reports, I cannot find the information that I want. I should therefore like to ask a few questions of the special representative merely to elicit some clarification regarding the phosphate industry.

When the representative of the Soviet Union asked a question relating to the cost of phosphate in the Territory, the special representative said -- and this is contained in the verbatim record of Friday's meeting, page 42 -- that Appendix XIII contained the f.o.b. cost, including other costs, and that in the body of the report itself there was shown the amount of phosphate shipped from

(Mr. Vellodi, India)

Nauru. As I see Appendix XIII, I note that it relates not only to the island of Nauru, but also to Ocean Island and Christmas Island. The balance sheet and the trading account given in Appendix XIII relates to all these islands and not only to Nauru. Therefore, the f.o.b. cost of approximately £5 million given in the balance sheet relates to all the phosphate from that area. Quite obviously, therefore, the f.o.b. cost cannot be worked out on that basis because, on page 17 of the annual report itself, the information regarding the tonnage of phosphate relates only to the island of Nauru.

In this particular context, I have no question; I am only making a comment to the effect that this does not give the f.o.b. cost very clearly. My question relates to the royalties, and it is in this connexion that I find the report rather inadequate.

For instance, page 17 of the annual report states, The royalty received during 1957-58 totaled £90,746", out of which £90,590 have been paid to or on behalf of the Nauruans. Later on in the report, the royalty is given for the three separate accounts, the Royalty Trust Fund, the Land-Owners' Fund and the Community Long-Term Investment Fund. I understand that these are the three royalties paid, and I would have thought that they should add up to this amount of £90,590. However, that is not the case. They add up only to about £45,000.

I also find it difficult to see in the report itself the amount actually paid to the land-owners not by way of royalty but by way of compensation for the land, the immediate payment to the land-owners of 9 d. per ton. The total amount paid to the land-owners under the account is not shown in the report.

Could the special representative give some clarification on this matter? Specifically, my question is: What is the break-down of the total royalty paid as shown by the figure £90,590?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I am very glad that the representative of India has brought this matter up again, because there does seem to be some confusion concerning how the various sums mentioned in the report are arrived at. Let us look at page 17 of the report, where we find a table.

(Mr. Jones,
Special representative)

This table shows 1,167,180 tons of phosphate valued at £2,421,898, which is approximately £2 per ton, which is the f.o.b. cost of Nauru phosphate alone, taking all expenses into consideration. It also shows that the royalty on that quantity, at the rate of 1/7 a ton, which is shown further down in the column, was £92,402. That represents the actual royalty that was paid, and I think, if you take the trouble to multiply 1/7 by the number of tons shipped, you will get £92,402. It also makes it quite clear that that sum of money is included in the f.o.b. cost shown in the second column of £2,421,898.

The next figure refers to a payment of £328,988 by the British Phosphate Commissioners towards the expenses of the Administration, and the sum of £7,650 for finalization of the housing scheme and expenses incurred in extending electricity to Mauruan homes. The report also shows that the total of £336,638 is also included in that total f.o.b. above. I think that is quite clear. These figures total £429,040; that is, the royalty plus the expenses paid towards the administration plus the housing scheme represents approximately 20 per cent of the total f.o.b. cost of Nauru phosphate shipped during the year under review. Of course, 80 per cent would be represented by costs of production, interest on capital and other expenditures incurred in the operations of the Phosphate Commissioners on Nauru, because that is the f.o.b. cost of the production of the Nauru phosphate alone.

I might add, as a matter of interest, that for the 880,000-odd tons that were raised in the first nine months of the year the f.o.b. cost was £2.1.6.

We now go on to the royalty received during the year. The £92,402 shown in the table, assessed at the rate of 1/7 a ton, is the amount chargeable at 1/7 per ton against the quantity of phosphate shipped, not the quantity of phosphate produced, because the quantity produced during the year has no relation to the quantity shipped. I want to make that quite clear because, as will be known by members of the Council, the phosphate when it is first raised is wet; it has to go through various processes and, when it dries, it has naturally lost a good deal of weight. Of course, all charges, payments and royalties are assessed on the dry phosphate after it has been treated. The method of assessing what is due to the Mauruan landowners is as follows. Each day the moisture in the phosphate is assessed and the loss is known, and they also know each day the exact amount of phosphate that has been raised from the land

(Mr. Jones,
Special representative)

of any particular Nauruan landowner, and then by a process of calculation they know eventually the amount of dry phosphate that has been raised from any particular section of Nauruan land. So it will be seen that the £92,000 shown in the table for phosphate shipped should not be confused in any way with the £90,000 shown towards the bottom of the column, which is for a twelve-months' period from 1 April to 31 March.

While we are on this, perhaps I can give a little more clarification. It is possible that some delegations have read the reply to a resolution which appears on page 42 of the report. There it gives the new rates of royalty. I should like to make it quite clear that, although these new rates are retrospective to 1 July 1957 -- and I made a statement that the retrospective payments in accordance with the new rates for the period from 1 July 1957 to 30 June 1958 exceeded £58,000 -- the decision to pay the increased rates was reached after the close of the year under review, and so the £58,000 royalty payments referred to are not included in the f.o.b. price of Nauru phosphate shown on page 17.

When, in reply to a question by the representative of the Soviet Union, I referred him to Appendix XIII, actually I meant to refer to this table on page 17, because I think it is quite obvious that the information given in Appendix XIII, covers the whole of the operations of the Phosphate Commissioners, and it is actually of very little assistance in obtaining any information at all regarding the shipment of phosphate from Nauru. That information can only be obtained from the figures given on page 17 of the report.

Mr. VELLODI (India): I am most grateful to the special representative for the detailed reply he has given. There was only one point upon which I think he did not comment: that was the splitting up of the amount of £90,590 paid by way of royalty to or on behalf of the Nauruans. In the Appendix on pages 60 and 61, the individual figures are given for the royalty paid towards the Nauru Royalty Trust Fund, the Landowners' Royalty Trust Fund and the Community Long-term Investment Fund in the year 1957-58. As I said in my earlier statement, these three add up to about £43,769. Are we to take it that the difference between this £43,769 and the figure of £90,590 represents the amount paid to the landowners as immediate payment at 9d. per ton? Is the difference of almost £46,000 the amount paid to the landowners as immediate payment?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): It does not show that fact in the report; that is quite clear. I can see the point raised by the representative; but in fact it does represent the amount of royalties paid to landowners for phosphate that was raised from their sections.

Mr. VELLODI (India): I am grateful to the special representative for the reply. In this connexion I cannot help feeling that the Council would benefit considerably if the type of information given by the special representative in his statements today could be included in the annual report itself. I am sure the Council appreciates, and the special representative also appreciates, the fact that when the members of the Council read the annual report they do come across certain difficulties in understanding the finances of the phosphate industry. We all know that that is the most important thing in the economic life of the Territory. I would at this point make a suggestion that in future reports more attention could perhaps be paid by the Administering Authority in giving more detailed information of the type that the special representative gave us a little while ago.

