



CONTENTS

Page

Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority on the administration of the Trust Territory of Nauru for the year ended 30 June 1954 (T/1171, T/1180) (continued)

Questions concerning the Trust Territory and replies of the special representative (concluded) 11

President: Mr. Mason SEARS (United States of America).

Present:

The representatives of the following States members of the Trusteeship Council: Australia, Belgium, China, El Salvador, France, Haiti, India, New Zealand, Syria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The representative of the following State non-member of the Trusteeship Council: Italy.

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

Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority on the administration of the Trust Territory of Nauru for the year ended 30 June 1954 (T/1171, T/1180) (continued)

[Agenda item 4 (d)]

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

QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY AND REPLIES OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE (concluded)

1. The PRESIDENT said that a suggestion had been made, with regard to the Trust Territory of Nauru only, that members of the Council might ask questions on all aspects of the subject concurrently. If there was no objection to that procedure, it would be adopted.

It was so decided.

2. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) stated, in reply to a question asked by the United Kingdom representative at the previous meeting concerning the indigenous population of Nauru, that according to a census taken on 24 April 1921 the population had then been 1,084. It had increased to 1,827 by 1941, had fallen to 1,350 by 1945 and had again increased to 1,828 by 1954.

3. The cultivable area of Nauru was very limited, and the plateau where phosphate was being mined had never been used for agricultural purposes. After the exhaustion of the phosphate deposit there would doubtless be enough cultivable land for a primitive subsistence agri-

culture, if the population did not increase too rapidly. Since 1919, however, Australia had taken steps to improve the living standards of the Nauruans; as a result of the current training programme more and more Nauruans would become skilled workers, and their living standard would rise accordingly. Hence it was out of the question that they should revert to their original mode of life. For those reasons the Australian Government considered that the Nauruans should be prepared for leaving the island when its resources were exhausted or when they themselves decided that the time had come to seek a new home.

4. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) said that he fully understood the necessity of making provision now for the future of the inhabitants of Nauru.

5. He asked what was the nature of the business of the Nauru Co-operative Society and whether it was well managed.

6. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) explained that the Co-operative was engaged in general trading. It imported goods from Australia and sold them to the Nauruan public, indigenous and non-indigenous alike. The management was not highly efficient, and it had often been necessary for Administration officers to assist the Co-operative in the keeping of accounts and the organization of its trading operations. The Administration had arranged to send one or two Nauruans to New Guinea to attend the course at the co-operative school. It was hoped that on their return to Nauru they would receive executive appointments in the Co-operative and that the management of the store would improve. It was also hoped that in the near future control of the co-operative store would be taken out of the hands of the Nauru Local Government Council and that the undertaking would become a co-operative in fact as well as in name.

7. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) noted that the Administration encouraged the planting of fruit trees and vegetable gardens. He asked whether the indigenous Nauruans showed any real interest in that development and whether the Administration had any hope of being able to develop the fishing industry.

8. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) stated with regret that the indigenous inhabitants took little interest in agricultural questions. The Administration, however, intended to persevere with its efforts; it contemplated establishing an experimental station under a qualified agricultural expert and granting scholarships to Nauruans for agricultural courses in Australia.

9. The Administration and the British Phosphate Commissioners had arranged to purchase from the Nauruans the surplus of their fish catch; the indigenous inhabitants had nevertheless shown little inclination to regard fishing as an industry, and caught fish only for their own domestic consumption.

10. Sir Alan BURNS (United Kingdom) noted that the project for the construction of 350 homes had now been completed. The new houses were admirably designed and built, but when he had visited Nauru

many of them had not been occupied owing to lack of furniture. He asked whether the Nauruans were satisfied with the new dwellings and whether all the houses built were now occupied.

11. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that all but one or two of the houses were occupied; a decision was pending as to which families should occupy the remaining houses.

12. Early in 1951 the Administration had appropriated £15,000 for the purchase of furniture for the new dwellings. That fund had never been used. The Administration was now suggesting to the Nauruans that the money should be spent on the construction of furniture by the indigenous inhabitants under skilled supervision. The Nauru Local Government Council was still considering the matter.

13. The indigenous inhabitants seemed on the whole to be well satisfied with the new dwellings, though some considered them too small for the families which had to live in them.

14. Mr. LALL (India) noted that, according to the annual report,¹ the Nauru Local Government Council was authorized to advise the Administrator in relation to any matter affecting Nauruans, but the Administrator was empowered to act in opposition to the advice of the Council. He asked whether the advice of the Council was generally accepted and, if not, how the Administration expected to attain the objectives set forth in Article 76 b of the Charter.

15. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that to the best of his knowledge the Administrator had invariably accepted the advice of the Nauru Local Government Council. It was, of course, possible that some suggestions of the Council might be discussed with the Administrator and that, as a result, the Council might acknowledge their unsuitability and withdraw them.

16. Mr. LALL (India) noted that the budgetary income of the Nauru Local Government Council was very small, and asked what happened if the Council wished to spend funds in excess of its income.

17. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) explained that if the proposed expenditure was approved, the Administering Authority supplemented the Council's income with the necessary appropriations. No such case had yet arisen.

18. Mr. LALL (India) pointed out that vessels calling at Nauru generally carried very little cargo and had to come in ballast. He wondered, therefore, whether the Administering Authority had studied the suggestion made at the fourteenth session of the Trusteeship Council (539th meeting) that vessels should carry earth as ballast with a view to improving the soil of Nauru.

19. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that he had studied a report of experts on the agricultural potential of Nauru. The report had not yet been published but was being considered by the competent departments of the Australian Government. The experts were of the opinion that the regeneration of Nauru soil was a practical impossibility. The problem could not be solved even if the exposed coral pinnacles could be levelled with heavy crushing equipment and even if sufficient soil to regenerate the land could be imported.

¹ Commonwealth of Australia, *Report to the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Administration of the Territory of Nauru from 1st July, 1953, to 30th June, 1954*, Canberra, Government Printing Office.

There was no guarantee that the soil would remain on the surface and would not be washed down into the crushed coral. Moreover, even if the soil of the plateau could be regenerated in that way, the question of an adequate water supply to supplement the rainfall would still remain. In that connexion it should be remembered that Nauru was subject to periods of drought lasting up to twelve months and that sometimes all vegetation on the plateau died owing to lack of water. The experts decided that any scheme to regenerate the soil of Nauru with a view to its utilization would be so expensive that such an idea was a practical impossibility from the economic point of view.

20. In reply to another question from Mr. LALL (India), Mr. JONES (Special Representative) explained that the ballast carried by vessels calling at Nauru was mainly fresh water.

21. Mr. LALL (India) said that the annual report stated that the Administrator was empowered to make ordinances for the peace, order and good government of the Territory and that Nauru had adopted certain laws from the United Kingdom, the Commonwealth of Australia and other countries. He inquired whether the Administering Authority considered that any amendments to the laws in force should be made on the advice of the Local Government Council.

22. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) replied in the affirmative. Some ordinances had been amended to meet changing conditions and in all cases such amendments had been considered by the Local Council. He did not know whether the advice of that Council had always been accepted.

23. Mr. LALL (India) drew attention to the demographic question. From 1941 to 1954 the indigenous population had risen from 1,827 to 1,828, an increase of one. The number of immigrants however, had risen from 845 to 1,689, in other words it had doubled. He asked what accounted for the sharp increase in immigrant population, whereas the number of indigenous inhabitants had remained constant.

24. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that as a result of the war the number of indigenous inhabitants had declined to 1,350 in 1945, a decline of 25 per cent. From 1945 to 1954 the indigenous population had increased to the point of regaining the pre-war level.

25. The sharp increase in the number of immigrants was obviously due to the expansion of installations and the steady and substantial increase in the tonnage of phosphate exported. He thought that the number of immigrants had reached its peak and would remain virtually unchanged in the future.

26. Mr. LALL (India) noted that according to the employment figures the number of Nauruan workers had declined slightly. He asked whether the Nauruans who had lost their jobs had found other employment, whether there were other unemployed Nauruans and, if so, why there should be so many outsiders employed on Nauru.

27. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that he had already explained the slight decline in the number of Nauruans employed. The Department of Works used to employ twenty-three skilled Nauruans and thirty-eight general labourers. Under the new provision it employed forty skilled workers but no general labourers. Any Nauruan who had ceased to be employed with the Administration could easily obtain employment with the Phosphate Commissioners. It was

only because there were insufficient Nauruan workers available that foreign labour had to be imported. In short any Nauruans who were not working were unemployed by their own choice.

28. Mr. LALL (India) asked why the number of Europeans in the public service had risen from sixteen to twenty-three, an increase of almost 50 per cent.

29. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) explained that the increase was necessary in the interests of the Nauruans themselves. The new personnel included highly qualified workers such as a dentist, two teachers and a hospital matron.

