



**CONTENTS**

	Page
<i>Agenda items 37, 39, 40 and 41:</i>	
<i>Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories:</i>	
(a) <i>Progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories in pursuance of Chapter XI of the Charter;</i>	
(b) <i>Information on economic conditions;</i>	
(c) <i>Information on other conditions;</i>	
(d) <i>General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;</i>	
(e) <i>New developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community: report of the Secretary-General</i>	13
<i>Dissemination of information on the United Nations in Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General</i>	
<i>Participation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies: report of the Secretary-General</i>	
<i>Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General</i>	

(e) **New developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community: report of the Secretary-General (A/4470)**

**Dissemination of information on the United Nations in Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General (A/4471 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1)**

**Participation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies: report of the Secretary-General (A/4472)**

**Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General (A/4473 and Corr.1 and Add.1)**

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had decided at its 1003rd meeting to consider agenda items 37, 39, 40 and 41 together. Representatives might therefore refer in their general statements to any or all of those items. After the conclusion of the general statements the Committee would no doubt wish to give attention to each of the items separately.

2. Agenda item 38 would include a number of points touching upon general questions relating to the transmission and examination of information. He therefore suggested that any point which would be discussed in connexion with that item should be omitted in dealing with sub-item 37 (d), in order to avoid unnecessary duplication. In connexion with sub-item 37 (d) members should confine themselves as far as possible to questions of procedure.

3. If there were no objections the Committee would proceed on the lines he had indicated. He requested the Secretary of the Committee to prepare a tentative time-table for the Committee's work and hoped that the Committee would adhere to that time-table as strictly as possible.

4. He appealed to members to submit any draft resolutions at the earliest possible date so that they could be referred to during the debate.

*Mr. Pachachi (Iraq) took the Chair.*

5. Mr. QUAISON-SACKEY (Ghana), Chairman of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, submitted the report of the Committee on its eleventh session (A/4371).

6. Since the Rapporteur of the Committee on Information and the Chairman of its Sub-Committee would go into detail about the sections of the report for which they bore special responsibility, he would confine his statements to some general observations.

7. The report clearly reflected the fact that the 1960 session of the Committee had been a milestone in United Nations activities affecting conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories. Members had shown an

**Chairman:** Mr. Adnan M. PACHACHI (Iraq).

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas (Argentina), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

**AGENDA ITEMS 37, 39, 40 AND 41:**

**Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/4360-4368, A/4371):**

(a) **Progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories in pursuance of Chapter XI of the Charter (A/4105-4109, A/4114, A/4124, A/4128, and Corr.1, A/4129, A/4131, A/4134, A/4136, A/4137, A/4142, A/4144, A/4152, A/4162 and Corr.1, A/4165-4167, A/4175, A/4178, A/4181, A/4192-4195, ST/TRI/SER.A/15/vol.5):**

(b) **Information on economic conditions (A/4371);**

(c) **Information on other conditions (A/4371);**

(d) **General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;**

awareness of the situation and a sense of responsibility that were reflected in the report, which he hoped would be examined in full recognition of the realities of the current situation and the international developments surrounding problems connected with Non-Self-Governing Territories, since such developments could no longer be claimed as matters of exclusive interest to the parties directly concerned. So-called colonial problems had for a long time been matters of international concern, but never before had there been such a need for international alertness to all the events linked with both the present and the future of dependent peoples. It was hardly an exaggeration to say that such international alertness was but one of the safeguards for the maintenance of peace and security in the world.

8. During its two months' work the Committee had covered some ten to eleven years of development in no fewer than fifty-four Territories. As the Chairman of the Sub-Committee would introduce the appropriate sections of the report, he would only mention at the present stage that part two was not, like the rest, submitted to the Fourth Committee for approval or disapproval but was laid before it in the manner desired by the General Assembly and in accordance with the implication of its title, "Observations and conclusions ...".