I will now go on to my next question that relates to the Long Term Investment Fund. As I understand it, this Fund is intended largely to cover the cost of the resettlement of the Nauruans later on. The increased royalty on this account is a shilling per ton. Does the Administration think -- this is my question -- that at the present rate of royalty of one shilling per ton, the entire cost of the resettlement of the Nauruans -- when the time comes -- can be met, bearing in mind the expressed desire of the Nauruans themselves that the three Administering Authorities should meet the cost of a future home in regard to the various aspects, that is, the cost of the homeland itself, the cost of the erection of villages, administrative centres, etc.? These are points which were made by the Local Government Council to the Visiting Mission of 1956. My question is in two parts, one, Am I right in understanding that the Community Long Term Investment Fund is largely being kept aside for meeting the cost of the resettlement of the Nauruans, or does the Administration also envisage the possibility of using a part of this Fund for improving the living

((Mr. Vellodi, India))

conditions of the Nauruans in the Island itself? That is the first part of the question. The second part, Is the Administration satisfied that with the present royalty of one shilling per ton, sufficient funds would be accumulated by the time the resettlement programme will come into operation?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I can assure the representative that this Fund would not and will not be used for any other purpose other than what it is intended for, that is, for the future resettlement of the Nauruan people, if and when that becomes necessary. So far as what is sufficient for the purpose, the Administering Authority assured the Council some years ago that the funds required for the resettlement would be forthcoming, and the idea of having this particular trust fund is, at least, to have a considerable sum of money available.

At this stage, I think, I am sure the Council appreciates that it would be extremely difficult to make an accurate estimate or even, shall we say, a rough estimate of what funds will be actually required. For the information of the Council I have worked out, very approximately, I admit, but when you are dealing with figures and interest covering a period of forty years, it is not an easy sum to arrive at, but allowing for the production to be 1.6 million tons a year, as is anticipated with the new second cantilever, at one shilling a ton for forty years, in that quantity the actual direct payments would amount to roughly £3.2 million; and counting the £323,000 in the Fund at present, the direct contributions will be £3.5 million. With compound interest, say at the rate of 3 per cent -- and that is very conservative, actually, if I remember correctly, I do not have the figures before me, the money is invested and the rate of interest it is returning is a little higher than 3 per cent -- the capital plus interest, in forty years' time would be approximately £7 million. I might point out that at that rate of interest, after twenty years, at the twenty-first year, the interest would be equal to the annual contribution by the BPC of roughly £80,000, and each year, of course, the interest would then be increasing, and it would be more and more. So we can say that a shilling a ton in forty years the sum would be approximately £7 million.

Mr. VELLODI (India): I again wish to thank the special representative for the assurance which we are all very happy to hear. I was somewhat surprised, however, to hear the special representative refer to a rate of interest of 3 per cent because, I believe, the special representative told the Council last year that the rate was 4 1/4 per cent and he did say that was the usual bank rate which was paid on Government loans. So just for my information, and for purposes of the record, I think we should get it quite straight. Is the interest 3 per cent or 4 1/4 per cent? If it is 3 per cent, why is it 3 per cent if the normal bank rate paid on Government loans is 4 1/4 per cent?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I will get the actual rate of interest. It was not available to me, and I merely worked out the figures roughly, on a very conservative rate of 3 per cent -- actually, I think it is higher. I will get the actual figure.

Mr. VELLODI (India): Certainly it is not my intention to try to find mistakes, but it might help the special representative if I tell him where I found this contradiction; apart from the statement that was made by Mr. Jones a little while ago about 3 per cent, there were the observations of the Administering Authority on the 1956 Visiting Mission's report, where it was clearly stated that the interest was 3 per cent; and last year the figure of 4 1/4 per cent was mentioned. As I said, it is not with the intention of trying to find any mistakes or contradictions, but this particular fund is very vital to the future of the Nauruans, and I feel that the Council should be quite clear as to the reason why this Fund could not be invested at a higher interest, if that is the normal rate in Australia. I will not press this question, at this stage, and I will go on to my next question.

My next question relates to the land in the Territory. Is there any land that is classified as phosphate-bearing land which is also cultivable? I will explain why I ask this question. Again I must refer to the 1956 report of the Visiting Mission. In paragraph 63 on page 12 of that report there is a reference to a section of land surrounding the Buada Lagoon which is fertile, containing coconut and other fruit trees. In the same paragraph, it is stated that the manager of the British Phosphate Commissioners told the Visiting Mission at that time that they had no intention whatsoever of mining this particular area although it was classified as phosphate-bearing land.

Again, in the annual report on page 22 under "Mineral Resources", there is a table where the phosphate-containing land is shown. Under that, there is a reference to the land surrounding the Buada Lagoon and it is stated that there is approximately 1,800,000 tons in that area.

In view of the fact that the cultivable land in the area is already so limited and also in view of the assurance given to a previous Visiting Mission that this particular land will not be mined for phosphate, can we get from the Administering Authority another assurance at this stage that although this area surrounding the Buada Lagoon is classified as phosphate-bearing it will not be mined?

The second part of the question is: Apart from this small area surrounding the Buada Lagoon, is there any other area at present classified as phosphate-bearing land which is also cultivable?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): The only area I know of that has been more or less found to contain phosphate is the Buada Lagoon. But I would draw attention to the fact that the Administrator is the sole authority to declare which land will be classified as phosphate land and subject to development. I am quite sure that if any land which actually did contain phosphate was being used by the Nauruan people and was suited for cultivation he would not declare that as phosphate land for the purpose of development.

I am quite sure that the Administering Authority will take note of the proposal of the representative.

Mr. VELLODI (India): I must make it quite clear that it is not my proposal. It is a suggestion that was brought about as early as 1956 when the Visiting Mission went there. At that time, an assurance was given by the Phosphate Commissioners, and I presume that if the Phosphate Commissioners gave their assurance, the Administrator must have concurred. The assurance that was given was that this particular land would not be mined, although it was classified as phosphate-bearing land.

I would not have raised this question but for the fact that on page 22 of the annual report for 1957-1958 this land is shown as phosphate-bearing land. In fact, they have even worked out the approximate quantity of phosphate that can be mined from this area. Therefore I obtained the impression that it was now the intention of the Administration and the Phosphate Commissioners to mine the land. Otherwise, they obviously would not have included it there, or at least they would have given some indication that, although this land can produce a million-odd tons of phosphate, it is not the intention of the Administration or the Phosphate Commissioners to mine this area. However, I only wanted to make this point, and I am grateful to the special representative for the assurance that he will take note of it and bring it to the notice of the people concerned.

My next question is with regard to the land that has already been mined and returned to the landowners. There is somewhere in the report that about 400 acres or a little more have reverted to the owners. I should like to know whether the owners of this used land utilize it in any way. When this land reverts to the owners, what do they do with it? Do they just leave it aside?

A supplementary question is: Can the used phosphate land, which we have been told cannot be used for cultivation, be used at least for other purposes? Can one build houses or some kind of even temporary houses on this land? I ask this because we have been told that even now there is some shortage of housing in the area, with the result that the labour that is recruited from outside are not always able to bring their families to the Territory.

