United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FOURTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

FOURTH COMMITTEE, 967th MEETING

Tuesday, 24 November 1959, at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 36:
Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories:
(a) Progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories in pursuance of Chapter XI of the Charter;
(b) Information on educational conditions;
(c) Information on other conditions;
(d) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information;
(e) Report of the Secretary-General on new developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community;
(f) Offers of study and training facilities under resolution 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954: report of the Secretary-General 493

Chairman: Mr. L. N. PALAR (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 36

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/4081 and Add.1-4, A/4082 and Add.1-5, A/4083 and Add.1-3, A/4084 and Add.1-4, A/4085 and Add.1-4, A/4086 and Add.1-10, A/4087 and Add.1-5, A/4088 and Add.1-14, A/4089 and Add.1-5, A/4111):

(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);

(b) Information on educational conditions (A/4111, part one, section VI, and part two);

(c) Information on other conditions (A/4111, part one, sections VII and VIII);

(d) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information (A/4096 and Add.1, A/4111, part one, section X, A/4115, A/4226, A/4227, A/C.4/405, A/C.4/406);

(e) Report of the Secretary-General on new developments connected with the association of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the European Economic Community (A/4197 and Corr.1);

(f) Offers of study and training facilities under resolution 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954: report of the Secretary-General (A/4196 and Add.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should begin its debate on item 36 with sub-item (a), relating to progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories in pursuance of Chapter XI of the Charter. Part one, section IX, of the report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/4111) recorded that Committee's discussion on the method of examination of the progress report. Members might also find helpful an informal note distributed by the Secretariat, which gave a brief historical survey of the events which had occurred since the adoption by the General Assembly of the resolutions requesting the Secretary-General to submit a progress report to the Assembly. A list of the documents comprising the progress report was attached as an annex to the informal note. During the discussion of sub-item (a) members might do well to refrain from references to the substance of the report until a decision had been reached on how to discuss it.

2. The Committee might wish to open the discussion on the substantive part of the item by general statements in which members could refer to sub-items (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f).

3. Sub-items (b) and (c) would be discussed jointly, i.e., members commenting on information on educational conditions could also comment on economic and social conditions and international collaboration, including technical assistance for Non-Self-Governing Territories. The views of the Committee on Information on those items were to be found in part two and in sections VI, VII, VIII and XI of part one of its report.

4. In accordance with the practice followed in previous years, sub-item (d) should be discussed separately. In that connexion members might wish to consider part one, section X, of the report of the Committee on Information and paragraphs 31 to 59 of the 1958 report of the Fourth Committee.[1] He would also draw attention to documents A/C.4/405 and A/C.4/406, which reproduced communications from the Governments of Guinea and Spain in response to the Secretary-General's letter. Documents A/4096 and Add.1 related to the cessation of information by the Government of France and documents A/4115 and A/4226 to the cessation of information from the Government of the United States of America.

5. He would suggest that members might wish to exhaust sub-items (e) and (f) in their general statements and thus save time by refraining from taking up those sub-items separately.

1/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirteenth Session, annexes, agenda item 36, document A/4068.

6. If there were no objections the debate would proceed on the lines he had suggested.

7. He appealed to members to submit any draft resolutions they might wish to introduce on any of the six sub-items at the earliest possible date, so that they could be referred to during the debate.

8. He hoped that the proposed organization of work would help to expedite the Committee's proceedings. Following the practice of previous years, he would call on members who desired to make declarations relating to any of the sub-items to do so immediately after the Chairman and Rapporteur of the Committee on Information and the Chairman of its Sub-Committee on educational conditions had introduced the Committee's report.

9. Mr. KELLY (Australia), Chairman of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, submitted that Committee's report on its tenth session (A/4111).

10. In compliance with operative paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 1332 (XIII) and in accordance with its three-year cycle of work, the Committee on Information had devoted its tenth session primarily to the consideration of educational conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Educational conditions in those Territories were not dissimilar from educational conditions in many independent Member States: the same technical problems were posed, the same urgencies existed, the same issues arose.