9. The Committee's task had been facilitated by the presence of special advisers sent by most of the Administering Members either from their metropolitan capitals or from the Territories concerned. In that connexion he expressed appreciation to the Governments of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and the United States of America.

10. The Committee's attempt to assess progress in the Non-Self-Governing Territories had been undertaken subject to the limitations imposed on it. Nevertheless he had been greatly impressed by the understanding shown by members for each other's points of view and their endeavours to give and take and to accept honest and dignified compromise.

11. The report was commended to the General Assembly as a set of facts, a formulation of analysis and, so to speak, a textbook of lessons for future activities in dependent territories. The account of activities in the territories given in the report might give the reader a realization of the burden of responsibility resting on those who continued to be in charge of the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

12. In addition to the examination of the progress report,<sup>1/</sup> the Committee on Information had followed its usual three-year work cycle and had given special consideration to economic conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The debate on that subject had been confined to subjects not covered, or only partly covered, in detail in the progress report, such as questions of terms of trade, balance of payments, currency and central banking and other related topics. Attention had also been paid to problems arising from the association of certain Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community. The views of the Committee on those matters would be found in part three of the report. The Committee had

<sup>1/</sup> A/4105-4109, A/4114, A/4124, A/4128 and Corr. I, A/4129, A/4131, A/4134, A/4136, A/4137, A/4142, A/4144, A/4152, A/4162 and Corr. I, A/4165-4167, A/4175, A/4178, A/4181, A/4192-4195, ST/TRI/SER.A/15/vol. 5.

also considered social and educational conditions in the Territories and had given some attention to recent developments in those fields.

13. The Committee had availed itself of the assistance generously tendered by the specialized agencies, to which his thanks were due. He also paid a tribute to the members of the Committee, the Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur, the Chairman of the Sub-Committee and the members of the Secretariat.

14. Mr. BACON (United States of America), Rapporteur of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, observed that while there was some duplication between part one of the report on the one hand and parts two and three on the other, it was with a purpose. Part two related to substantive matters and gave the views of the Committee as such; part one gave the individual views of members. The report was of necessity drafted in general terms and should be read in conjunction with the documents submitted to the Committee on Information and the summary records of the Committee. Part one was basically procedural in character. Sections VI, VII, VIII and X gave an account of the views expressed by members of the Committee on some aspects of the report on progress achieved and on economic conditions. The subject had been given a thorough examination by the Committee, which was reflected in detail in parts two and three, as were also the views expressed on social and educational conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories and on international collaboration. Section IX included comments made by various members of the Committee with regard to the date of transmission of information and certain problems relating to the cessation of the transmission of information. Other comments related to the absence of information on areas which, according to some views expressed, were subject to the provisions of Article 73 e of the Charter. Section XI contained an account of the discussions concerning the future work of the Committee.

15. The technical language used in the report should not be allowed to obscure the fact that the story was basically a human one of people who were not yet self-governing and of the progress they were making towards the attainment of the goals set by the Charter. It was a story of individuals and their efforts, and of the administering Powers and their efforts to assist individuals to help themselves.

16. He drew attention to annex II of part one, which consisted of a draft resolution submitted by the Committee on Information for consideration by the General Assembly.

17. Mr. RASGOTRA (India), Chairman of the Sub-Committee set up to study the progress report and to prepare a report on economic conditions, welcomed the representatives of the new Member States and expressed his delegation's regret that no representatives of the former Belgian Congo were present. He was confident that the participation of new Members whose countries till recently had been Non-Self-Governing Territories would lend point, substance and weight to the deliberations of the Fourth Committee.

18. In introducing parts two and three of the report he would remind members of the Committee that the task of the Sub-Committee and of the Committee on Information itself had been not to give final opinions

but to make recommendations and to draw up observations in order to assist the Fourth Committee in formulating its assessments with regard to the ten-year progress report. The task had been complicated to some extent by the structural flaws in the progress report itself, which consisted of some three thousand pages, including a mass of statistical information and perhaps a still greater mass of interpretative matter. Not all the statistical tables had been reproduced in the Sub-Committee's observations, but references were made in appropriate places to the statistics and tables.

