



CONTENTS

	Page
Examination of the annual report on the administration of the Trust Territory of Western Samoa for the year ending 31 March 1950 and of the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific on Western Samoa (T/800, T/792 and T/825) (continued)	47

President: Mr. HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA (Dominican Republic).

Present: The representatives of the following countries: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, China, Dominican Republic, France, Iraq, New Zealand, Thailand, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Examination of the annual report on the administration of the Trust Territory of Western Samoa for the year ending 31 March 1950 and of the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in the Pacific on Western Samoa (T/800, T/792 and T/825) (continued)

1. Mr. QUESADA ZAPIOLA (Argentina) drew attention to the fact that the High Commissioner for Western Samoa not only wielded executive power, but was the presiding officer of the legislative body. In that latter capacity he would no doubt cast a deciding vote in case of a tie; since as High Commissioner he already had the power to veto legislative measures, he would appear to be in a dominant position. Had the Administering Authority considered a separation of powers in that case, in accordance with accepted democratic principles?

2. He also wished to know whether any provision existed for replacing representatives of the Public Works Committee who were absent from the Territory.

3. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) replied that there was at present no plan to relieve the High Commissioner of the Presidency of the Legislative Assembly. When the political structure of the Samoan Government had developed sufficiently, such a scheme would no doubt be considered. The office of President involved ensuring the proper conduct of the Assembly's business and did not materially increase the powers of the High Commissioner, who as such could in any case veto bills.

4. There was no provision for substitute representation on the Public Works Committee, but the Legislative Assembly was free to make such provision if it chose.

5. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) remarked that a strong and stable public service was essential for a truly democratic régime. He wished to

know whether the time was yet in sight when Samoans in public service would have sufficient experience and qualifications to occupy senior positions. He also wished to know whether a policy of gradual transition, successfully used in his own country, had been contemplated. Under that policy, the first directors had been Europeans; they had later been replaced by nationals assisted by European advisors; in the third stage the advisors had been replaced by European experts who could be called on for advice but were not expected to volunteer it. Some such scheme would certainly expedite matters.

6. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) said there were three groups of Samoans which should be considered in that connexion. The first were young people with high qualifications, who would be able to occupy senior positions in the civil service when they had acquired the necessary experience and maturity of judgment, which only time could give. That group would be ready for senior positions in perhaps twenty years. The second group comprised Samoans already in public service; a few of them, though not highly educated, were, owing to their long experience, capable of holding senior positions. In the third group were educated Samoans who were fully capable of holding important public offices, but who were more interested in politics. Members of the Samoan legislature fell in that class.

7. The policy of gradual transition mentioned by the representative of Thailand had been under consideration; while no steps in that direction were contemplated for the next year or two, it was the obvious line for future development.

Mr. Ryckmans (Belgium), Vice-President, took the Chair.

8. The PRESIDENT invited the special representative for Western Samoa to reply to the questions on economic conditions contained in document T/L.120.

9. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) said, in reply to question 15, that the figures on increased planting of crops were not yet available, but would be ready in a few months; the Samoan Government would undoubtedly be able to make use of them in connexion with agricultural development.

10. Questions 16 and 17 dealt with much the same subject. Replying first to question 17, he said that the price of copra under the contract with the United Kingdom Ministry of Food had been determined for the first year by negotiations in which a number of copra-producing countries in that area had taken part. The price for each successive year was also fixed by negotiation, provided that it did not vary by more than 10 per cent in either direction from the previous year's price. The price for 1951 had been set at 53 New Zealand pounds, 15 shillings, per ton, which represented the maximum possible increase of 10 per cent. Though lower than world prices, which varied from day to day, it was considered quite satisfactory by Samoan producers. With regard to question 16, he said that the price received by Samoan producers compared very favourably with the prices received by other producers in the Pacific area, whether they sold their copra under contract or in the open market. It was generally considered that the contract worked to the Territory's advantage.