My question, therefore, is in two parts. First, Do the owners of the land to whom it has reverted make use of this used land? Secondly, Is it possible to use this land in any way, for instance, for building houses on it?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I would say that at least 80 to 85 per cent of the area from which the phosphate has been raised would be quite unsuitable for having houses built on it or for being used for any other purpose. So far as the Nauruan people themselves are concerned, of course there is no shortage of land to meet their housing requirements, and the shortage of land with respect to the BPC for the purpose of building houses was more or less overcome recently by an arrangement with the Nauruan people. The route of a certain road was changed. That has given the BPC sufficient land on which to build the additional housing required to accommodate their staff.

Mr. Vellodi
Mr. VELLODI (India): My last question relates to the airdrome. This point was raised by my delegation last year. Perhaps a reply had been given at that time by the special representative, but since I could not get the information from the verbatim records, I am taking the liberty of asking the question again.

The airdrome, as we understand it, is located in the cultivable part of the Territory. Out of a total cultivable land of about 1,000 acres or a little less, we understand that as much as 100 acres is being used for this airdrome, which we have been told time and again is not used all the time. In reply to a question by the representative of Burma, the special representative said that during the last three or four months there has not been an occasion on which this airdrome was used. However, my delegation does not feel that there should be no airdrome in the area. The only question is whether it is at all possible to shift the airdrome from this area to some other area in the land.

(Mr. Vellodi, India)

There again, I would refer to the land that has already been mined for phosphate. It would seem to me that some way can be found for utilizing this land -- of course it would cost some money -- to have part of it levelled out and converted into a landing strip. This question was raised last year by my delegation and I am wondering whether the special representative could tell us whether this has been considered and found impractical.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): The possibility of siting the aerodrome on the foreshore, using part of the reef -- that is, reclamation work on the reef -- and also the possibility of siting it somewhere up on the plateau, on the area from which the phosphates have been raised, was considered by experts sent up from Australia for that particular purpose. That was done before the decision was made to extend the present aerodrome and I did inform the Council of the result of those investigations, which were that it would be quite impracticable to site the drome either on the foreshore or in the area from which the phosphate has been raised. The area where the phosphate has been raised is not level. Although it is a plateau, it is very uneven, as the Visiting Mission no doubt noted, and it would be almost impossible to site the aerodrome in that particular area.

Mr. JEAN-LOUIS (Haiti)(interpretation from French): The questions which I would like to put to the special representative concerns clarifications on points which were already dealt with by the various representatives who spoke before me.

The first question relates to the Commonwealth Savings Bank. On page 16, section 2, of the annual report, we are told that there is a different rate of interest for individuals than that which applies to certain agencies or organizations. On the other hand, there is a special system for deposits exceeding £1,000 but not exceeding £1,500. The interest an individual may have in depositing his money is, of course, the profit he makes from such a deposit. It would seem that in the case of Nauruans, the more money an individual deposits,

(Mr. Jean-Louis, Haiti)

the smaller the interest on that deposit. This policy does not seem to me to be a very good incentive for encouraging deposits.

I would also like to know whether the depositor will really not be receiving any interest at all after £1,500. Has the special representative been able to understand the purport of my question and would he be able to comment on this point?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): The rates given in the annual report are the rates of interest provided by the Commonwealth Bank of Australia. Exactly the same conditions apply in Australia and, as far as I know, it is the generally accepted banking practice in the savings bank department of any bank. These rates, of course, have nothing to do with the Administering Authority. They are set by the bank which provides the facilities for banking in the Trust Territory.

Mr. JEAN-LOUIS (Haiti)(interpretation from French): The special representative was not able to give me the explanations I had hoped for. I am referring to the fact that when a depositor puts in more than £1,500, no rate of interest is provided for. I was wondering, therefore, how much money a Nauruan would be interested in depositing. Obviously, not more than £1,500.

My next question is the following. The Local Government Council can engage in trading operations. It can trade in the large number of commodities. I would like to know whether this is a sort of monopoly in the hands of the Local Government Council or whether an individual can also engage in trading in the same commodities, or does the Council hold a monopoly in the fields allocated?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): They do not hold any monopoly. There is nothing to prevent any Nauruan from setting himself up in business if he so desires, but no Nauruan has actually done so, because the Co-operative Society, which is under the control of the Council, provides for all their needs. I think that they appreciate that no good purpose would be served if they were to have any individual set-up in opposition to their own co-operative store.

Mr. JEAN-LOUIS (Haiti)(interpretation from French): On page 19 of the annual report, in the paragraph dealing with land tenure, we are told that out of 214 acres, 207 are owned by the Administration, that two acres are owned by the British Phosphate Commissioners and that five acres are owned by the two religious missions. However, we are told that the Nauru Lands Committee was established in order to determine questions as to the ownership of, or rights in respect of, land, being questions which arise between Nauruans or Pacific Islanders.

We would like to know whether those Pacific Islanders are also land owners. Do those immigrant islanders also own land?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I have no information in regard to the land ownership of the area which is mentioned as being owned by individual Nauruans. But it is quite possible that other Pacific Islanders who have more or less joined the Nauruan community and married into that community have acquired some land rights.

Mr. JEAN-LOUIS (Haiti) (interpretation from French): We know that the Nauruan people derive their income from the royalties which they receive for the exploitation of the phosphates. However, the land tenure system is an individual one. Thus, a number of land owners have not as yet had their land exploited. On the other hand, the land of some other owners has been completely worked, over-exploited, as it were. Could the special representative tell us what is the position of the owners of land which has been completely exploited and of the owners of land which has not as yet been exploited at all? what is the position of these owners as regards royalties?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): Many of the owners of land from which all the phosphate has been raised -- owners who therefore no longer receive direct royalties -- have invested their money and have rather substantial bank accounts. Although, as the representative of Haiti has mentioned, no interest is payable over a sum of £1,500, there is nothing to prevent each member of a family from having a bank account in his name up to that particular sum. I can assure the representative of Haiti that those whose land has already been worked are in a very sound financial position.

I have no definite information on the owners of land which has not as yet been worked. Although the money is paid to the actual land owners, they do pay certain sums to members of their extended family groups. Thus, as the land is worked, the money is, in effect, distributed among quite a number of Nauruans.

In addition, of course, there are the other benefits which all the Nauruans receive at all times. They are not taxed in any way for the cost of administration. They have free housing -- actually, a nominal rental has been instituted recently, but the basic wage has been increased to cover that rental. They have free education. They have many other amenities, for which they pay nothing. Thus, all the Nauruans actually are benefitting all the time. Last and not least, there is the fact that there is ample work for any Nauruan who seeks it.

Mr. PRESTON (United States of America): The thoroughness with which conditions in Nauru have so far been examined leaves few questions for my delegation to put to the special representative. I should, however, like clarification or additional information on two points.

