



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Twenty-sixth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Wednesday, 20 April 1960,  
at 2.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

C O N T E N T S

	Page
<i>Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru: annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1959 (continued)</i>	
<i>Questions concerning the Trust Territory and replies of the special representative of the Administering Authority (continued) . . . . .</i>	21

President: Mr. Girolamo VITELLI (Italy).

*Present:*

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

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

*Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru: annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1959 (T/1509, T/1517, T/1518, T/L.963) (continued)*

[Agenda item 3 (e)]

*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 OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY (continued)

*Economic advancement (concluded)*

1. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic), drawing attention to paragraph 23 of the working paper on conditions in Nauru (T/L.963), in which it was stated that the response to the Administering Authority's efforts to encourage agriculture has been disappointing, asked what kind of efforts the Administering Authority had made in that regard and whether it had ever called on FAO for assistance.

2. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) replied that efforts to interest the Nauruans in agriculture and kitchen gardening had been going on for many years. They had been supplied with seeds and artificial manures and given every assistance and encouragement, but the results, particularly those of the pineapple-growing experiment, had been disappointing. The present Administrator, with the assistance of the

Department of Agriculture in Australia, had made renewed efforts; soil samples had been tested and experiments conducted with certain manures and seeds which seemed to be suited to the local soil. Judging by the results of previous efforts, however, he doubted whether the present ones would meet with success.

3. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic), recalling the special representative's statement at the 1052nd meeting on the subject of the Nauruan Community Long-Term Investment Fund, the credit balance of which had been £345,910 in June 1959 and £398,026 in December 1959, asked whether the funds in question were interest-bearing and, if so, whether the interest accrued during the last six-month period was included in the latter figure.

4. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the interest for the year under review had amounted to £12,902. At 30 June 1959 the credit balance had been £246,658, plus royalties totalling £86,350 and interest amounting to £12,902. The royalties actually paid to the Nauruans during the year covered the last quarter of the year 1957-1958 and the first three quarters of the year under review.

5. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) asked what royalty rate was paid to the Nauruan landowners.

6. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the rate of 1s.1d. which he had mentioned in his opening statement (1052nd meeting) had come into effect only on 1 July 1959. For the year under review, the rate had been 9d. He had mentioned the new figure to give an idea of the progress made.

7. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) observed that when the royalty paid to Nauruan landowners had been 1s. per ton, 3d. had been paid on their behalf into the Nauruan Landowners Royalty Trust Fund. He asked whether that figure had been changed after the increase in royalties.

8. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) replied that it had remained the same.

9. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) asked whether the decision on any change in the sum to be paid into the Trust Fund rested with the British Phosphate Commissioners or with the Government of Australia as the Administering Authority.

10. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the proposals made by the British Phosphate Commissioners and by the Nauru Local Government Council would be the subject of negotiation until a decision acceptable to both parties, the Nauruan people and the British Phosphate Commissioners, had been reached.

11. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic), turning to the question of the so-called wireless station land, pointed out that the Administering Authority had

stated in its annual report<sup>1/</sup> that the question could be litigated in the Central Court of Nauru and that the Local Government Council had been so informed. He asked for information on the latest developments in that connexion.

12. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said the Nauruans had told the Administrator that they had no desire to take the matter to court and that they thought they could come to an agreement. After discussions with the Nauruans, the Administrator had submitted certain proposals to the Department of Territories at Canberra.

13. Mr. VELLODI (India) said he wished for some information in connexion with article 6 of the Nauru Island Agreement, 1919<sup>2/</sup>, which provided that the title to the phosphate deposits and to all land, buildings, plant, and equipment used in connexion with the working of the deposits was to be vested in the Commissioners. He asked whether the Commissioners had the right to mine an area of land without obtaining the owner's permission. The annual report stated (pp. 20-21) that they had the right to lease any phosphate-bearing land and to mine it, "subject to the approval of the Administrator and the owners, which approval could not be unreasonably withheld". He wished to know exactly what the position was.

14. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) recalled that in 1919, after the League of Nations had placed Nauru under mandate, the Governments of the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand had entered into an Agreement regarding the phosphate deposits. The provisions of that Agreement made it clear that the extraction of phosphates was not to be a profit-making undertaking. To give effect to those provisions, the three Governments had purchased the Pacific Phosphate Company in June 1920. Following the change of administration in 1920, the basis of payments had been agreed upon between the Commissioners and the Nauruans, who had accepted the fact that they had ceded the rights for the raising of the phosphate. Besides payments to the individual landowners, certain sums were to be paid to the Administrator and used for the benefit of the Nauruan people. A new Agreement, concluded in 1927, had fixed royalties and other conditions. That Agreement, signed by all the chiefs on behalf of their people and included as part of the Lands Ordinance of the Territory, had settled questions concerning phosphate-bearing land, the removal of trees on leased land or on land used for phosphate-raising, royalties, and the rental on non-phosphate-bearing lands. The 1919 Agreement, to which the Indian representative had referred had been an administrative act by the three Governments to enable the British Phosphate Commissioners to raise the phosphate. It did not mean that they could mine any land without the permission of the Administrator or the owners.

15. Mr. VELLODI (India) asked what was the significance of the statement that approval should not be unreasonably withheld. Had such a case ever arisen?

<sup>1/</sup>Commonwealth of Australia, Report to the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Administration of the Territory of Nauru from 1st July, 1958, to 30th June, 1959 (Canberra, A. J. Arthur, Commonwealth Government Printer). Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by a note of the Secretary-General (T/1509).

<sup>2/</sup>For the text of the Agreement, see T/1466.

16. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said it was his understanding that that provision was more or less an escape clause to cover cases in which, for example, a landowner particularly wished to retain some trees on land he had leased. So far as Mr. Jones knew, however, the case had never arisen.

17. Mr. VELLODI (India) inquired about the land surrounding Buada Lagoon. On page 23 of the annual report it was stated that there were approximately 1.8 million tons of phosphate in that area, but there was no indication whether the deposits were being mined. On page 22 the report stated that in the same area around the Lagoon there were about fifty acres suitable for agriculture. He wondered whether the British Phosphate Commissioners and the Administering Authority had taken care not to damage that land in any way. The figure given, of 1.8 million tons of phosphate, seemed to indicate that it was the intention to mine the phosphate in that area also.

18. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) assured the Indian representative that the area had not been mined. It represented such a small proportion of the phosphate-bearing area that the Administering Authority would certainly not grant permission to mine it until all other deposits had been exhausted.

19. Mr. VELLODI (India) said that there was a sentence in article 11 of the 1919 Agreement which provided that any phosphates not required by the three Governments might be sold by the Commissioners at the best price obtainable. Had phosphate ever been sold outside the territories of the three Governments?

20. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) thought that there had been no such sale during the year under review; otherwise it would have been mentioned in the balance sheet of the British Phosphate Commissioners included in appendix XIII to the annual report.

21. Mr. VELLODI (India) observed in that connexion that the balance sheet of the British Phosphate Commissioners was not very illuminating. According to article 14 of the 1919 Agreement, the United Kingdom and Australia were each to receive 42 per cent of the phosphate extracted, while New Zealand was to receive 16 per cent. It appeared from the export figures that those proportions had not always been adhered to, Australia having received 70 or 75 per cent, with a corresponding drop in the United Kingdom's share. He asked whether the shares of the three countries could be modified by arrangement between them according to their requirements.

22. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said the Agreement provided that if any one of the three Governments did not require its full quota, that quota could be used by one or both of the other Governments.

23. Mr. VELLODI (India), referring to the balance sheet of the British Phosphate Commissioners, asked what the figures appearing in the left-hand column under the heading "Liabilities" meant. If the allotments to the United Kingdom and to Australia had varied considerably, should there not be a corresponding variation in the figures for those countries under liabilities?

24. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) explained that the figures in question represented the funds made available by the three Governments when the rights had been purchased from the Pacific Phosphate Company