11. With regard to question 22, which dealt with a related topic, he remarked that the copra-purchasing contract did not have any of the objectionable features of a monopoly. The advantages to producers were that they were ensured stable prices and that the shipping problem was handled by the United Kingdom. Copra did not keep well; since shipping in the Pacific was in short supply, producers might find it difficult to deliver their produce to the world markets before it spoiled and might have to pay exorbitant shipping charges. Furthermore, Samoan production of copra, while vitally important to the Territory, was relatively small and world markets could easily do without it. The long-term contract therefore protected the interests of the Samoan producers.

12. In reply to question 18, he said that the reference to "Samoan producers" on page 31 of the annual report for 1950¹ applied to all the copra producers in Western Samoa. The Copra Board Amendment mentioned by the special representative at the seventh session (T/PV.285, page 11) involved a very minor administrative change and did not in any way alter the procedures concerning marketing of copra described in the annual report for 1948-1949.²

13. In answer to question 19, he said that the methods used in marketing copra had not been applied to cocoa because no one purchaser was prepared to take up the whole supply of that product. Western Samoa produced a high grade of cocoa, particularly suitable for blending; it was bought, at high prices, by a number of manufacturers who mixed it with inferior grades. Furthermore, since cocoa beans actually improved with keeping, the producers could afford to wait until shipping facilities were available. The trade and commerce report for 1949,³ which had been

circulated to the Council, showed that Samoan cocoa was exported to half a dozen countries, approximately half the exports going to the United States.

14. In reply to question 20, he stated that prices of bananas had been fixed on the basis of a reasonable return to the producers, due allowance being made for the costs of crating, handling and shipping, but not for any profit to the New Zealand Marketing Department. The price paid to the producer was much lower than the retail price, but, in the case of bananas, the handling costs were very heavy; a crate cost nearly as much as the bananas packed into it. The banana industry in Western Samoa was on the verge of being uneconomical and was kept going only because the New Zealand Government was giving it maximum assistance. New Zealand was the only market for the Samoan banana crop, but New Zealand could buy cheaper bananas from closer areas such as Fiji. As at 1 January 1951, the New Zealand Marketing Department had ceased marketing Western Samoan bananas, which in the future would be handled by an organization of fruit distributors set up for that purpose. It was possible that banana prices would go up; on the other hand, it might become necessary to reduce the export duty on bananas in order to encourage that industry.

15. With regard to question 21, he said that the Union Steamship Company of New Zealand intended, towards the end of 1951, to place in the island service a new vessel which was being built for the purpose. It would have a greater capacity for carrying cargo and passengers than the vessel at present being used and should enable Samoan exports of bananas to be approximately doubled. Plans were being made for planting increased areas in bananas and it was also hoped that Savai'i could be brought back into the banana trade. A shipping difficulty had to be solved before that could be accomplished.

16. In answer to question 23, he said that it was not proposed to transfer the management of the New Zealand Reparation Estates to Samoans. Samoans were being employed in a number of sub-managerial positions, and would be promoted to managerial status if they showed the requisite competence. Thus, two part-Samoans had recently been promoted to managerial positions.

17. With reference to question 24, he remarked that the Administering Authority had not yet reached a formal conclusion on the basis of the examination which it was conducting. The Samoan Government's principal concern in the matter was the economic welfare of the Samoan people. The select Committee of the Legislative Assembly, set up in the previous year to study the preferential tariff, had made it quite clear in its report⁴—which had been made available to the Trusteeship Council—that the so-called preferential tariff did not produce any discrimination in trade or affect the normal patterns of Samoan trade. The report showed that for the previous fifty years Samoan trade had followed almost exactly the same pattern. Under German administration Samoa had bought over 70 per cent of its imports from Australia, Fiji, New Zealand

¹ See *Report by the New Zealand Government to the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Administration of Western Samoa for the year ending 31st March, 1950*, Department of Island Territories, Wellington, 1950.

² See *Report by the New Zealand Government to the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Administration of Western Samoa for the year ending 31st March, 1949*, Department of Island Territories, Wellington, 1949.