The first concerns paragraph 32 of the Visiting Mission's report, in which the Mission states that the Nauru Co-operative Society as presently constituted is not a true co-operative society. The Mission goes on to suggest certain measures which might be taken to transform the Society into a true co-operative society. Could the special representative give us the Administration's views on those proposals?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): The Administering Authority has always felt that it would be much better if the Nauru Co-operative Society were in fact, as well as in name, a true co-operative society. About three years ago, the matter was discussed with the Local Government Council, which agreed that it would be better to run the Co-operative Society on truly co-operative lines. To assist the Council's arrangements were made for two senior employees of the Co-operative Society to go to the Territory of Papua-New Guinea to attend a co-operative school and become competent in the running of a co-operative society on truly co-operative lines. Unfortunately, these two Nauruans were involved in certain matters which necessitated their dismissal from the Co-operative Society. The Council has not as yet got round to appointing one or more of the officers of the Society to go to Papua-New Guinea for the necessary training.

It will be appreciated that, before the Co-operative Society can become a true co-operative society, some Nauruans must be trained in co-operative work. The matter has again been taken up with the Nauru Local Government Council, and we are hopeful that in the not too distant future it will be possible to transform the Society into a true co-operative society.

Of course, there is an outstanding debt to the Administration of £21,000. Action with regard to that will have to be considered if and when the Society becomes a true co-operative society.

sf Mr. PRESTON (United States of America): My second question concerns the airstrip on Nauru. I notice that on page 42 of the annual report, the Administering Authority states that:

"The majority of the land owners concerned continue to show opposition to the acquisition of part of their lands for the airstrip by not lodging their claims for compensation as provided for under the Aerodrome (Acquisition of Land) Ordinance 1952".

Could the special representative tell the Trusteeship Council what compensation has been offered to the Nauruan land owners concerned with respect to land reserved for the purpose of extending the airstrip?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I do have that information, but it is not before me at the moment. I do not want to delay the proceedings and I shall therefore be very happy to furnish the information at the next meeting.

sf Mr. MUFTIL (United Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): My first questions concern the subject of phosphates. In reading the annual report and the explanations furnished by the special representative, my delegation has obtained the impression that each time the value of phosphates exported from the Territory is mentioned, it is a question of the overall value of the phosphates, including all the expenditure involved -- that is, what it costs to produce the phosphates. My delegation would like to have some confirmation of that understanding.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): Let us take the table on page 17 where it shows the value of the phosphates, approximately £2.4 million. That is the FOB cost at Nauru of the phosphate produced on Nauru and includes the royalties and other expenses which I referred to previously, plus production costs, rates of interest and other charges which go to make up the total sum.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic)(interpretation from French): It would seem therefore, that that is indeed the production cost of the phosphates produced in the Territory.

My second question is: if the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand were to purchase the same phosphates on the world market, would the price be the same or would it be higher than the price which we find here in the report for the equal amount?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): As I mentioned on Friday in reply to questions of a similar nature, I have no information on the world price of phosphates. I do not know what it would cost if they were to purchase it elsewhere. That is the actual FOB cost from Nauru to which, of course, before it reaches the country concerned to where it is exported, would have to be added freight charges and many other charges. I have no information as to what they are.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic)(interpretation from French): My delegation considers that that is specifically the crux of the problem because if we do not know the world price of phosphates, we cannot judge what the economic situation is.

I should like to know if it would not be in the interest of the Nauruans to know how these phosphates could be sold, how they would be sold, how they might have been sold on the world market and how the prices charged by the company could be broken down. I should very much like to know whether the Administering Authority agrees that it would be in the interest of the Nauruans to know all this.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): Whether it be in the interest of the Nauruans or not to know that, the point is what purpose would it serve if the Nauruans did have that information.

I certainly will refer the questions and the matter to which they refer to the Administering Authority.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic)(interpretation from French): If it is difficult to conceive the benefits this would have for the Nauruans, I could clarify the question. For instance, if there is a difference between the cost of the phosphates produced in the Territory and the value of those phosphates on the world market, this would mean that there would be a difference in the price in the Territory and on the world market. This difference would be a saving for the three countries which have the monopoly on purchasing the phosphates. In other words, this could become a profit for the Island and a tax could be charged on this profit since there are no other taxes in the Territory. That is the specific purpose, without splitting hairs, for this information being requested.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I have no further comments.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic):(interpretation from French): My delegation hopes that such information will be supplied in the future. This can be done by attaching a person who has knowledge of this matter to the Australian Mission or by appending this information to the annual report.

My delegation would like to know whether the Administering Authority has provided for an over-all economic plan which would endow the Territory with a diversified economy which would allow the Territory to face up to the situation which will arise when the phosphate deposits have been exhausted. My delegation would like to know whether such a plan actually exists and, if not, what measures are envisaged by the Administering Authorities to draw up such a plan?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I take it that the plan referred to by the representative of the United Arab Republic is a plan for Nauru or for its future. I think it will be quite clear that the circumstances of this Territory are very different from any other Trust Territory. They are well known to this Council, and I think that the steps which have been taken by the Administering Authority to meet the circumstances and the position on Nauru are also well-known to this Council.

In regard to any plans for the economic development of Nauru, I think that that has been pretty well explored over the last few years by this Council, that is, that there can be no real economic development of the Island for the reason that there is only 1,000 acres that are suitable for development, that we have done our best to encourage the Nauruans to increase their agricultural activities, that owing to the porous nature of the soil and the uncertain rainfall and the lack of any adequate water supply suitable for agricultural purposes Any agricultural activity would be extremely difficult. This brings us down to the possibility of developing a fishing industry, in a small way to begin with, in the hope that it may develop. That would appear to be the only industry that has any chance of developing. But to talk of an over-all development plan for Nauru itself is not actually in accord with the position on Nauru. It is asking the Administering Authority to try and do something which would be quite out of the question.

So far as the future of the Nauruans is concerned, without talking about plans that are envisaged, I think that this Council will appreciate that the Administering Authority is doing everything that is humanly possible and I am sure that that has been reflected from year to year and also in the Visiting Mission's reports.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic)(interpretation from French): In debating the political situation, we established very clearly that the political progress and self-government of the Territory have nothing to do with the future of the Nauruans as this matter has been posed here in the Council; that is to say, their resettlement elsewhere than on the Island. Consequently, my

(Mr. Mufti, United Arab Republic)

delegation is of the opinion that in order to assure self government, the Administering Authority must make an effort in the economic field as well. It was with that in mind that I put my question, namely, that before speaking of the future of the Nauruans some provision would have to be made for an economic plan for the Territory. This has nothing to do with the future of the Nauruans, but I will not press this matter.

stop I have one last question concerning the air strip. My delegation would like to know whether it would not be possible, in view of the fact that there is no regular air service to the Islands and it seems that the air strip is not used very extensively, to provide some helicopters or something of that nature rather than regular planes because helicopters would not require a long air strip; thus some land could be recovered for use by the Nauruans to meet their own needs.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): Without knowing what actually took place when the decision was reached concerning the airfield, in other words that Nauru should be kept in touch with the rest of the world by air transport, I feel sure that the possibility of using helicopters must have been considered. While I am not aware of the actual range of the latest helicopters, I doubt very much whether it would be sufficient to cover the distances involved. There would also be the difficulty with regard to providing suitable fuel, but I believe that could be overcome. However, I have no doubt that the Administering Authority will give full consideration to the possibility of the use of helicopters instead of regular airplanes.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic) (interpretation from French): My delegation believes that the range of helicopters does not present a problem because of the other islands which are near Nauru and which might offer the facilities of a regular airfield.