11. During the tenth session philosophical issues had been mentioned and as Chairman he had felt it his duty not to impede or discourage such discussion. On the other hand he had felt it equally his duty to express the opinion that, having regard to the ideologically pluralistic character of the world community, it was beyond the competence of the United Nations, UNESCO or the Committee to formulate value judgements with respect to the association of significant ideologies with education. The present age was happier than most, for the responsible adherents of significant contemporary ideologies had been able to subscribe to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, notwithstanding the fact that the Declaration was in some respects inadequate or insufficiently explicit and that, in accepting it, many schools of thought proceeded from different philosophical premises.

12. The Committee had discussed in some detail the principles of a possible examination of the voluminous progress report and the views which had emerged from the discussion were set out in part one, section IX, of the Committee's report.

13. In its examination of educational conditions and of conditions in the other functional fields, the Committee had had before it a mass of information submitted to the Secretary-General or to the Committee, particularly by several of the Administering Members. Educational experts had been attached to the delegations of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States of America and had rendered invaluable help.

14. Since the Committee had also surveyed developments in the fields of vocational and technical training, agricultural education, extension services and the training of medical and health personnel, it had had the benefit of the active and continuous participation not only of UNESCO but of the ILO, WHO and FAO.

15. The Committee had commented briefly on the need for technical assistance in the Non-Self-Governing Territories and had had additional information concerning the receipt by the Territories of such assistance from the Administering Powers or on the basis of multilateral or bilateral agreements or from international organizations. Another matter which had aroused interest was that of international collaboration. There had been some discussion of the ways in which the regional commissions of the Economic and Social Council, inter-governmental bodies operating in the areas concerned and the specialized agencies had made or might make contributions to progress in the Territories.

16. Mr. RASGOTRA (India), Rapporteur of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, said that since the Chairman of the Committee on Information had already presented the Committee's report and made observations on the substantive aspects of the problems it dealt with, he would confine himself to a few remarks on the general pattern and structure of the report. He had had the benefit of consultation with various members of the Committee so that the report should achieve the maximum of objectivity and accuracy. The report had been approved by the Committee on Information without opposition and with only one abstention.

17. Brief though the report was, it was accompanied by a considerable documentation, which was listed in annex I to part one. The summary records of the Committee's discussions should also be regarded as integral parts of the report.

18. Part one was mainly procedural in character, though sections VII, VIII and XI contained views expressed by members on social conditions, economic conditions and international collaboration respectively. Section VI contained some general references to educational conditions, which were reviewed in detail in part two of the report. Sections I to IV gave an account of the constitution of the Committee, the election of its officers, the consideration of its agenda and the appointment of the Sub-Committee responsible for the preparation of the report on educational conditions. Section V gave a summary of reservations made by members concerning sovereignty over various Territories and commented on the absence of one of the members of the Committee.

19. Section IX reflected the Committee's views on the method of examination of the progress report. While the Committee had felt that the report should be examined in accordance with the desire of the General Assembly, the consensus of opinion had been that the Committee on Information itself would be a sufficiently competent body to undertake the examination of the report on behalf of the General Assembly. Some 2,500 pages of summaries of information transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter which formed part of the progress report had already been examined by the Committee, as stated in section IXB. The question of the method of examination was of course for the General Assembly to decide.

20. A number of maps prepared by the Secretariat had been circulated to the Committee on Information, which had unanimously felt that they were of the

greatest use. He would suggest that, if possible, copies should be distributed to the members of the Fourth Committee.

21. In section X reference was made to the transmission of political and constitutional information by some of the administering Powers. The information available in that field had been discussed by the Committee, but information had not been received from several of the administering Powers and that would be a matter for the Fourth Committee to consider. There were also some preliminary observations concerning the lack of information from the Governments of Portugal and Spain, a subject on which he would refrain from commenting at the present stage, the communication by the Government of France on the cessation of information on most of its Territories, the lack of information on developments connected with the European Economic Community and some other points.