- in 1921. They did not vary with the quotas because it was provided that if one of the Governments did not take the full amount allotted to it, it was credited with the cost price as fixed by the Commissioners, which was the f.o.b. price shown in the annual report. If one of the Governments desired to make a permanent change in its quota, it was quite possible that consideration would be given to a revision of those figures.
25. Mr. VELLODI (India) recalled that at the twenty-fourth session of the Council several delegations had suggested that the British Phosphate Commissioners should provide separate sets of accounts for Nauru and for the other islands. Some of the explanations given by the Administering Authority when that issue had been raised had not been very satisfactory and he asked the special representative what steps had been taken to persuade the Phosphate Commissioners to give separate and more specific figures in respect to Nauru.
26. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) thought that there was no purpose in repeating the explanation which had been given at the twenty-fourth session. No change was contemplated in that connexion.
27. Mr. VELLODI (India) recalled that the Council had never succeeded in obtaining information from the Administering Authority about what might be considered world prices for phosphate. Phosphate extracted in Nauru cost approximately £2 per ton f.o.b. If the costs of production in other territories were higher, there would be what might be called a hidden or indirect profit. He asked the special representative if he could give particulars on the world prices and comparative prices of phosphate.
28. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) regretted that he could not provide any additional information. The Council was no doubt aware that there was no world price for phosphate. Conditions varied greatly from country to country and it was therefore impossible to quote a world price.
29. Mr. VELLODI (India) said he would like to know whether the price of £2 per ton could be regarded as fair. Could not the special representative at least tell the Council what price the British Phosphate Commissioners paid for phosphate from Christmas Island and Makatea? That should be comparable to the price of Nauru phosphate.
30. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that he was not in possession of those figures. The only information available to him was what appeared in the balance sheet.
31. Mr. VELLODI (India) asked whether any Nauruans held senior posts with the British Phosphate Commissioners and whether there had been any change in that respect since the previous year.
32. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) replied that no Nauruans had been appointed to senior or executive posts. A large number of them held semi-skilled posts.
33. Mr. VELLODI (India) asked whether the increase in royalties paid direct to the landowners, which had risen from 9d. to 1s.1d. per ton, i.e. about 30 per cent, and which, according to the special representative, represented an automatic triennial increase based on the price of phosphate, corresponded to the increase in that price during the three previous years. He also wished to know whether the increase applied to all royalties or only to the royalties paid direct to the landowners.
34. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) replied that the increase was due to the increased price of phosphate from Nauru and applied only to the royalties paid to landowners. He did not think that the price of phosphate had increased by 30 per cent but the royalty rate had been increased as a result of the rise in the price or phosphate.
35. Mr. VELLODI (India), referring to the assets of the Nauruan Community Long-Term Investment Fund, which were invested in bonds in Australia, asked the special representative what rate of interest was received for that money. Did the estimate given by the special representative at the twenty-fourth session (976th meeting), that in thirty or forty years the Fund, which could be used for the resettlement of the Nauruans, would amount to some £7 million, still hold good?
36. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that he did not have the figure for the interest paid on the bonds in question. Interest rates had varied according to the date of purchase of the bonds, but it had usually been between 3 and 4 per cent. No change had been made in the assessment of the amount of the Fund after the year 2000.
37. Mr. VELLODI (India) said he would appreciate it if the special representative would let the Council know the exact rate of interest at a future meeting. One of the visiting missions had reported an interest rate of 3 per cent, whereas in one of the annual reports, or in one of the statements made by the special representative at the twenty-fourth session, a figure of 4 1/4 per cent had been given.
38. There was also discrepancy in the figures given in the annual report with regard to the Nauru Royalty Trust Fund. On page 17, the revenue for 1958-1959 was given as £50,719 whereas on page 63 it was given as £24,336. Expenditure was shown on page 17 as £23,341 and on page 63 as £31,478. He would be glad if the special representative would clarify that point.
39. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that he would try to provide an explanation at the next meeting.
40. Mr. VELLODI (India) asked whether the increase of about £40,000 which had occurred in withdrawals from bank deposits indicated any relaxation of the restrictions which applied to such withdrawals.
41. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) replied that the increase in withdrawals was a reflection of the general banking position.
42. Mr. VELLODI (India) said he assumed from that reply that the restrictions were still in force.
43. Mr. MONTERO DE VARGAS (Paraguay) asked whether there was a direct relation between the increase in royalties which had taken effect on 1 July 1959 and the increase in phosphate production, which, according to the report (p. 23), would amount to 1.6 million tons a year.
44. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the increase in production naturally affected the amounts received by the landowners. The amount an owner received varied with the tonnage taken from his land, but that did not affect the rate at which the royalty was paid.

45. Mr. MONTERO DE VARGAS (Paraguay) asked whether, if phosphate production increased, the Administering Authority would consider establishing a special fund as a reserve against the time when the problem of the resettlement of the inhabitants of Nauru would arise.

46. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that a fund for that purpose was already in existence—the Nauru an Community Long-Term Investment Fund. A royalty of 1s.0d. per ton was paid to that special fund, which had been set up to safeguard the future of the Nauruans.

47. Mr. MONTERO DE VARGAS (Paraguay), referring to the land which could no longer be used for the extraction of phosphates, asked whether any new surveys had been made in order to ascertain whether it could be reclaimed for agriculture.

48. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) recalled that that question had been thoroughly discussed by the Council at its twenty-fourth session. It had then been pointed out that, in theory, it would be possible, with the aid of explosives and the necessary equipment, to level the land and to import soil for it but that such soil would be washed down through the crushed coral. Moreover, it had been stated that the rainfall was totally inadequate for agricultural purposes, that the Nauruans had shown no desire to become a purely agricultural community and that the cost of such an abortive scheme would be astronomical.

49. He had already explained that there was at present on Nauru no soil in the generally accepted sense of that term; there was only a gravelly and very porous sand. Before non-Nauruans had arrived on the island, the inhabitants had lived mainly on coconuts, a coarse type of taro and fish, because the land would not grow the fruit and other vegetables normally to be found in tropical territories.

50. As a result of questions which had been asked on the subject at the twenty-fourth session, the matter had again been referred to the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO), an Australian scientific organization, which had been asked whether any attempt had been made elsewhere in the world to reclaim land in similar circumstances. The reply given by CSIRO was that there had been no new development to cause them to alter the conclusions they had reached several years earlier with regard to Nauru. Accordingly, the Administering Authority took the view that it was out of the question to consider reclaiming the land in the manner suggested.

51. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to know who, under the 1919 Agreement, had the right to own land, including phosphate-bearing land.

52. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the hereditary rights were held by the Nauruan people, certain of whom, regarded as the owners of the land, received royalties on the phosphate raised.

53. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that under articles 6 and 7 of the 1919 Agreement all rights in the phosphates belonged to the British Phosphate Commissioners, and any right which any person might have in such deposits was to be converted into a claim for compensation.

54. Mr. JONES (Special Representatives) explained that a distinction had to be made between land rights and the rights in the phosphate deposits dealt with in articles 6 and 7 of the 1919 Agreement. The Nauruans who owned the land and the phosphates it contained had unanimously agreed to leave the mining of the phosphates to the British Phosphate Commissioners, subject to certain provisions and restrictions laid down by the Administrator in the Lands Ordinance. Once rights to the deposits had been acquired with the agreement of the Nauruan owners, it was a matter for the three Governments concerned to vest the Commissioners with the necessary authority to extract the phosphates and handle their sale and other related questions.

55. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that strict interpretation of the 1919 Agreement would seem to imply that the Nauruans retained the ownership of the surface of the land, that they transferred their ownership rights in the phosphates to the British Phosphate Commissioners and that, after the phosphates had been extracted, the remaining sterile land reverted to the Nauruan people.

56. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said it was true that after completion of the phosphate extraction the land was useless for agricultural purposes; but it was next to useless for agriculture even before mining, since the phosphate almost touched the surface.

57. The surface rights in the land were respected; the compensation agreed upon was £60 per acre. In addition, the owner received a royalty of 1s.1d. per ton of phosphate extracted. With regard to compensation, it had also to be borne in mind that all the expenses of the island and all social service costs were met by the British Phosphate Commissioners. Those expenses had amounted over the past five years to £1,390,000. The direct benefit to the Nauruans had been £1,290,000—an appreciable sum considering the small size of the island's population, which did not even pay any taxes.

*The meeting was suspended at 4.5 p.m. and resumed at 4.30 p.m.*

58. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that according to the annual report phosphate deposits in Nauru amounted to approximately 65 million tons. By 30 June 1959 about 25 million tons had been raised and the royalties paid to Nauruans had amounted to £1,291,000. If the reserves—about 40 million tons—lasted for another forty years and the royalties paid to the Nauruans reached a figure of approximately £6 or 7 million, there would be a very great discrepancy between the sums paid in the past and those the Nauruans would receive in the years to come: the ratio would be 1 to 3, or even 4. It would be fair and just to recalculate the figures, even on the basis of the current very low prices, and pay the Nauruans a supplementary indemnity for the phosphates already exported.

59. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that that was correct; the figure might perhaps be higher, since the rate of royalty would probably be raised. In considering what the Nauruans received by way of benefit from the phosphate deposits the cash payments should not be considered alone; the many other benefits the Nauruans received, such as public utilities, hospital treatment, education, social services etc.,

had also to be taken into account. It was also a fact that the Administering Authority had accepted the responsibility for the future resettlement of the Nauruans. It would thus be seen that the benefit actually derived by the Nauruans from the phosphate mining would be three or four times the value of the royalties paid to them.

60. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the Administering Authority was contemplating a re-evaluation of past payments, with a view to paying the Nauruans a retroactive supplementary indemnity on the basis of the new royalty rate.

61. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the Administering Authority was not contemplating such a measure, since the royalties paid had been considered equitable by arrangement with the Nauruan people. The Administering Authority was, however, definitely considering an increase in the rate of royalty at present.

62. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that at the twenty-fourth session of the Trusteeship Council (975th meeting) his delegation had asked how the price of the phosphates was calculated. He asked whether the special representative was in a position to reply.

63. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that he had no detailed information on the various expenses included in the calculation of costs.

64. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the special representative knew what prices were paid in other countries, since prices could be found in all surveys which were two or three times higher than the price of £2 per ton paid for Nauruan phosphate.

65. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that no comparison could be made between the prices in various countries; the cost of phosphate depended on many factors, such as ease of extraction, distance from markets etc.

66. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the special representative could tell the Council what proposals the Nauruans had presented at the conference held in Canberra in April 1959 regarding equitable and reasonable rates of royalty.

67. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that he had no information on that subject. In any event, it would not be proper to divulge such information at the current stage of negotiations.

68. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the special representative could not make some special effort to obtain the information in question from the British Phosphate Commissioners within the coming week.

69. He asked also whether the Administrator in Nauru had any control over the British Phosphate Commissioners—for example, over their financial, administrative and other activities.

70. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the Administrator received no report on the technical or financial work of the Commissioners; all the information provided was given in the annual report. The Commissioners were required to conform to the

laws of the Territory; they went about their business in the same manner, in every respect, as most other industries in independent States.

71. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the Nauru Local Government Council had the right to ask the British Phosphate Commissioners for information and to invite representatives to its meetings and put questions to them; and, if so, whether it had ever done so.

72. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that there was no statutory right of that kind, but there had been many discussions between the Nauru Local Government Council and the local manager of the British Phosphate Commissioners. It was also the usual practice that when the general manager from Australia or any of the British Phosphate Commissioners visited Nauru, he had discussions with the Nauru Local Government Council. Of course, any changes in royalty rates were made by agreement between the Nauru Council, the British Phosphate Commissioners, and, usually, the Administrator; any such change had to have the prior approval of the Administrator.

73. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the specialists who had decided that the land could not be reclaimed for agriculture after the extraction of the phosphate had actually visited Nauru, whether their report could be communicated to the Trusteeship Council and whether the Administering Authority had asked the United Nations or one of its specialized agencies, or any other Government, for assistance in carrying out such a survey.

74. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that no application had been made for assistance; CSIRO, the Australian scientific organization in question, was well known all over the world. The original survey had been made on the spot in 1954 by three experts in soil analysis and reclamation. The Administering Authority had approached CSIRO again to ask whether there had been any recent developments which might affect the conclusions set forth in its first report; the answer had been in the negative.

75. Mr. VELLODI (India), referring to the subject of land regeneration, recalled that at the twenty-fourth session several members of the Council had suggested that another survey should be made on the question; perhaps a pilot project could have been carried out on an acre of land. Apparently CSIRO had based its views on the survey conducted in 1954, not on any new survey. Was the reluctance of the Administering Authority due to the fact that it had already decided that the people of Nauru had to leave the country, or was the regeneration of the land actually a technical impossibility?

76. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the report of CSIRO was based purely and simply on scientific data and had not been influenced in any way. The reason why no new survey had been made in Nauru was that conditions had not changed since 1954. The report of CSIRO took account of developments in other parts of the world which might have offered some hope of a solution. Of course, if such a solution were found and if, in addition, the people of Nauru showed any interest in measures of the kind proposed—which was not the case—the situation would be different. He

assured the Indian representative that the fact that the Nauruans would very probably have to leave the island and be resettled elsewhere had not influenced the Administering Authority.