Mr. KELLY (Australia): I should like to put a question to the Secretary of the Council through the President: Has the Secretariat at any time given thought to the use of helicopters by a Visiting Mission to islands in the Pacific? Is the range of helicopters adequate to cover the vast areas between the islands in the Pacific? Is the capacity of a helicopter sufficient to carry four members of a Visiting Mission and four members of the Secretariat?

The PRESIDENT: The Secretariat has no comment to make or information to give on this question at this time.

Mr. KELLY (Australia): In order that further consideration might be given by the Administering Authority to the proposal suggested by the representative of the United Arab Republic, I should be grateful if at any time in the future the Secretariat could give the Australian delegation any information on this question which might be of assistance.

The PRESIDENT: The question will be brought to the attention of the Secretariat for future reference.

Mr. MUFTI (United Arab Republic)(interpretation from French): My delegation did not wish to debate this suggestion in detail. We simply want our suggestion to be transmitted to the Administering Authority for consideration.

Social and educational advancement

low
Mr. ZHUKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): During the examination of social advancement in the Territory, my delegation feels that it must state that the social situation leaves a great deal to be desired. We should like to examine first the situation of the workers in the Territory. This situation, according to the Local Government Council, is not satisfactory. We see from the documentation available that the views of the Local Government Council are well justified. I shall come now to my first question.

I should like to draw the Council's attention to a recommendation which it adopted at its twenty-second session and which it repeated a second time in connexion with racial discrimination, salaries and the length of the work week as between Nauruans and Europeans as well as other immigrant groups. The Administering Authority states that now a single wage scale has been established for all workers in the administration of the Trust Territory. On page 51 of the annual report we find a detailed table which lists the posts held by Europeans, Nauruans and Chinese, along with their salary per annum. If the annual salary is more than £1,000, we can be quite certain that the post in question is occupied by a European and not by a Nauruan, but if the annual salary is in the field of £280, one can be sure that the job is occupied by a Nauruan.

(Mr. Zhukov, USSR)

It is difficult to make any comparison between these various positions so as to show that racial discrimination does indeed exist, but the Nauruan Workers' Organization, in the communication it addressed to the Visiting Mission, did indicate certain facts showing that discrimination exists in regard to the length of the working week. Discrimination is also shown by the fact that Nauruan and European workers holding the same posts receive different salaries. This is stated in the Visiting Mission's report. An examination of the table given in the Administering Authority's report shows that this is true.

In the case of teachers, for example, a European teacher in a primary school receives more than £1,000 per year, whereas a Nauruan holding a similar post has different salary; he only receives £320 or something like that per year. The Council's attention might also be drawn to the situation of women; a European woman teacher receives about £1,000 whereas a Nauruan woman teacher receives something like £216 or £316 per year.

In view of the fact that on several occasions the Trusteeship Council has adopted recommendations inviting the Administering Authority to remedy this situation, and in view of the fact that the Administering Authority repeats over and over again in its annual reports that the question is under study by the competent organs, we would like to know whether representatives of Nauruan and immigrant workers participate in the examination of the problem, and we would also like to know what has been done about it.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I would again like to point out that it is my desire to answer questions as fully as possible, but when a question is addressed to me in the way in which the representative of the Soviet Union has just addressed one, it seems to be more in the nature of a general statement and I find it very difficult to pick out exactly what information is being sought. I think it would help this Council, and it would certainly be of great assistance to me, if when addressing questions to me representatives would make them clear-cut and not wrap them up in a lot of propaganda or anything like that. If the questions could be kept clear, I could answer specific questions about specific matters and not have to try to combat orations criticizing some aspect of the administration of the Territory. I am not here to

(Mr. Jones,
Special representative)

do that; I am here to answer questions of fact on what the Administration is doing or to clarify matters which do not appear to be clear. I think it would be generally accepted that the statement just made by the representative of the Soviet Union is not a question at all. Wrapped up in it I did detect one or two points which might be called queries, but I wish to assist the representative of the Soviet Union and I would be grateful if he could break down his statement into actual questions.

The PRESIDENT: Would the representative of the Soviet Union please restate his question in a shorter form?

Mr. ZHUKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): My delegation put a very precise question to the special representative and what he said about propaganda interventions is out of place. The information which I submitted during my question was intended to let the special representative understand what my delegation had in mind in putting its precise question. I spoke of the existence of racial discrimination concerning salaries and the difference between the salaries paid to Nauruan workers on the one hand and European workers on the other and I mentioned precise facts which I obtained from the annual report and from other documents. The figures which I gave and the facts which I mentioned appear in documents submitted either by the Administering Authority or by the Visiting Mission which was sent to the Territory by the Trusteeship Council. The question is as follows: In view of the fact that on several occasions the Administering Authority has stated that labour conditions in the Territory are under consideration, can the special representative tell us when an end will be put to racial discrimination in the matter of the length of the work week and in the matter of salaries, and what measures have already been taken by the Administering Authority in that direction?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I thank the representative of the Soviet Union for breaking down his statement into a question which is clear-cut to some extent. The first remark I wish to make is this: There is no racial discrimination in the Territory in regard to education, labour or any other matter. I want to put the record straight on that point.

In regard to the general question, it is quite true that the Administering Authority has said from time to time that the matter of workers on Nauru and their conditions is under consideration, but it has always been some general question which has been discussed with the Nauruan Workers' Organization.

The representative of the Soviet Union mentioned the wage scale which appears on page 51 of the annual report and said that if a salary goes above £1,000 a year it could be deduced that the post was occupied by a European and not by a Nauruan. I would draw the attention of the representative of the Soviet Union to the continuation of the table on page 52; at the top of the page one of the higher posts is listed, with a salary scale ranging from £1,263 to £1,443. That post is occupied by a Nauruan. It must surely be obvious to the representative of the Soviet Union that the salaries paid are in accordance with the efficiency and ability of the officer concerned. If an officer reaches a stage where he is as competent as a European who is occupying a similar position, it is obvious that he will be paid a similar salary. There is no discrimination because of race but merely a differentiation in wages on account of competency and work output.

I think it will be accepted by the Council that the Administering Authority has a very responsible function in this Territory, namely, to administer it efficiently. If it is necessary to go to the metropolitan country and pay metropolitan rates to attract competent and efficient officers to the Territory to do the work which it is our responsibility to do, surely no complaint can be made. The suggestion is that because we bring say a medical practitioner or a qualified surveyor or other qualified person from Australia to work in the Territory and assist the Administration in carrying out its responsibilities, for that reason alone we should bring all the Nauruan salaries, irrespective of competence or anything else, up to the same scale. I do not think there is any force at all in such an argument. Let us look at it

(Mr. Jones,
Special representative)

the other way round. We have immigrant workers from other islands or from other countries; we have the Chinese and we have the indigenous people from the Gilbert and the Ellice Islands who receive lower rates of wages than the Nauruans. Why should we not lower the Nauruan scale to be equal to theirs?