19. Figures should always be studied with care, since percentages and statistical tables could be misleading. The Sub-Committee had endeavoured to bring out the real significance of the statistics to which it referred. He recalled that a few days earlier, at the 883rd plenary meeting of the General Assembly, the representative of Belgium had stated that per caput income in the former Belgian Congo was \$70. That figure was somewhat misleading, and he would draw the Committee's attention to paragraph 53 of part two of the report, which portrayed a different picture: the per caput income of the African population was \$42.20 and that of non-Africans \$2,973. Those disparities in the incomes of Africans and Europeans residing side by side in the same Territory were characteristic of many Territories. Percentages or averages should not be allowed to blur the picture and mislead opinion. The Committee should concern itself primarily with the poverty of the mass of people, which stood in terrible contrast with the wealth and prosperity of a handful of alien settlers.

20. He drew attention to certain key paragraphs in part two. Paragraphs 24 and 25 gave the general context in which the progress achieved during the past ten or twelve years in the various Non-Self-Governing Territories should be judged. The substance of those two paragraphs and certain other observations in the body of the report was that progress in all fields must be measured by what was achieved ultimately in the political field. Thus it would have been helpful to the Sub-Committee, the Committee on Information and the Fourth Committee if information of a political nature had been available. Such information had been provided in respect of a certain number of Territories, but not for the majority. That was deplorable, since the General Assembly had several times requested the transmission of information on political advancement. He hoped that the findings of the Sub-Committee would lend further weight to the General Assembly's previous recommendations in the matter, which the General Assembly might perhaps wish to reiterate with greater force.

21. He pointed out that no information whatsoever was forthcoming about the development of civil and technical cadres in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Most of the difficulties of many of the new Members of the United Nations which had formerly been Non-Self-Governing Territories arose from the fact that at the time of achieving independence they had not had sufficient personnel trained in various fields of administration and development. He hoped the Fourth Committee would take note of the fact that, although information on that subject was not strictly political, it had not been available to the Com-

mittee on Information, and would adopt a suitable recommendation.

22. Progress was a relative term and was not to be measured in terms of statistics but rather in terms of benefits received by human beings. In 1957 a good deal had been achieved, in comparison with previous years, in economic, social and educational matters, while political progress was evident from the presence of the new Member States. Nevertheless, he regretted to say that the general conclusion which emerged was that, in terms of human welfare, prosperity and social services, progress had been limited. He was not seeking to condemn the Administering Members but to spur them on towards greater advances. There were Territories, for example, in which the literacy rate was only 5 per cent; in fact, there was a Territory in which it was only 1 per cent. Education of women in particular was lagging behind and he hoped that the Committee would endorse its previous recommendations on that subject.

23. There had been evident economic progress, but that again was a subject on which statistics could be misleading. For example, when it was stated that there had been an increase in the national product, the question arose of the extent to which that growth had affected the indigenous inhabitants. The impression that the Committee would probably form was that certain sections of the population, who were often aliens, had had the lion's share of it, whereas the indigenous inhabitants had benefited little. That observation remained true despite improvements in agriculture, exports and the balance of payments. The Territory concerned might be benefiting but persons outside might be benefiting still more. An example of that was to be found in paragraph 24 of part three of the report, where it was stated that during the period 1951-1958 transfers of income from investment in the former Belgian Congo alone accounted for 18,949 million francs, whereas total Belgian private and public investments during the same period amounted to only 14,542 million francs. The return on the capital invested, including payments by means of invisible transactions and for services amounting to another 65 million francs, far exceeded the outlay; and the principal, if not the only, beneficiary from all this was the investing country.