*Educational and social advancement*

77. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) asked how the Nauruan students in Australia had fared in examinations during the academic year ending in 1959, and why many of them had failed in their examinations.

78. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) replied that in March 1960 there had been thirty-five Nauruan students in Australia, seventeen of whom had been attending secondary courses. Of the remaining eighteen, two were apprentices and two were receiving on-the-job training; they had failed in their examinations and were working in their trades while at the same time attending courses at a technical college. Five other students had passed their examinations: a girl, who had taken a commercial course, was now employed by the Administration in Nauru, while the four students at the Gordon Institute of Technology had been promoted to the next higher grade, one of them having shown such promise that he was to enter a university. The five Administration cadets had not made satisfactory progress and did not appear to have the necessary aptitude for higher education. One of the female teacher-trainees had had to be returned to Nauru, while one of the male trainees had completed his course successfully and was now being trained at the Australian School of Pacific Administration. A student who had been unable to cope with a university degree course in agriculture was now attending the Sydney Technical College. The two youths who had taken up, respectively, medicine and science, had proved incapable of university studies, although they had been given excellent facilities. The medical student had left Australia at his own request, while the other was taking a course at a technical university. The two cadet trainee nurses had displayed very little industry but had been permitted to stay in Australia in order to give them a last chance.

79. With regard to secondary school students, he said that, while in two cases the results had not been satisfactory, in the majority of cases the students had passed their examinations and it was hoped that several of them would matriculate and be able to go on to a university. At the end of the year scholarships had been awarded to seven more pupils, all of whom had begun secondary courses in Australia.

80. Mr. DE CAMARET (France) observed that thirty-five Nauruans were studying abroad, which was a very high proportion of a population of under 2,000.

81. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) said he had received the impression that the outlook for education in Nauru was gloomy, either because the educational system was ill-adapted to the people's needs or because the people were reluctant to study. He asked whether the Administering Authority had considered sending pupils to Australia for secondary education.

82. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) pointed out that there was a secondary school in Nauru, with teachers who had the necessary qualifications, where pupils were taken up to the intermediate certificate level. At the end of the year under review there had been sixty-one pupils attending that school. At the

beginning of the current academic year the number had risen to 108, forty-eight of whom were girls.

83. In reply to the Bolivian representative's question, he said that after pupils had obtained their intermediate certificate they sat for an examination the object of which was to ascertain whether they would be likely to benefit from higher education. Those who succeeded were granted scholarships for secondary education in Australian schools.

84. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) said that apparently most of the students who had gone to universities had failed. However, the Administering Authority did not seem to have tried to give secondary school pupils handicraft or technical training which would enable them to earn a living elsewhere than in Nauru. That was an important question which should be considered by the Administering Authority.

85. He noted from the annual report that there were no monetary regulations or other barriers to limit the access of students to overseas education and training. He asked whether a Nauruan student who studied and passed his examinations in Australia could remain and find employment there.

86. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the primary intention of the Administering Authority was to enable Nauruans to qualify for some of the more senior positions in the Administration and with the British Phosphate Commissioners. The Australian Government hoped that when Nauruans did qualify for such positions they would return to the Territory and accept the posts which would be offered to them. Should a Nauruan qualify in Australia in medicine or law or any other profession and desire to stay in Australia, he had no doubt that the Administering Authority would view the request with sympathy.

87. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) welcomed that reply. Since the people of Nauru could not be resettled on another island where the level of living was lower than that which they enjoyed at present, the only possible solution would be for Australia to absorb Nauruan technicians. He asked whether the Administration would contemplate increasing the number of students going to Australia.

88. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) assured the Bolivian representative that any Nauruan who showed the necessary capability was given the opportunity to continue his studies in Australia.

89. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) asked why the Administering Authority had declined WHO's offer to conduct an investigation on the island into the effect of phosphate dust on the health of the inhabitants. Such an investigation would have had a very good psychological effect on the people.

90. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the Administering Authority had greatly appreciated WHO's offer, but since it had in its service experts who were fully capable of dealing with the problem it had not considered such an investigation to be necessary. The Nauruans had every faith in the Administering Authority in that respect. The fact that the Administration had not accepted assistance from WHO in that particular case did not indicate any lack of confidence, for WHO was giving great assistance to the Administering Authority in other fields.

91. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) asked how the Administering Authority made known to the Nauruans that there were certain scholarships offered by States Members of the United Nations and whether any of them had shown a desire to avail themselves of such scholarships.
92. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) understood that the availability of the scholarships had been known to the Nauruans. So far there had been no candidates, no doubt owing to the fact that all the scholarships were for higher studies. As more and more Nauruans matriculated and became eligible for universities, no doubt some of them would like to accept those scholarships.
93. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) noted from the observations of WHO on the annual report (T/1518) that the total attendance of children at child health clinics had decreased and asked what was the reason. He would also like to know whether anything had been done to organize a home visiting service to help improve the care of mothers and children, which was mentioned in the same document.
94. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) pointed out that there were eleven child health clinics in Nauru; he thought that the decrease in the number of children attending those centres might perhaps be due to a general improvement in health. He had no information about the establishment of a home visiting service.
95. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) asked whether the reduction in attendance at the clinics might be due to the fact that the number of nurses had dropped during the year.
96. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) regretted that he was unable to reply to that question.
97. Mr. KIANG (China) asked whether the Administering Authority had informed the Nauruans of the results of the phosphate dust analysis and, if so, what the people's reaction had been.
98. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that the Nauruans had been informed orally of the findings of the two scientists who had made the analysis and that a letter had been sent to the Local Government Council on the subject.
99. Mr. KIANG (China) asked whether the conclusions to be drawn was that the results had been reassuring to the Nauruan community.
100. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said he understood that the people were satisfied with the results and were grateful to the British Phosphate Commissioners for the steps being taken to lessen the dust.
101. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to pages 28 and 29 of the annual report of the Administering Authority and to paragraph 66 of the report (T/1448 and Add.1) of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru, New Guinea and the Pacific Islands, 1959, asked what steps the Administering Authority had taken or intended to take, and when, to put into effect the principle of equal pay for equal work regardless of race, sex or age.
102. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said there could be no objection in principle to equal pay for equal work. Nevertheless, it was well known that the wages paid to European employees, both by the Administration and the British Phosphate Commissioners, were higher than those paid to Nauruans, Chinese and Gilbert and Ellice Islanders, because the Administering Authority must employ experts from overseas until they could be replaced by indigenous inhabitants, and their salaries must be sufficiently high to induce them to leave their own country. The working week consisted of forty hours for non-Nauruans and forty-four for Nauruans, Chinese and Gilbert and Ellice Islanders. In an effort to overcome the problem, employees of the British Phosphate Commissioners who were engaged in the actual raising and drying of phosphate worked forty-seven hours a week but European workers were paid overtime for seven hours and other workers for three hours. In shops and offices all employees worked from thirty-six to forty hours a week; but in the Administration, with the exception of certain clerical workers, the working week was forty-four hours. Workers who belonged to the same race and did the same kind of work received equal pay for equal work.
103. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether there were Nauruans and Europeans employed by the British Phosphate Commissioners in positions of equal importance, or whether, after so many years, the Nauruans were still not sufficiently trained to occupy the technical and administrative posts at present held by Europeans.
104. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) replied that he knew of no instance of a Nauruan working side by side with a European and doing the same work with the same output and the same skill. Most semi-skilled work was performed by Chinese, Gilbert and Ellice Islanders and Nauruans, who either assisted the skilled European employees or worked under their supervision.
105. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) concluded from the replies of the special representative that employers practised discrimination against Nauruans and foreign workers of non-European origin, both with regard to wages and to access to posts requiring certain qualifications, since the Administering Authority had frequently stated that education in Nauru was satisfactory and that 95 per cent of the population could read and write. He asked whether any steps had been taken to comply with proposal 5 of the Local Government Council concerning the extension of the Council's powers in the field of education, which appeared in paragraph 39 of the report of the 1959 Visiting Mission.
106. Mr. JONES (Special Representative) said that, contrary to the impression given in the Visiting Mission's report, the Administration paid great attention to the views of the members of the Education Advisory Committee, which consisted of four Nauruans and three Europeans. That fact had been confirmed to him by the Director of Education. He did not know whether the proposals of the Local Government Council with regard to the budget for education had been adopted, but the recommendations and suggestions of the Nauruan members of the Education Advisory Committee were taken into account in all matters relating to education.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.