(Mr. Jones, Special representative)

The wages of immigrant workers in Nauru are related to the wages paid in their own countries. So far as the Nauruans are concerned, they are paid what is considered a fair and reasonable rate and, if and when, as we have already proved, they do reach an equal standard with immigrant labour, particularly qualified professional and technical people, they will be paid similar wages.

Let us take the case of the United Nations itself and its specialized agencies, where there are hundreds of qualified professional and technical people working in dependent territories who are receiving salaries probably fifty times larger than the indigenous people of those territories. Is it going to be suggested that, because the officers of the United Nations specialized agencies are receiving those salaries, the salaries of the people in those countries should be brought up to the same rate? No, of course, that would never be suggested. But, because the Administering Authority has to bring experts to Nauru to carry out its responsibilities and functions in Nauru, immediately the question arises, why do they not work the same hours, why do they not get the same money as the Europeans? There is no basis for it at all.

What the Administering Authority is trying to do in Nauru so far as Nauruan wages are concerned is to provide them with a reasonable standard of living. I think there is no argument about the fact that we have done that and have continued to improve the standard of living; that has been noted by every Visiting Mission. So I do not see any basis for suggesting that the conditions for the Nauruan workers should be related at all to those for any other workers on the island. It should be considered as a separate responsibility and a separate problem, and that is what the Administering Authority is doing.

Mr. ZHUKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): According to the reply given by the special representative, I now understand why my question was not understood very clearly by him when I mentioned the existence of racial discrimination with regard to the salaries

(Mr. Zhukov, USSR)

of the employees. Racial discrimination, or difference in salaries, does exist, no matter what the special representative says, and the Trusteeship Council has already drawn the Administration's attention on many occasions to this fact. The exceptional case cited by the special representative, when he did find one job held by a Nauruan where more than £1,000 was paid as a salary, was only an exception, and we all know that exceptions prove the rule.

The special representative, unfortunately, did not provide any reply to the question which I put rather clearly, as he said on the second occasion. Do the Nauruans and immigrants participate in the review of this salary situation and working conditions and so on? Could he give me a reply to this question? Do the Nauruans participate in these negotiations?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): So far as the Nauruans are concerned, yes, they do. The matter is discussed and considered every six months with the representatives of the Nauruan Workers' Association. So far as the other members of the Administration are concerned, the salaries of the Australian members of the Administration are based on Australian rates and Australian working hours, and it is on those that they agree and we can attract them to come to the Territory. So far as the Chinese and Gilbert and Ellice Islands employees of the British Phosphate Commissioners are concerned, and a few that are employed by the Territorial Administration, their conditions are discussed with them in the countries where they are engaged, and they freely enter into their agreements, and on their arrival in the Island they appear before the Administrator and again signify their agreement and willingness to work on the conditions laid down in their agreements. Those conditions relate very closely to the working conditions in their own countries.

Mr. ZHUKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): This assessment of salaries is precisely racial discrimination. It is decided ahead of time how much someone will get. If he is born in Australia he will receive one salary; if he is born in China he will receive another salary; if he is a native Nauruan he receives a third salary. That is precisely what we call racial discrimination, the absence of which was invoked by the special representative. The reply of the special representative, of course,

(Mr. Zhukov, USSR)

cannot satisfy my delegation, since his reply does in fact justify and consecrate the existence of such racial discrimination, which is not admissible in a Trust Territory.

I should like to put a second question, which also relates to the pay of various categories of Nauruans. On page 51 we see that women receive less pay for the same work than men, and individuals under twenty-one years of age also receive less pay. Of course, as we know, one of the fundamental human rights is equal pay for equal work, and that right is invoked in the petition that was addressed to the Visiting Mission by Nauruan workers. Here we see quite clearly that men and women performing the same duties receive different wages. We see that even men who are younger than twenty-one years of age but who are performing the same work as an older person receive less pay. A boy of sixteen receives only 50 per cent of the male basic wage, a boy of eighteen receives only 60 per cent, and so on. I should like to ask the special representative whether the same rule applies to the employees of the British Phosphate Commissioners and whether the Administering Authority has any plans to introduce the principle of equal pay for equal work throughout the Territory.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I am not aware whether any women or youths of sixteen years of age are employed by the British Phosphate Commissioners, but, if they are, these conditions would apply because it is the practice of the British Phosphate Commissioners to follow the lead given by the Territorial Administration. All these rates were fixed and agreed to at a meeting with the representatives of the Nauruan Workers' Association some years ago, and this request now by the Nauruan Workers' Association has been agreed to without comment by the Nauru Local Government Council, although it did not seem to be very enthusiastic about it generally; but, now that it has been brought up by the workers' committee, it will undoubtedly be considered at the next half-yearly meeting with the Territorial Administration.

al
Chadwick
Mr. ZHUKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The special representative has told us that these conditions apply also to employees and workers of the BPC. In this connexion it becomes quite clear that the Administering Authority has an opportunity to set the price of phosphates at an even lower price than the metropolitan countries and thus gain additional concealed profit. Now, as regards the wages that are paid to women workers, we can infer from the remarks of the special representative that the conclusion at which the Administering Authority arrives in its annual report, to the effect that women have equal rights with men in the Territory, is a fictitious statement. As we can see from this question of pay, women do not enjoy equal rights with men in every field.

On page 27 of the annual report we see that a pension bill has been adopted; and also there is one that provides for allowances to children. Could the special representative tell us the details about this bill, and could he tell us who will bear the cost of these provisions? Will it be the BPC, which has a number of Nauruan workers in its employ -- not employees, but workers, since the special representative told us that there are no Nauruan employees in the company -- or will the burden of expenditure be carried by the Administration? Will we see in the next annual report a figure that will show that the Administration has spent such and such a sum under this decree?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I take it that the representative of the Soviet Union is referring to Chapter 5, Social Security and Welfare Services, on page 27 of the annual report.

Mr. ZHUKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Yes.

Mr. JONES (Special representative): It will be noted that this ordinance is not yet in force; it is being held up for reasons which I have already given to the Council, but which I will repeat.

(Mr. Jones,
Special representative)

Some two or three years ago, at the suggestion of the Trusteeship Council, the Nauru Local Government Council was given authority to levy rates and taxes; and at that particular time, one of the purposes for giving them that authority was that they could levy rates and taxes from which they could pay for services under the then proposed social service ordinance. Before the ordinance came into force, the Council had an election, and a new council was elected. The new Council had different views from its predecessor, and was not agreeable to levying rates and taxes on its people, feeling that the money for this purpose should be forthcoming from the phosphate industry. The rates mentioned here are, of course, merely stating the provisions that are made by the Administration pending the bringing into operation of the Social Services Ordinance. It is still held up because the Administering Authority considers that it would be a good thing for the Nauruans to levy rates and taxes on their own people, and so to assume some responsibility in connexion with their own affairs. The matter is still under discussion.

Mr. ZHUKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We must, therefore, conclude that under this ordinance it will be the Nauruan people who will carry the burden of expenditures when these become effective, in the form of additional taxes, is that correct?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): If the Nauruans agree, yes.