30. Mr. LALL (India) asked why three of the teaching staff of Nauruan primary schools should be European whereas the superintendent was a Nauruan. He asked whether it had been impossible to find qualified persons to teach under his direction.

31. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) explained that in the past some Nauruans had held high positions, with titles that did not quite correspond to their qualifications. Thus, the superintendent of Nauruan primary schools was not a qualified educational officer. He had been appointed to that position a very long time ago because of his great influence with the indigenous inhabitants. When the Administration had reorganized education it had been faced with the difficulty of replacing unqualified indigenous staff by Europeans or Nauruans qualified to carry out the new programme. The matter had been discussed with the superintendent of the Nauruan primary schools, other community leaders and the Nauru Local Government Council. Some indigenous girls had recently completed teacher-training courses in Australia and had received educational appointments in Nauru.

32. The Administration intended to appoint the present head teacher, who was European, as superintendent of Nauruan primary schools. The Nauruan who occupied the position at the moment had quite willingly agreed to become assistant superintendent, and would advise the new superintendent on questions of particular concern to the indigenous inhabitants and their customs. It should be noted that his salary would remain unchanged. Moreover, as and when Nauruans obtained the necessary qualifications, they would replace Europeans who held various appointments in the educational system.

33. Mr. LALL (India) noted that in its report, dated 23 December 1953, the commission which had inquired into wages had fixed the basic wage of a head of family at £4. 11s., and that of a woman at 70 per cent of that figure. The head of family received a dependant's allowance of 10s. a week for every fully maintained child under 16 years of age. That figure appeared to be quite inadequate in view of the prices of primary necessities. He asked how the commission of inquiry had arrived at that figure.

34. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that he was unable to offer an explanation. While the amount of the allowance corresponded to that in many other countries, it was true that it was not very high in view of the cost of living.

35. He pointed out that the wages of most, if not all, Nauruan workers were much higher than the basic wage. That was clear from appendix II, which appeared on page 44 of the report.

36. Mr. LALL (India), while not questioning the special representative's explanation, said that the salary

and wage scales which appeared on page 45 of the annual report were probably applicable to most of the indigenous inhabitants. From the particulars there given it appeared that some indigenous inhabitants received only the basic wage.

37. On page 28 of the annual report it was stated that the European staff of the Administration contributed to a provident fund which was subsidized by the Administration. He asked why the provident fund was reserved for Europeans, why it was subsidized by the Administration and whether it did not violate the principle of racial equality, which was said to be scrupulously respected in Nauru.

38. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) explained that it was usual to establish provident funds for workers who left their country and had to incur various expenses in their new place of residence. When they completed their service with the Administration and returned to their country of origin they incurred fresh expenses in connexion with their resettlement; the provident fund enabled them to defray such expenses. Nauruans who worked for the Administration did not have to move, and hence did not incur any additional expenses by reason of their employment. Nevertheless, consideration was being given to a social services ordinance to provide for the administration by the Nauru Local Government Council of a scheme for the payment of old-age, invalidity and other benefits.

39. Mr. LALL (India) noted that a Nauruan who had studied medicine was referred to as a "Native medical practitioner" and asked the significance of the word "Native".

40. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) explained that the Nauruan referred to had received his training at the Central Medical School at Suva, graduates of which were normally called "Native medical practitioners" or "assistant medical practitioners", in order to make it clear that they were not fully qualified medical practitioners.

41. Mr. LALL (India) asked whether there were any statistics which would show the percentage of children of school age actually attending school.

42. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that page 41 of the annual report gave the number of children under 16 as 911; the number of children in school was given on page 74. Although primary education was compulsory, truancy had been noticeable. Every effort had been made to remedy that situation by means of discussions with the parents and the members of the Local Government Council.

43. Mr. LALL (India) asked whether steps were being taken to foster and encourage indigenous handicrafts and whether anything was being done to market handicraft products in Australia or other countries.

44. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the quantity produced was inevitably very small and the entire output was marketed locally.

45. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) said that he would welcome an explanation of the statement in the outline of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru prepared by the Secretariat² that the Administering Authority sought to effect economic development indirectly by means of social advancement rather than by the development of economic activities.

² Working paper circulated to members of the Council only.

46. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the only explanation he could give was that there were no avenues of economic development on the island; any development the Administration might encourage would be more on the lines of social advancement than of economic advancement; in other words, it would not be anything from which the population could expect any financial gain.
47. In reply to a further question by Mr. RIFAI (Syria), Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the Nauruan Workers Organization had been able to work smoothly with the Administration and had been of use to the workers.
48. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) asked how the economic equality enjoyed in the Territory by nationals, including corporations or associations, of Members and non-members of the United Nations was being exercised.
49. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the only industry was the phosphate industry, which was controlled by the British Phosphate Commissioners. If there were any other possibilities of industrial development, the principle of equality would certainly apply. The question had not so far arisen.
50. In reply to Mr. RIFAI (Syria), Mr. JONES (Special Representative) pointed out that the Nauruans received royalties from the Commissioners, and were employed by the Commissioners. As their output and efficiency as workers improved, their remuneration would also increase, while social services and education were provided free. There had been a remarkable advance during the previous ten years, and the progress would doubtless continue until the Nauruans had become fully Europeanized. There was therefore no reason to ask the Commissioners to provide extra funds.
51. Mr. RIFAI (Syria) asked what would happen to the reserve fund of £30,000 if no unforeseen expenditures arose.
52. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) explained that that money had been set aside to meet unforeseen circumstances for which the quarterly payments made by the Phosphate Commissioners might not be sufficient. If the money was not required, it would naturally remain with the Commissioners.
53. In reply to Mr. RIFAI (Syria), Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that despite the recent increase in royalties, the actual amount in the Nauruan Community Long-Term Investment Fund at the present time would be insufficient for the purpose for which it was established. However, at the present rate of output of phosphate, which would continue for, say, the next twenty years, the fund would increase by approximately £25,000 per year. Depending on progress made in finding a new home for the Nauruans, the amount in the fund over the next few years might be sufficient to cover the costs involved. The Australian Government also considered that if it became necessary for the Nauruans to leave the Territory, the cost of the move would be considered as an administrative cost and would therefore be borne by the Phosphate Commissioners.
54. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the relations between the Commissioners and the Administration were rather peculiar, as the Commissioners not only paid no taxes but even paid the expenses of the Administration. That fact showed that the Administration was dependent upon the Commissioners.
55. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the Administration was in no way influenced by the Phosphate Commissioners. It prepared its budget on the basis of what was required to carry out its obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement, and of the available resources of manpower and raw materials. The Commissioners were not required to pay taxes because, under the phosphate agreement, they were to defray the expenses of the Administration and to pay royalties on each ton of phosphate exported. The royalties were for the direct benefit of the Nauruan people.
56. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the Nauruans had any real share in the administration of the Territory, in other words, whether they held posts which enabled them to exert a direct influence on the management of Nauruan affairs.
57. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) replied that neither the Nauruans nor the Europeans either, for that matter, apart from the Administrator, held posts of that nature. However, the Nauruans made their views known through the Nauru Local Government Council, an advisory body. In addition, the Council should not disregard those Nauruan officials such as the Native Affairs Officer, the assistant medical practitioners, the superintendent of primary schools, and the sergeant-major of the police force, who played an important part in the social development of the people and who thus indirectly had an influence on administration generally.
58. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether any Nauruans, other than those who worked as labourers, held posts in the British Phosphate Commissioners.
59. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) replied in the negative.
60. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the Administration supervised the activities of the Commissioners and whether the latter complied with the labour code, particularly as regards safety and health regulations in plants or mines, labour disputes, employment and dismissal.
61. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) replied that the Commissioners were subject to all the laws of the Territory, including labour legislation. Every agreement between the workers and the Commissioners had to be approved by the Administrator before the workers began work. Conditions of employment, including accommodation, rations and accident-prevention measures, were inspected.
62. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether Nauruan landowners were compelled to lease their phosphate-bearing land, whether they could refuse to lease the land or whether the land could be leased without their consent.
63. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) referred to the 1927 agreement under which the representatives of the Nauruan people and about fourteen of the chiefs had agreed to lease phosphate-bearing land to the Commissioners. The agreement had been renewed in 1947. There was no question of compelling Nauruan landowners to lease their land or of leasing land without their consent, since all had already given their consent by accepting the agreement.
64. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether all the Nauruan landowners were bound by the commitments entered into in 1947.

65. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that in 1947 the Phosphate Commissioners and the Administrator had discussed the matter with all of the owners at meetings held in every district, and the consent of all the owners had been obtained. The Nauruan Council of Chiefs had merely signed on behalf of all the owners.

66. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) inquired whether it was true that once the land was exhausted and returned to the owner, no further payments were made.

67. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) replied in the affirmative.

68. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) inquired what benefits could be obtained by the owners of land from which all the phosphates had been extracted.

69. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) replied that such land was of no value, but that it had never been of any value and that the Nauruan people had never used it for agricultural purposes. However, thanks to the extraction of phosphates, the people of Nauru had drawn many benefits from land which had never been of any use to them.

The meeting was suspended at 4.5 p.m. and resumed at 4.25 p.m.

70. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked how soon the Movement of Natives Ordinance, restricting the movements of the indigenous inhabitants and migrant workers at night, would be repealed or amended.

71. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) explained that repeal of the ordinance was a matter for the Administrator and that action would probably be taken within a few weeks.

72. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that absence from work for a period of more than seven days was one of the grounds for dismissal authorized by law. He wished to know whether the provision applied in the case of strikers or whether the right to strike was recognized in some other part of the labour contract.

73. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that there were two classes of workers on the island. On the one hand, there were the Chinese workers and the workers from the Gilbert Islands, who made an individual agreement with the employer, in most cases, the British Phosphate Commissioners. There was no provision in the agreement for the worker to go on strike. Disputes were referred to the courts. The Nauruan workers, on the other hand, worked from day to day and had no agreement. There was no mention in the labour laws of the right to strike, although in the previous year there had been a stoppage of work by 182 Nauruan employees, resulting in the establishment of the Nauruan Workers' Organization, which was representative of the workers. That particular stoppage of work had been mainly due to a misunderstanding, and a very satisfactory solution had been found.

74. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked why the Administration did not encourage the Chinese workers or those from other islands to settle on Nauru with their families.

75. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) replied that most of them wished to return to their own countries where their wives were awaiting them. Furthermore,

there was not enough land on Nauru for the Nauruans themselves, and it would not be in their interests to encourage the immigration of permanent residents to Nauru. In 1954, however, consideration had been given to making an area of land available so that more Chinese and workers from other islands could bring their wives to reside on Nauru for the term of their agreements. No decision had yet been taken.

76. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) inquired whether the special representative expected that the Nauruans would eventually be able to receive university degrees.

77. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) thought that in the next ten years, if not earlier, Nauruans who were receiving secondary education in Australia would be able to qualify for the professions.

78. Mr. GRUBYAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked, in view of the fact that the phosphate deposits would be exhausted in sixty years, how long, in the opinion of the Administering Authority, it would take the Nauruans to reach a stage of development which would enable them to decide on their future themselves. Did the Administering Authority believe that the Nauruans would reach that stage in less than sixty years?

79. Mr. LOOMES (Australia) said that, at that stage, the Administering Authority did not know what the rate of development of the Nauruans would be, but that it would advance them as quickly as possible. With regard to the future of the island when the phosphates had been worked out, the Administration was already consulting the population regarding their wishes in respect of a possible resettlement and it was not necessary to await any particular stage of development.

80. In reply to questions from Mr. S. S. LIU (China), Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the increase in royalties payable to Nauruan landowners had been decided upon after the completion of the report for the year 1952-53. It had been retroactive to 1 July 1953.

81. The Nauru Lands Committee, which comprised Nauruans only, was dealing with the question of payment for the land required for the airfield, and the Administration, while bringing no undue pressure to bear on the Committee, was endeavouring to give it assistance.

82. The number of medical personnel was adequate to the size of the population: there were three Nauruans at the Central Medical School at Suva and four had obtained their diplomas as assistant medical practitioners.

83. In reply to questions from Mr. BARGUES (France), Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that, as far as he was aware, the supply of phosphates to the United Kingdom would continue.

84. The decline in copra exports was due to an increase in local consumption and to the fact that the Nauruans had lost interest in producing copra. The Administration was anxious to get rid of the large number of coconuts which were sprouting, in order to avoid the possibility of insect-borne diseases being introduced into the Territory.

85. The Nauruans showed very little interest in fishing, despite the Administration's efforts to interest them in fishing as an industry; they caught fish for their own domestic requirements.

86. Mr. BARGUES (France) inquired whether there were any small savers among the indigenous population.

87. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) had no detailed information concerning the depositors in the local bank; but a considerable number of Nauruans and inhabitants of neighbouring Pacific islands had savings accounts.

88. In reply to Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti), Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that he did not know whether a higher price could be obtained for phosphates on the open market.

89. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) thought that the price of phosphates from other countries was higher, and that the price at which phosphate from Nauru was supplied seriously reduced the earning power of the Territory. He asked whether, in the circumstances, the Australian, United Kingdom and New Zealand farmers were not deriving more benefit from the extraction of the phosphates in the Territory than the Nauruan people themselves.

90. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the price of phosphates had no effect whatsoever on the way in which the Administering Authority carried out its responsibilities under the Trusteeship Agreement.

91. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) thought that, on the contrary, an increase in the price of phosphates might permit an increase in the royalties paid to such bodies as the Nauru Royal Trust Fund, the Nauruan Community Long-Term Investment Fund and the Nauru Local Government Council, which, in principle, would benefit the Territory and its inhabitants.

92. He inquired what representations had been made to the British Phosphate Commissioners with a view to an increase in the royalties paid to those bodies.

93. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) replied that whether it was considered that it would be reasonable to increase the royalties or whether it was thought that the income of the fund which was to be used for the resettlement of Nauruans should be increased, the price of phosphates would have no influence on any action which the Administration might take in that connexion. The agreement was between the Nauruans and the British Phosphate Commissioners, and had been approved by the Administrator.

94. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) considered that in accordance with previous recommendations of the Council, the Administering Authority should have submitted two separate accounts for phosphate operations in Nauru.

95. Mr. JONES (Special Representative for Nauru) said that his Government had given all relevant information on page 36 of the annual report, in its reply to the last recommendation of the Council on the subject. As special representative, he had nothing to add to that information.

96. In reply to a question from Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti), Mr. JONES (Special Representative) regretted that he had no exact information on the causes of the high infant mortality rate in 1952-53. Probably, neglect of hygiene in childbirth had been to blame.

97. In reply to Mr. SERRANO GARCIA (El Salvador), Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the Administration was drawing up a land register which would probably be completed a year's time.

98. Dairy products consumed by the inhabitants were preserved, and all imported. There were two importers:

the Nauru Co-operative Society and the store run by the British Phosphate Commissioners. The products were bought on the open market and sold in the stores. The Co-operative made no profit but it naturally had to cover its working costs, as did the Phosphate Commissioners.

99. The population generally recognized the need to establish an airfield on Nauru. The airfield was rarely used at the present time because it was not considered to be up to international standards.

100. Persons sentenced to hard labour generally had to work on the roads. If they were serving a sentence of six months or more and their conduct was satisfactory, they were entitled to a small wage, which they received on discharge. Breaches of the Movement of Natives Ordinance were generally punished by a fine.

101. Mr. ROBBINS (United States of America) said, in connexion with a question raised by the representative of India, that the family allowances drawn by the officers and employees of the British Phosphate Commissioners constituted an admirable method of increasing the incomes of the islanders and an excellent incentive to work. In that connexion, Mr. Lall had referred to the price of powdered milk. He pointed out that a three-pound can of milk was enough to prepare a relatively large quantity of liquid milk; consequently the price of powdered milk was not very high. It followed that the family allowances in question were not inadequate.

102. Secondly, his delegation was keenly interested in the recent visit to Nauru, in the latter part of 1954, of Mr. Eltham, Director of Training in the Australian Department of Labour and National Service. His delegation would be greatly interested to know the results of the evaluation of Mr. Eltham's report particularly with regard to the forms of training which might be developed to prepare Nauruans for skilled work on the island or elsewhere.

103. Mr. Robbins asked for information concerning the building of the new hospital, post office and courthouse.

104. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the building of a new hospital had been started on 1 April 1955. He had no information on the post office or the new courthouse.

105. In reply to further questions from Mr. ROBBINS (United States of America), Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that most of the population, including the Nauruans, subscribed to outside publications, and the inhabitants were at perfect liberty to listen to radio broadcasts from any part of the world. Many people read the United Nations literature available to them in the library.

106. Mr. ARNALDO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) wished to add some supplementary information to that contained in the covering note to UNESCO's observations on education in Nauru (T/1180). Neither the Executive Board nor the Committee of the Board had had time to study those observations or the observations on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (T/1181). Nevertheless, the UNESCO reports on those Territories had been submitted to the Trusteeship Council by virtue of the delegation of authority granted the Director-General by the General Conference of UNESCO.

107. He read out a decision recently taken by the Executive Board at its forty-first session, from 21 March

to 1 April 1955, regarding UNESCO's relations with the Trusteeship Council.

108. Finally, he noted that the Executive Board had recently reviewed its procedure in the matter so as to

facilitate the preparation of UNESCO reports to the Trusteeship Council, a function to which the Board attached great importance.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.