³ See *Trade, Commerce, and Shipping of the Territory of Western Samoa for the Calendar Year 1949*, New Zealand.

⁴ See *Report of the Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly of Western Samoa on the Preferential Tariff*, Publication No. 1, Government Printer, Wellington, 1950.

and the United Kingdom. That percentage had obtained ever since. In other words, the pattern of trade was established not by preferential tariff but by the fact that those particular countries were able to supply the bulk of Samoa's requirements. The so-called preferential tariff could not simply be abolished since the net result would be to increase the prices of staple items of food and consequently the cost of living; that should be avoided at all costs. A completely new tariff schedule would have to be framed for Western Samoa, and the Committee had advised that that point should be considered. Since the conclusions of the Committee's report seemed to show that the present tariff was serving the interests of the Samoan people quite well and since the government had had other problems to consider, the matter had been left in abeyance during the preceding nine months.

18. Question 25 dealt with a related subject which had also been examined by the Select Committee. As the Committee had found, the flow of goods into the Territory from hard currency areas was clearly much more restricted by a shortage of hard currency than by any difference in customs duties. The general pattern of Samoan trade was also in part responsible.

19. In answer to question 26, he said that a directive had been issued, pursuant to Samoan import regulations, to the effect that goods imported from any country other than those specified by the Reserve Bank of New Zealand as hard currency areas should be exempt from licensing. The Samoan Government would, of course, continue to watch closely the flow of import and export trade and would review the position at the end of twelve months. The reference by the special representative at the seventh session⁵ had been to control over imports from hard currency areas and to certain cases of the transfer of capital to countries with depreciated currencies. The aim of the Samoan Government was not to spend more dollars than the Territory earned.

20. With regard to question 27, he observed that, at the time referred to, a 10 per cent tax had been levied on all Samoan exports except cocoa, on which the tax had been 3 per cent. Since then, the tax on cocoa had also been raised to 10 per cent. He further pointed out that the price of copra paid to the grower and also the merchant's profit were controlled by the Copra Board; desiccated coconut was sold only by the New Zealand Reparation Estates, the profits of which returned to Samoa in other ways; the remaining principal export, bananas, could not bear further taxation. Higher export duties therefore seemed impracticable. Whether or not the government revenues represented a reasonable share of the national income was a very important question, with which the Samoan Government was greatly concerned. At the moment no one knew what the national income of Western Samoa was. A rough comparison with other islands in the Pacific showed that Samoan Government revenues were reasonably high, but no exact estimate could be made until a competent national income study for Western Samoa had been carried out; that was no easy matter, since techniques for estimating the national income figures for an economy

such as that of Western Samoa were still in the experimental stage.

21. In answer to question 28, he said that the place of the income tax in Western Samoa was taken by the store tax, a tax on the gross selling price of goods, which had yielded about 70,000 New Zealand pounds in the year under review. There was also a salary tax on individual incomes in excess of 200 pounds a year after deduction of exemptions. The question of the applicability of an orthodox income tax structure to Western Samoa had been under consideration for several years. A preliminary report had been made by a New Zealand tax expert in January 1950; and an income tax technician from New Zealand, who had just completed half a year's service as collector of taxes in Western Samoa, would report on the problem of income tax collection as applied to small traders in the Territory; such traders, who constituted a numerous group used the most primitive methods, if any, of book-keeping and cash accounting. The advantage of the store tax was that it provided a definite and continuous source of revenue regardless of the profits of the particular enterprise, whereas there might be a serious loss of revenue in bad times if business enterprises were to pay income tax only. Samoa still remembered its economic crisis, and there was a general reluctance to make any change in the fiscal structure that was not in the direction of stability and security.

22. With reference to question 29, he remarked that a financial officer from the Reserve Bank of New Zealand would visit the Territory the following month to examine the currency situation on the spot, to confer with the Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly, and to report on whether an independent Samoan currency would be practical and what technical measures would be required. It was felt that more information was needed before the matter could be decided in principle. What was really desired was not a completely independent currency—that might create great difficulties for a small economic unit like Western Samoa—but a Samoan pound linked to the New Zealand pound but not necessarily on a parity with it. That would permit the Samoan pound to be fixed at a value which was in accordance with the interests of the Samoan economy.