Mr. ZHUKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It would seem to the Soviet delegation that it would be more correct if it were the BPC which were to carry the burden of expenditures since most of the adult population of Nauru is employed by that company, or they are employed in running the island, and thereby are receiving allowances from the same company. But there is furthermore a complaint of the Nauru Government Council regarding the pollution of the island with phosphate dust, and from the fact that the steps taken have not improved this situation. Now, the fact that most of the diseases seem to be diseases of the respiratory tract testifies to the danger of this situation -- and statistics show this to be true, in 1956-57. There has been a survey of the population, and forty-seven cases of tuberculosis were found in

(Mr. Zhukov, USSR)

Nauru, twenty-seven in Gilbert and Ellice Islands, and sixty-eight among the Chinese. On page 78 of the annual report, in the table, we have the groups of diseases most widely spread; and here we have only those six persons who were treated in the hospitals of the island. The respiratory tract seems to hold the most prominent place here. For instance, in the year-end survey there were ninety-three cases of persons sick -- there were ninety-three persons who were treated in the hospital. We do not know how many were treated at home. Could the special representative tell us what is the total number of sick persons, those who are infected with tuberculosis, not only those that have been treated in the hospital but those who are also at home?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): So far as dust is concerned, I have some notes here which I would like to read out to the Council because they show clearly the steps that are being taken to control the dust, both from the bins and the conveyor belts. The investigation showed that it is proving to be a very difficult problem, and investigations are still in progress, overseas and on the island, with a view of designing a really effective system.

(Mr. Jones, Special
representative)

A number of experiments have been carried out on the island with a view to reducing or eliminating dust at the transfer points in the belt conveyor system between the main phosphate storage bin and the cantilever shore bin and the shiploading point, not with complete success. However, the latest overseas investigations indicate that this problem will be solved successfully.

There is one point in regard to this dust. It is very fortunate that the ships load only when the wind is blowing from the island out to sea. That does help to eliminate the dust to some extent. I can assure the Council that everything possible is being done at the present time to eliminate altogether the dust coming from the activities of the Phosphate Commissioners.

So far as the information regarding the tuberculosis patients is concerned, I think that full information was given in my opening statement last year and the subject was also dealt with by the Visiting Mission in its report for this year. I have no other information at the moment in regard to the actual number of cases other than the cases that are mentioned in the report.

I think the Council will remember that last year we gave full particulars with regard to the treatment of tuberculosis by teams of specialists brought in from Australia -- that a complete survey was made of the island and that all patients that needed treatment were treated, with some being sent to Australia for thoracic operations. We have also explained fully the preventive measures being taken. I think that will be found on page 29 under the heading "Preventive Measures."

I might also say that there is no proof -- it has not even been suggested -- that the dust in any way causes tuberculosis or any other chest complaints. Some years ago, tests were carried out and they were found to be negative. The Medical Officer who is at present in Nauru is now carrying out another series of tests. If the Administering Authority thinks that it is necessary, the Administering Authority will no doubt take steps to give him some assistance by providing other medical people to help in carrying out this survey.

Mr. ZHUKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The special representative indicated that in last year's report there was information. This is indeed the case. Unfortunately, we do not find this information in this year's report, and we wanted to have up-to-date information. However, this year's report tells how many persons were being treated in hospitals. This is not very reassuring because if we compare these figures with last year's figures we see that the cases of diseases of the respiratory system have become much more current. Last year, there were approximately sixty; this year there have been more than ninety.

The assurance that the phosphate dust is harmless can hardly convince us because obviously any dust, if it comes into the respiratory system, can, if not provoke, at least worsen the condition of the respiratory organs. Therefore, we would be very grateful to the special representative if he could supply us with the figures which are lacking in the report, namely, as to how many tubercular patients have been registered this year.

My next question refers to the problem of education. Part VIII, chapter 1 deals with it. Here, again, the situation is far from satisfactory and can hardly tally with the optimistic remarks we find in the Visiting Mission's report. Perhaps this is due to the fact that the Mission had only one morning to visit all the schools and kindergartens. It is true that there are not too many of them.

When we go into the matter of education in the Trust Territory, we are first of all struck by the fact that the Administering Authority has not yet put an end to the racial separation of school children. The situation with regard to high school education is still unsatisfactory. There is not a single Nauruan who has completed his higher education. Technical training of the children is also unsatisfactory. We find mention of this in the memorandum to the Visiting Mission by the Local Government Council. In that memorandum, we see that the Advisory Council on Education, which was set up by the Administering Authority, has been debarred in fact from participating in the planning of measures in this field. Nauruans only participate nominally in this agency. What we read in the UNESCO report shows that this Advisory Council met only three times last year, whereas the year before it held seven meetings. Can the special representative tell us what problems were discussed in the meetings of that Advisory Council? What did the Nauruans themselves suggest? Were their suggestions adopted by the Administering Authority?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): The representative again mentions racial separation. There is no racial separation in the schools in Nauru. I think that is made clear if part VIII, "Educational Advancement", on page 52 is read carefully. There it explains the reason why certain schools are provided for certain pupils. The only reason for this differentiation is the lack of knowledge of English of Nauruans, the Chinese pupils and the Gilbert and Ellice Island pupils. To overcome that, the Administering Authority has done everything possible by providing education in a manner which will best assist them, having in mind their lack of knowledge of the English language.

(Mr. Jones,
Special representative)

If all the pupils in the Island had a good command of English, they would naturally be going to the same school. I think it will be seen from the statistics at the present time that there are children of the various races attending the various schools. In fact, I think it is rather misleading to call these schools "Nauruan school" or "Gilbert-Ellice Island school". I think that I shall recommend to the Administering Authority that as there is no racial discrimination, these are misleading the Trusteeship Council, or at least some members of it, into the constant and persistent use of the words "racial discrimination" when it is obvious from the report of the Administering Authority that that does not exist.

In regard to the high school and the technical training, the representative of the Soviet Union has referred to both as having been unsatisfactory. I will not waste the time of the Council by going into that general statement, but I would suggest that the representative of the Soviet Union read paragraph G of the Observations of the Administering Authority (T/1460) on the various points and if the information there does not satisfy the representative, I may be able to supplement that with further information on these particular matters which he has raised.

He also raised the question of the Advisory Council, again more or less repeating what the Nauruans had to say on this particular point. It will be found that the reply of the Administering Authority, which has been recorded by the Visiting Mission in its report, is quite the contrary and they do not accept the statement of the Nauruans. The Visiting Mission said the following:

"The Administering Authority stated that full information on educational matters is always provided to the Committee, planned projects are discussed in advance, and reasons behind Administration proposals are always supplied. Discussion is encouraged and due weight is always given to the views of the Nauruan members of the Education Advisory Committee." (T/1448, para. 87)

Therefore, I think it can be accepted that the opportunity is there for them to play quite an important part in educational policy. I do not know why

(Mr. Jones,
Special representative)

there were only three meetings last year instead of seven, nor do I know what was actually discussed at those particular meetings. But I do know, from past experience in the Island, that quite a lot of consideration and weight has been given to matters brought forward by the Nauruan representatives on the Education Advisory Committee.