24. In the past, several recommendations on community development had been made by the Committee on Information and by the General Assembly, but as members of the Committee would see from paragraph 153 of part two of the report, the Sub-Committee had found that little or no progress had been made in that respect in the Territories during the period under review.

25. With regard to social development, race relations continued to present a rather depressing picture, as was evident from paragraph 188 of part two. The paragraph concluded with the words "It is on wise and statesmanlike action in all fields, including the political ... that reliance should be placed for the elimination of racial discrimination", and he would particularly emphasize the words "including the political".

26. He was glad to acknowledge that on the whole members of the Committee would find much in the report that gave cause for satisfaction, although there were parts of it which might occasion them

some concern. He asked the Committee to bear both those aspects in mind when studying the report; in preparing which the Sub-Committee had endeavoured to produce a balanced and reasoned compromise.

27. There were still some Territories about which no information was available. For that reason the Sub-Committee had not referred to them but he hoped that at the appropriate time the Fourth Committee would give attention to that very serious matter.

28. In conclusion, he expressed his thanks to the members of the Sub-Committee and to the specialized agencies and the Secretariat for the valuable help which they had so readily given.

29. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Secretary of the Committee to introduce the documentation on the agenda items under discussion.

30. Mr. KUNST (Secretary of the Committee) said that, so far as sub-items (a), (b), (c) and (d) of agenda item 37 were concerned, the Committee's basic documentation was contained in the various sections of the report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/4371).

31. In connexion with sub-item 37 (a), members of the Committee could consult part two of the report, section VI of part one, and the documents listed in annex I of part one. In addition, there was volume 5 of the progress report, containing the Territorial surveys.

32. With regard to sub-items (b) and (c), members of the Committee could refer to part three of the report, to sections VII, VIII and X of part one and to the documentation listed in annex I. The summaries of information covering the year 1958 were available in documents ST/TRI/B.1959/1-9, which were also issued as documents A/4360-4368.

33. For sub-item (d) the Committee might wish to consult paragraphs in section IX of part one of the report.

34. With regard to new developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community (agenda item 37 (g)), he drew the attention of the Committee to section VIII of part three of the report and to document A/4470, which gave the reasons why a full account of new developments in connexion with that subject could not be presented to the General Assembly at that stage.

35. For agenda item 39, the Committee would find in document A/4471 the material available to the Secretariat on the existing state of the dissemination of information concerning the United Nations in the Non-Self-Governing Territories which had been called for under General Assembly resolution 1465 (XIV). An addendum had been issued containing information specifically provided for that purpose by the Government of the United Kingdom and received too late for inclusion in the original document.

36. With regard to agenda item 40, concerning participation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies, he drew attention to document A/4472, which had been prepared in consultation with some of the specialized agencies and the secretariats of other relevant bodies, and to section X of part one

of the report of the Committee on Information, which summarized the information on the subject provided by some of the Administering Members.

37. In connexion with agenda item 41, an annual report (A/4473 and Corr.1 and Add.1) had been prepared, in compliance with General Assembly resolution 1471 (XIV), on the actual use made of scholarships and training facilities offered by Member States to students within the Non-Self-Governing Territories. A further brief addendum might be issued later should additional information warrant it. References to the subject were also to be found in section X of part one of the report.

38. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) said that his delegation formally reserved its position with regard to the submission of information by the United Kingdom Government on the Islas Malvinas. The submission of such information did not affect the sovereignty of Argentina over those islands, which the United Kingdom held by an act of force never recognized by his Government. He reaffirmed his Government's inalienable rights over the South Sandwich Islands, the South Georgia Islands and the land included in the Antarctic sector of the Argentine Republic which, together with the Islas Malvinas, formed an integral part of the national territory of Argentina.

39. Mr. AGUERO (Chile) said that his Government reserved its rights over Chilean Antarctic territory, which went back to the days when Chile had been a Spanish colony. That territory was part of the Chilean province of Magallanes and his country's authorities exercised their functions there in the same way as they did elsewhere in the Republic.

40. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom Government had no doubts concerning its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and the Falkland Islands Dependencies and he wished formally to reserve its rights on that question.

41. Mr. KESTLER (Guatemala) observed that the Government of the United Kingdom had transmitted reports on Belize, which was improperly known as British Honduras. Guatemala had always rejected any claim by the United Kingdom to Belize and wished once again expressly to reserve its rights. His delegation's presence during the debate was not in any way to be interpreted as an indication that Guatemala had abandoned those rights. The *de facto* situation in Belize was the result of an act of force committed by a great Power against the territorial integrity of a small Power.

42. The matter had been dealt with by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Guatemala at the 874th plenary meeting of the General Assembly and his delegation could only reiterate its energetic protest against the continued and illegal occupation of Belize by the United Kingdom. He hoped that the United Kingdom would help to achieve a just solution of the question.

43. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) observed that his country's position with regard to Belize had been set forth on previous occasions both in the General Assembly and in its Committees. In particular, he wished to draw attention to the statement on the subject made by the Secretary for External Affairs of Mexico at the 771st plenary meeting, held on 6 October 1958, during the thirteenth session.

44. Mr. KESTLER (Guatemala) said that he wished to make two points regarding the claim advanced by Mexico in recent years. In the first place it did not represent joint action by that country with Guatemala; in the second place Guatemala's claim to exclusive rights to Belize dated back for about a hundred years. At the same time, he desired to emphasize the fact that relations between Guatemala and Mexico continued to be increasingly cordial.

45. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom Government had no doubts as to its sovereignty over British Honduras and he wished formally to reserve its rights on that question.

46. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) said that he wished to reserve his Government's position with regard to regions which had always belonged to Morocco but were now under foreign occupation—namely, the region known as Mauritania, which was under French occupation, and Sidi Ifni, Saguia-el-Hamra, Ceuta and Melilla, which were occupied by Spain. Despite Morocco's undoubted historic rights to those territories, they had been forcibly detached from his country. The inhabitants were unquestionably Moroccan and had always claimed to be so, despite blind colonialist oppression.

47. The question of Mauritania had been included in the agenda of the General Assembly. His Government made the most formal reservations about the abnormal state of affairs in the other areas, which should not be allowed to continue; for political, legal and moral reasons, as also for the sake of good relations with Spain, they should be returned to Moroccan sovereignty at the earliest possible moment. The maintenance of a foreign administration with no connexion with the population—the latter was kept in a state of mediaeval servitude and was in a constant state of revolt—was contrary to right and justice; the forces occupying the area were a danger not only to Morocco but to several other African States and constituted a standing provocation to his country. Only a few days previously an incident had been instigated by the Spanish forces which had shown their irresponsibility and their attachment to the ideas of colonialist domination. Morocco had not lost hope of a negotiated settlement with Spain and was firmly decided to settle the question in accordance with the principles of the Charter and the wishes of the inhabitants. The division of the territories concerned had been the result of an absurd arrangement between the Powers which at the time had been quarrelling over the hegemony of Morocco.

48. Mr. DOISE (France) said that his Government formally reserved its position with regard to the claims made by the Moroccan representative and rejected both the claims and the references made in that representative's statement. As the representative of Morocco had said, the question of Mauritania was on the agenda of the General Assembly. Mr. Doise would point out that the inhabitants of that Territory would freely decide their own destiny and that the Territory would become independent on 28 November 1960.

49. Mr. ALWAN (Iraq) said that his country recognized no sovereignty over Mauritania except that of Morocco.

50. Mr. Najmuddine RIFAI (United Arab Republic) observed that the United Arab Republic recognized no sovereignty over Mauritania, Ifni and Saguia-el-Hamra other than Morocco's and considered that Mauritania had been forcibly occupied against the wishes of its population and in violation of the rights of Morocco.