23. In reply to question 30, he said that the supply of water-pipes and other kinds of pipes had greatly improved during the preceding year. Although non-sterling sources for pipes had not been used much in recent years because of higher prices, those prices might have to be paid in future, since it was becoming increasingly difficult to secure steel anywhere in the world market.

24. Mr. Powles was prepared to give any further information the Council might require.

25. In reply to a request from Mr. QUESADA ZAPIOLA (Argentina) for further clarification on question 23, Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) explained that the New Zealand Reparation Estates owned and managed about 70,000 acres of land, much of which was unsuitable for plantation development. The acreage which was being developed by the Reparation Estates and that needed for future exploitation would not be transferred to the

⁵ See *Official Records of the Trusteeship Council, Seventh Session, 2nd meeting.*

Samoans, but the remaining 42,000 acres would be made available to the Samoan Government. Much of it was heavily wooded and high above sea level and, though not suitable for plantations, could be partially utilized for village cultivation. Moreover, small areas of plantation land were being made available out of the good land held by the Reparation Estates to meet the needs of the inhabitants of the two small islands of Manono and Apolima.

26. Mr. Shih-shun LIU (China) was afraid that the rigid stipulation in the copra contract that price changes should not exceed 10 per cent might operate to the disadvantage of Samoan copra producers, especially as copra prices tended to rise.

27. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) pointed out that the contract, while it might put the Samoan producer at a temporary disadvantage when the world market price rose more than 10 per cent, would protect him from severe losses when there was a steep drop in world prices. The contract assured continuity of supply for the purchaser and continuity of sale for the seller and a guaranteed price was the principal advantage of such a long-term agreement. Experienced traders and merchants had felt complete satisfaction when the contract was being negotiated in 1946 and 1947, although much harder conditions might have been made if the contract had been negotiated in 1951, in view of current trade trends.

28. Mr. Shih-Shun LIU (China) noted with regard to question 25 that, as the shortage of goods in Western Samoa was due to the shortage of hard currency rather than to the preferential treatment accorded certain imports, extension of that treatment to imports from countries outside the British Commonwealth would not affect the flow of goods into the Territory.

29. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) concurred and added that immediate removal of the preferential tariff would not affect the direction of trade or the sources from which the Samoans imported goods.

30. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) also sought clarification of the preferential tariff question and the extent to which the current tariff schedules might be compatible with the relevant provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement. The 1949 report on trade, commerce and shipping of the Territory of Western Samoa indicated that import duties were subject to a surcharge of 15 per cent of the duty on British imports and 25 per cent of the duty on foreign imports as at December 1940; yet the special representative had stated that the present tax did not actually create a preference. On the other hand, the Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly had recommended revision of the customs schedule, with its varying rates and surcharges, and its consolidation so as to abolish the so-called preferential duty and provide a single over-all duty for standard basic commodity items and a higher over-all rate for all other items. That recommendation would seem to be entirely reasonable and not in conflict with article 4 of the Trusteeship Agreement, which obliged the Administering Authority to ensure equal treatment in social, economic and commercial matters for all Members of the United Nations and their nationals.

31. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) said that his government's obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement were a matter of policy which he was not competent to discuss; they would be taken fully into account before a final decision was made on revision of the tariff schedules. From the practical point of view, however, it was decidedly in the interests of the Samoans, who depended largely on imports of basic foodstuffs, for the government not to secure as much *pro rata* revenue from food imports as from imports of relatively non-essential goods. He was satisfied that the existing preferential tariff caused no diversion of trade or discrimination between sources of imports; that had also been confirmed by witnesses, including a United States citizen representing the Chamber of Commerce, who had supported retention of that tariff before the Select Committee.