Mr. ZHUKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The special representative gave the reasons for which education in the Island is carried out in separate schools. One of the reasons was the lack of knowledge of the language and the differentiation in the general background of the children. But keeping the children in different schools is bound to retain the state of backwardness of the Nauruans. It is bound to keep them from progressing in English or in Science, and therefore we can hardly accept this explanation. Nauruans would, of course, benefit considerably were their children able to compete with the children of the Europeans or of other inhabitants of the Island;

As regards the matter of professional and vocational training, the special representative's reference to paragraph G of the Observations of the Administering Authority (T/1460) can also hardly be satisfactory to my delegation. In fact it is in conflict with the statement which the Administering Authority makes in paragraph D of the same document. We read that most of the positions occupied by Europeans call for professional or technical qualifications -- for instance, doctor, dentist, and so on -- none of which are held by Nauruans.

At the same time, when the Nauru Local Government Council suggested that this professional and technical training be intensified, the Administering Authority replied that it should not be done. The Administering Authority does not agree that the provision of teaching in commercial subjects requires expansion. I repeat that the Administering Authority also does not agree with the implication that vocational and technical training can be extended.

On the one hand, we read that the Nauruans are not adequately trained, and therefore it is obvious that they should be trained. Yet two pages later, we read that in the view of the Administering Authority, the vocational and technical

training cannot be extended. This is, of course, a vicious circle which can hardly be accepted by the Council.

As regards the extension of the rights of the Education Advisory Committee, here again the explanations are hardly acceptable. The Nauruans request that these rights be extended and they advance a series of concrete proposals. To this the Administering Authority replies, as the Visiting Mission points out, that it is essential that the present practice prevail. The Administering Authority says:

"When the views of the Nauruan Council are not reasonable" -- we find the word "reasonable" very often here -- "and when the views do not correspond to realistic or reasonable practice, then these recommendations are not accepted."

When, in the opinion of the Nauruans and the Visiting Mission, it would be reasonable to extend commercial training, then in the view of the Administering Authority this is not reasonable and therefore the suggestion is rejected.

In this connexion I would like to put a final question. Does the Administering Authority propose to extend the rights of this Education Advisory Committee, be it only to satisfy the petitions or proposals that have been sent in to the Administering Authority by the Nauruans?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): As I understand it, the question is whether the Administering Authority will give consideration to extending the rights of the Nauruan members of the Advisory Committee.

The Advisory Committee is composed of representatives of the Territorial Administration and of the Nauruan people. All representatives on the Committee have equal rights. The Advisory Committee forms its opinions and then advises the Administrator on general educational problems. I really do not know exactly how the rights of the Nauruan members of the Committee could be extended. As I have said, they have the same rights as other members of the Committee. I must admit that, if I had control of the Committee and had the say about what it should do, I should be at a complete loss to know how to extend the rights of one section of the Committee over another. I am not sure whether that is the point being made by the Soviet Union representative.

Mr. ZHUKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The special representative has correctly understood my question and has replied to it.

My second question in this respect is the following. Proposal 5 made by the Nauru Council was that it should participate in the formulation of school curricula and have some say in regard to the education budget. Does the Administering Authority propose to extend the powers of the Local Government Council in the field of education? Specifically, when could the Local Government Council be given the right to have a say in regard to the education budget?

Mr. JONES (Special representative): I should like to verify in the chapter of the annual report on educational advancement the Administering Authority's reply to proposal 5. Since this may take a little time, I should like to answer the Soviet Union representative's question at the beginning of this afternoon's meeting.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

Trusteeship Council
24th Session, 10th Meeting (AM)

Press Release TR/1492
15 June 1959

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL -- TAKE 2

ERNEST JEAN-LOUIS (Haiti), referring to the store run by the Nauruan Cooperative Society, asked whether that store functioned, more or less, in the nature of a monopoly, or whether individual Nauruans were free to set up their own stores.

Mr. JONES, the administering authority's special representative for the territory, said the store was run by the Cooperative Society under the management of the Nauru Local Government Council. The store provided what was needed, and there was no need for individuals to set up rival stores.

Practically all the land in Nauru, Mr. JEAN-LOUIS noted, was owned by Nauruans. Of the 214 acres not so owned, 207 acres belonged to the administration, two acres to the British Phosphate Commissioners (BPC) and five acres to two religious missions. He asked whether any immigrants also owned land.

The special representative said he had no information with respect to land owned by individual Nauruans. It was possible that other Pacific islanders, now in Nauru, had married into the community and had acquired some land rights.

Referring to the visiting mission's observations with regard to the Cooperative Society, KENNETH W. PRESTON (United States) asked what efforts had been made to turn the Nauruan Cooperative Society into a true cooperative society.

Mr. JONES said the administering authority also felt that the Nauruan Cooperative Society should be turned into a true cooperative society. Two senior members of the society, he said, were sent for training to a Papua-New Guinea cooperative school. Unfortunately, these two Nauruans had become involved in certain matters which necessitated their removal. Since then, he added, the Nauru Local Government Council had not "gotten around" to naming any officer for such training.

JAWDAT MUFTI (United Arab Republic) asked whether the administering authority had prepared, or planned to prepare, an over-all economic development plan for Nauru.

The special representative said the economic circumstances of the territory, as well as the activities of the administering authority, were well-known to the Trusteeship Council. There could be no real economic development of the island, he said, for the reason that only 1,000 acres were suitable for development.

(more)



The administering authority, he added, had done its best to encourage Nauruans to increase production. But, with the nature of the land and the shortage of rainfall, any agricultural development was difficult. That was why, he said, efforts were being directed to the development of a fishing industry.

To speak of an over-all plan for Nauru, Mr. JONES said, "is not actually in accord with the position in Nauru." It was asking the administering authority to do something which was not possible.

VLADLEN I. ZHUKOV (USSR), criticizing what he called the "racial discrimination" in wages between Nauruan and European workers, asked when an end would be put to such differences in the length of working hours and in wages. He noted that the administering authority had been stating for some time that labor conditions were under consideration.

Mr. JONES declared that there was no racial discrimination in education, labor or any other matter in Nauru. He wished to set the record straight on this.

The salaries paid, he said, were based on efficiency and ability. There was no discrimination on the basis of race; there was only differentiation because of competence and output. The workers, he said, were paid a "fair and reasonable wage," and UN visiting missions to the territory had noted the high standard of living enjoyed by the Nauruans, he observed.

The special representative added that personnel of the UN or of the specialized agencies working in dependent areas received a wage many times higher than local scales. Would anybody suggest that the local wages should be raised accordingly? he asked. Yet, the administering authority was being criticized for paying a higher wage to European personnel brought into Nauru.

Mr. ZHUKOV, however, continued to maintain that different wage scales existed for the workers, depending on whether they were Nauruans, Chinese or Europeans. That, he said, constituted racial discrimination.

Other questions asked by the Soviet representative, to which the special representative replied, had to do with such matters as the control of phosphate dust and education.

Questioning of the special representative for Nauru will be continued by the Council at 3 p.m. today.

(END OF TAKE 2 AND PRESS RELEASE TR/1492.)