51. Mr. KUKAN (Libya) said that his Government recognized no sovereignty but that of Morocco over Mauritania, Ifni and Saguia-el-Hamra.

52. Mr. SOEBANDRIO (Indonesia) said that he wished to reiterate his Government's strong protest against the assumption by the Netherlands Government of sovereignty over West Irian. The matter had been extensively discussed during past sessions in the First Committee and the recent further deterioration of the situation as a result of the sending of reinforcements by the Netherlands to that Territory had been discussed in the plenary meetings of the General Assembly by the President of Indonesia (880th meeting), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia (888th meeting) and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands (886th meeting). He would therefore confine his observations to four points.

53. First, West Irian was not a Non-Self-Governing Territory. It had been a "residency", i.e., part of a province, of the former colony of the Netherlands East Indies, which had been renamed "Indonesia" by the Netherlands on 29 April 1948, recognized by it as independent on 27 December 1949 and admitted to membership of the United Nations in September 1950. West Irian was therefore part of a province of a State Member of the United Nations. If the people of the Territory were debarred from enjoying the same rights as those living in the other provinces of Indonesia, it was due to the Netherlands military occupation of the Territory, against which his Government and people strongly protested.

54. Secondly, when the Netherlands Government had recognized the independence of Indonesia, it had ceased to have any obligation under Article 73 e of the Charter to transmit information on Indonesia. The submission by the Netherlands of information on a part of Indonesia might therefore be interpreted to mean that the Netherlands had acquired new territory by conquest and that, by providing information on West Irian, it was asking the United Nations to recognize that conquest.

55. The continued occupation by the Netherlands of a part of Indonesian territory was in flagrant violation of earlier agreements to the effect that the political status of West Irian should be determined by negotiation between representatives of the Netherlands and of Indonesia. The Indonesian Government had requested the General Assembly to seek a peaceful solution through negotiations based on the earlier agreements between the two parties and on the Purposes and Principles of the Charter. Since no such peaceful solution had been possible, owing to the Netherlands' refusal to negotiate, the Indonesian Government could only protest in the strongest possible terms against the unilateral and illegal action of the Netherlands in continuing to occupy part of Indonesian territory.

56. Thirdly, the use in some United Nations documents of the term "Netherlands New Guinea" to designate the Territory of West Irian was wholly unacceptable. The objective and neutral designation which the United Nations had always employed in its documents to refer to the Territory was "the Residency of New Guinea (Irian)", a term which had been accepted by both parties. So long as the dispute between the Governments of Indonesia and the Netherlands on the political status of the Territory remained unsettled, it was undesirable that any change should be made in the accepted title; any change made without the consent of the other interested party ran counter to the United Nations tradition of objectivity and was harmful to the prestige of the Organization.

57. Fourthly, the agreement on administrative co-operation between Australia and the Netherlands was unacceptable to the Indonesian Government, because all such administrative unions adversely affected the orderly and favourable development of Trust Territories and, moreover, that particular agreement lacked any legal basis whatever. Although Australia was within its rights under article 5 of the Trusteeship Agreement in administering a Non-Self-Governing Territory together with a Trust Territory, the addition of West Irian caused the agreement to cover a part of the territory of another independent State not a party to the agreement, a situation which was totally unacceptable. Since there was no basis for the presence of the Netherlands in West Irian, there was even less basis for the conclusion of an agreement with Australia on its administration. His Government wished to reiterate at the present stage the strong protest it had made to the Netherlands and Australian Governments on the subject at the time the agreement had been signed.