32. Mr. SAYRE (United States of America) agreed that it would be useful to revise the tariff system if such revision seemed advisable in order to promote the welfare of the Samoans. As recommended by the Select Committee, that objective could probably be achieved by abolishing the preferential rate and substituting a uniform rate for all basic commodities regardless of origin. He had every confidence that the Administering Authority would take whatever action it found compatible with article 4 of the Trusteeship Agreement. *The meeting was suspended at 4.5 p.m. and was resumed at 4.30 p.m.*

33. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), noted from appendix VI of the annual report, dealing with public finance, that since the year 1930 no subsidy had been paid by the New Zealand Government to Western Samoa. Until 1942 receipts and expenditures had just about balanced, but since then considerable surpluses had been built up. He asked what use had been made of those accumulated surpluses.

34. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) explained that the surpluses were invested in New Zealand Government securities and bore interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum.

35. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the funds could be better used to promote the economic and especially the educational development of the Territory.

36. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) explained that when the accumulated surpluses had reached 500,000 New Zealand pounds, that amount had been constituted as a general reserve fund to cover future losses resulting from a deterioration in world trade. Surplus funds in excess of 500,000 pounds were to be used for capital development, but such development was hampered by the shortage of materials and of skilled personnel.

37. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) feared that the so-called reserve fund might never be used in the interests of the indigenous population and, during an economic crisis, might be subject to devaluation. Accordingly, it would seem more advisable to use the fund to further economic development.

38. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa), while he agreed that there could be no

guarantee against all possible disasters, pointed out that the funds invested in New Zealand Government securities were backed by the economy of New Zealand, were yielding 3 per cent interest each year and should therefore be considered reasonably safe.

39. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested further clarification regarding the participation of the indigenous inhabitants in the administration of the stabilization fund established by the Copra Board.

40. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) said the Copra Board had been established by an ordinance of the Legislative Assembly; details of its exact composition could be found in the annual report of the Administering Authority for 1949 (pp. 25 and 26). The figures indicating the cash price received by the Samoan producers had been explained at a previous Trusteeship Council session⁶ in the form of a diagram showing the breakdown of the total price into the stabilization fund, merchant's handling costs, special fees and the amount received by the producer. That general pattern had been maintained except that the increase in the price of copra to its current level of 53 pounds 15 shillings would not be passed on to the Samoan producer but would be kept in the stabilization fund. The producer continued to receive the same cash price as in 1949 and 1950.

41. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the table at the bottom of page 30 of the annual report, noted that the export value of one ton of cocoa beans had fallen by nearly a half in 1949 compared with 1948 and asked for an explanation.

42. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) explained that some eighteen months previously the price of cocoa beans had in fact dropped sharply on the world market. Prices had risen again, however, quite sharply, so that in 1950 a total of 1,880 tons yielded 439,770 New Zealand pounds.

43. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the Administering Authority had taken any steps to relieve the economic situation of Samoan producers who had incurred losses as a result of the sudden drop in the price of cocoa beans. Obviously, in the absence of a stabilization fund for cocoa, the government had not had to pay a subsidy to the producer.

44. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) confirmed that the government had taken no action to control the marketing of cocoa beans or to stabilize the internal price of that product. The case for a stabilization fund for cocoa was not as strong as that for a copra stabilization fund. Moreover, it was doubtful whether the indigenous producers of cocoa had suffered hardship from price fluctuations. Actually, there had been a marked increase in the planting and growing of cocoa by the indigenous inhabitants, so much so that at the present time most of the crop was produced by Samoans.

45. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) understood the impetus which had been given to indigenous producers to grow more cocoa

beans, but found the price drop abnormal. It was surprising that the Samoan producers had lodged no complaints and had not asked for a stabilization fund to cushion possible losses due to price fluctuations, as had been done for copra producers.

46. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) explained that the conditions for the production of cocoa beans were quite different. The trees did not bear fruit for eight or nine years after planting. As the general pattern of the world cocoa market had been one of rising prices, production had been consistently expanded by the Samoans; year to year price fluctuations had little effect on the situation as a whole.

47. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested further clarification of any plans the Administering Authority had to return part of the land used by the New Zealand Reparation Estates to the indigenous population.

48. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) again emphasized that the land currently used and managed by the Estates, together with whatever land was considered necessary for future development, was not likely to be returned to the Samoan Government or the indigenous population; it was considered an economic asset which served the welfare of the Territory. The Administering Authority was however considering the possibility of transferring the balance of the land to the Samoan Government. As such transfer would require legislative action and as discussions were still under way, Mr. Powles did not feel able to say more on the matter at that stage.

49. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the information available on Samoa indicated that the indigenous population numbered about 70,000 and was divided into about 6,000 large families most of whom lived in villages. He would like particulars of the composition of small, medium and large families, their income, the standard of living, division of labour, etc.

50. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) stated that there was no information available regarding the average income or composition of Samoan families. The census which was to be taken in 1951 might provide the answers to many of the questions raised by the USSR representative.

51. He recalled that at previous sessions of the Council conditions in Samoa had been described at great length. In general, the pattern could be described as that of a subsistence economy with the *matai*, or head of family, exercising general direction of all family activities. In recent years increasing prosperity in Samoa had resulted in a growing desire to convert produce into money for the purchase of consumer or other goods.

52. In general, there seemed to be no discernible difference between the standard of living of small, medium and large family groups in various parts of Samoa. In visits to nearly all of the 200 villages in Samoa, he had found fairly uniform living conditions, with only slight variations depending on the nature of the principal product of the area. Despite the general impression that life in the Polynesian islands was one of complete

⁶ *Ibid.*, Fourth Session, 25th meeting.

idleness, the inhabitants of Samoa led a reasonably normal and energetic existence, determined in great measure by climatic conditions.

53. Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wondered from the description given by the special representative whether Samoans were all equally wealthy and whether there was a group which was poorer or less prosperous than the others. Family circumstances were obviously affected by death or illness. He asked whether there were any beggars or indigent persons and, if so, what provision was made for their maintenance. He also wondered whether there was a wealthy group which exploited the poor.

54. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) replied that there was no wealthy group in Western Samoa. Though a few families might be richer than others, the general pattern of life was very much the same, partly because of the communal idea of property which barred recognition of individual ownership and meant that almost all possessions were held in common. In some cases the more senior families of a village lived in houses which were in slightly better condition than the rest but, considering the differences in social strata, living conditions were surprisingly uniform.

55. A small group of Samoans had become interested in trading and become familiar with the European way of life. A few had moved to Apia where they lived like modern businessmen. Personality rather than membership of any particular family or group seemed to be the key to their success.

56. He pointed out that the operation of the family system provided an almost complete system of social security in which beggary was unknown; dependent women and children were always well provided for in case of the death or illness of male members of the family. Cases of starvation or lack of adequate shelter were practically non-existent, except occasionally in Apia.

57. Within the family group children were looked upon as common property and there was no stigma associated with illegitimacy.

58. Mr. QUESADA ZAPIOLA (Argentina) noted from page 32 of the annual report that there were no monopolies in the Territory of Western Samoa. Nevertheless, references to the New Zealand Reparation Estates on pages 27, 34 and 35 indicated that that organization exercised considerable influence over many phases of the Territory's economy. He wondered whether the existence of that organization obstructed the economic development of the Territory and prevented the growth of competing enterprises. Did the government contemplate dividing the activities of the New Zealand Reparation Estates so as to reduce the concentration of its economic power?

59. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) stated that the division of the New Zealand Reparation Estates into smaller organizations had not been considered by the government. He doubted that the presence of that organization had in any way been a deterrent to the growth of private enterprise. The Estates had no actual monopoly and there was no law

preventing other groups from carrying on activities in the same field. He was sure that a study of the situation would reveal that the operation of the Reparation Estates had in the long run been most beneficial to the Territory. It must be remembered that it was an organization capable of establishing new enterprises and assuming certain risks and possible losses. For example, the establishment of the desiccated coconut factory had required a considerable amount of capital. The organization had also tried to establish a dried banana factory and had lost considerable sums of money in that unsuccessful venture. In saw-milling, as well as in other activities, the Estates did not operate in such a way as to drive out competitors.