58. It had been argued by the Netherlands that if West Irian was administratively reunited with the rest of Indonesia, the United Nations would no longer receive information on the Territory under Article 73 e. Quite apart from the fact that West Irian was not a Non-Self-Governing Territory, that argument was absurd, since West Irian, once reunited with free Indonesia, would be as open to the world Press and other media of information, including those of the United Nations, as were the other provinces of Indonesia. Under the existing illegal military occupation by the Netherlands the position was quite different. The Charter had provided for the transmission of information on Non-Self-Governing Territories precisely because of the policy pursued by the colonialist Powers of isolating such Territories and in order to provide some sort of check on their policies. The fact that the Netherlands had advanced that argument only confirmed the belief that it was that country's intention to retain the people of West Irian indefinitely in its colonial grip.

59. His delegation also wished to place on record the fact that it did not regard the Portuguese overseas territories as part of metropolitan Portugal; they were colonies, and information on them should be transmitted in accordance with Article 73 e.

60. His delegation also associated itself with the statement of the Moroccan representative regarding Ifni and Mauritania.

61. Mr. DINGEMANS (Netherlands) said that the Netherlands regarded its sovereignty over Nether-

lands New Guinea as beyond question. The Netherlands administered the Territory in accordance with its obligations under Chapter XI of the Charter and presented reports on it under Article 73 e.

62. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) said that Burma regarded West Irian as an integral part of Indonesia and had no doubt of Indonesia's sovereignty over the Territory. His delegation fully supported that country's position on West Irian.

63. Mr. ALWAN (Iraq) said that Iraq considered that the transmission of information on West Irian by the Netherlands was incorrect and incompatible with Article 73 e. Iraq recognized only the sovereignty of Indonesia over West Irian.

64. Mr. SINGH (India) said that India regarded West Irian as an integral part of Indonesia and therefore held that the transmission of information on the Territory by the Netherlands was out of order. Any views which the delegation of India might later express in the matter should be viewed in the light of that reservation.

65. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) pointed out that his delegation's later observations on the transmission of information by the Netherlands on West Irian should be considered subject to the reservation that Ceylon recognized no sovereignty other than that of Indonesia over West Irian.

66. Mr. KABBANI (Saudi Arabia) said that Saudi Arabia recognized no sovereignty other than that of Morocco over Mauritania, Saguia-el-Hamra and Ifni or other than that of Indonesia over West Irian.

67. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) supported the arguments advanced by Indonesia with regard to West Irian. The positions of Indonesia and Morocco on the problem had been fully defined in a "communiqué" signed a few months earlier by President Sukarno and the King of Morocco.

68. Mr. Najmuddine RIFAI (United Arab Republic) said that the United Arab Republic recognized no sovereignty except that of Indonesia over West Irian.

69. Mr. LOOMES (Australia) said that Australia had no doubt of the sovereignty of the Netherlands over West New Guinea. He hoped that that difference of opinion would not affect the cordial relations his country enjoyed with Indonesia.

70. Mr. SOEBANDRIO (Indonesia) thanked the representatives who had expressed their support for his Government's position on West Irian. Treaties signed centuries before might have proclaimed that Indonesia was a part of the Netherlands but in the modern world the concept of one people being subject to another was archaic and obsolete. Indonesia considered that West Irian had been occupied by the Netherlands by force as a result of what might be termed an act of aggression. While Indonesia was unable to defend itself, it had to regard the situation as an accomplished fact but it hoped to settle the dispute by peaceful means, either through the United Nations or by means of bilateral talks. His country's tolerance, however, had limits. Indonesia had been patient for ten years but it could not sit idly by and watch its people in West Irian repressed by force. Recent reinforcements from the Netherlands made the situation in the Territory very serious. The Indonesian people were prepared to meet force on the

part of the Netherlands with force. That did not mean, however, that the Indonesian people liked war. The Indonesian people were a peaceful nation and the Netherlands could not compel Indonesia to declare war on the Netherlands, but the situation in the Territory was indeed very grave and tense. If the explosive situation in the Territory came to a head, it would not be Indonesia's doing or Indonesia's fault.

71. Mr. KUCHAVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his country recognized no sovereignty but that of Indonesia over West Irian.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.