60. Mr. HAY (Australia) noted from page 26 of the annual report that smaller firms operated as many as twelve trading stations each and that there were independent traders in the villages; page 31 also contained a reference to the system of trading stations throughout the Territory. He requested information regarding the identity of the dependent traders, the sources of their initial capital and the nature of the transactions carried out with the villagers.

61. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) said that most of the small, independent traders were Samoans who had been able to make arrangements to receive the merchandise needed to start up and carry on their business.

62. Referring to the pattern of trade, he noted that the villagers sold their crops regularly through the traders chiefly in order to obtain the cash required to meet their daily needs, for example, to purchase tinned meat, tea, flour, etc. In addition to that regular flow of goods, there were, occasionally, larger transactions to meet special requirements of the villagers.

63. In reply to a question by Mr. QUESADA ZAPIOLA (Argentina) regarding the expiration of leases of the first type referred to on page 33 of the report, Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) indicated that there was at the moment no information available on that point, but the only leases of that kind were now held by the New Zealand Reparation Estates. He further explained that leases made in earlier times had been arranged during the German régime when restrictive legislation was not in effect. At the present time the disposal of Samoan land for any purpose whatever had been made virtually impossible. Although not certain of the date, he believed that that provision had been introduced in 1921 when New Zealand had assumed the Mandate.

64. In reply to questions by Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) regarding a reference made on page 35 to the number of cattle slaughtered and regarding the meat consumption per person in Samoa, Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) said that the questioner's calculation that only four or five head of cattle were slaughtered per day for a population of 75,000 was not completely accurate. The figure of 1,697 was only the total head of cattle killed by the New Zealand Reparation Estates, principally for the Apia market. Many other thousands of cattle were slaughtered all over Samoa, by Europeans

as well as by Samoans. He added that no local government taxes were levied on the slaughter of animals.

65. The PRESIDENT invited the special representative for Western Samoa to reply to the written questions on social conditions (T/L.120).

66. Mr. POWLES (Special representative for Western Samoa) stated that question 31, on public health, was somewhat comprehensive. Apart from Apia Hospital and the thirteen district dispensary hospitals, there were no additional hospital facilities in Western Samoa. The proposed main district hospitals were being built out of the district dispensary hospitals. Consequently, there would still be thirteen hospitals in the district, some of them district dispensary hospitals and some main district hospitals. One main district hospital had been completely finished, another was partially completed and, in two other cases, construction had not yet begun.

67. There were 120 beds in the Apia Hospital, 25 beds in each of the five main district hospitals and 12 beds in each of the district dispensary hospitals.

68. The detailed staffing of Samoan district hospitals in February 1951 was shown in the following table:

	<i>Samoan medical practi- tioners</i>	<i>Samoan dental practi- tioners</i>	<i>Samoan staff nurses</i>	<i>Assist- ant nurses</i>	<i>Dressers</i>	<i>Beds</i>
Tuasivi	2	1	4	1	—	25
Fagamalo ...	2	1	2	—	1	25
Lufilufi	1	—	2	2	—	25
Poutasi	2	—	2	2	—	25
Leulumoega .	2	—	2	1	—	25
Safotu	1	—	2	1	—	12
Sataua	1	—	2	1	—	12
Sala'ilua	1	—	3	1	—	12
Satupa'itea .	1	—	3	—	—	12
Fagaloa	1	—	2	1	—	12
Lalomanu ...	1	—	2	1	—	12
Sa'anapu	1	—	3	1	—	12
Mulifanua ...	1	—	3	—	—	12

69. Visits were paid to district hospitals by highly qualified European doctors and by senior European nursing personnel.

70. In reply to question 32, he indicated that the former Chinese indentured labourers now enjoyed full so-called European status, without restrictions. They had the right to vote for European members of the Legislative Assembly, the right to stand for election to that body and to sit in it if elected.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.