22. Section XII summarized the Committee's discussions on its future programme of work. It had decided that at its 1960 session it would undertake an exhaustive examination of economic conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

23. As the Chairman had indicated, the Committee had benefited from the active participation of a number of the specialized agencies and by the presence of experts attached to the delegations of some of the administering Powers. There had, however, been one lack: the General Assembly in previous years had adopted various resolutions requesting the administering Powers to associate indigenous inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the work of the Committee on Information, and that had not been done. He hoped that at future sessions local experts would take part in the Committee's work.

24. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon), Chairman of the Sub-Committee on educational conditions, presented the Sub-Committee's report (A/4111, part two), which had been approved by the Committee on Information without amendment.

25. The Sub-Committee had had the benefit of experts who, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 745 (VIII), had been attached to various delegations as advisers. He expressed special appreciation of the assistance rendered in that respect by the delegations of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States. He also expressed appreciation of the assistance rendered by the representatives of FAO, the ILO, WHO and UNESCO, who had actively participated in the Sub-Committee's discussions.

26. The report on educational conditions adequately reflected the harmonious atmosphere in which the discussions had been held and the way in which conflicting opinions had been resolved. The fact that the Sub-Committee had been able unanimously to approve the report, which had subsequently been adopted by the full Committee without amendment, was a tribute to the spirit in which the Sub-Committee had worked.

27. The draft resolution in annex II to part one of the Committee's report included a new element which made it somewhat different from similar resolutions adopted in previous years. Operative paragraph 2 invited the Secretary-General to communicate the 1959 report on educational conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories to various bodies, among which were included the regional economic commissions. The work programme of the Economic Commission for Africa in particular indicated that such a report could be of considerable assistance to it.

28. He trusted the Fourth Committee would be able to approve the report and that first there would be a thorough discussion of the various aspects of educational conditions treated in the report. In that connexion he would observe that any comment or criticism of the report would have to be related to the documentation forming an integral part of it. He drew attention to the annex to part two, which gave a list of studies of educational conditions submitted by the Secretariat and the specialized agencies, all of which had been examined thoroughly by the Sub-Committee and by the Committee on Information.

29. The views expressed by members of the Sub-Committee as recorded in the report maintained continuity with the views on the same subject expressed in earlier years. In some cases members had reiterated the conclusions reached in the past by means of direct references to the similar reports resulting from the 1956, the 1953 and even the 1950 sessions, while on the other hand it had been felt that with changing times certain views could be modified. The report of the Sub-Committee for 1959 was a self-contained document, as had been the previous studies on educational conditions. In discussing the diverse aspects of educational conditions in the Non-Self-Governing Territories the Sub-Committee and the Committee on Information had surveyed point by point the major phases of development which constituted the essential factors of progress in education. The report emphasized the passion for education existing in most Territories as the most vital source of inspiration for those who organized and administered education. The Committee had linked that sentiment with the role of the inhabitants in the formulation of educational policies for their Territories, had expressed concern for equality in education, adult education and the eradication of illiteracy, had stressed the value of free compulsory education and had dealt with primary, secondary and higher education. It had also emphasized the need for vocational training, agricultural training, the training of medical and health personnel, the education of women and the role women could play in promoting education. Its views on the subject of race relations in education were set forth in paragraphs 35-38. The matter of international collaboration in respect of education in Non-Self-Governing Territories was touched upon in part one, section XI, and the Sub-Committee had felt that there was no need to go into it again in part two.

30. Mr. KUNST (Secretary of the Committee) informed the Committee that individual maps of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, which were to be included in the summaries of information when the latter appeared in print, were available. For the present, however, there were no texts in languages other than English.

31. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) observed that the information transmitted by the United Kingdom Government (A/4089/Add.5) referred, inter alia, to the Islas Malvinas (Falkland Islands). The transmission of such information in no way affected Argentine sovereignty over that Territory, which the United Kingdom

held by virtue of an act of force never recognized by his Government. He reaffirmed his Government's inalienable rights over the Islas Malvinas, which, together with the South Sandwich Islands, the South Georgia Islands and the land included in the Antarctic sector of the Argentine Republic, was not a colony or possession of any country but formed an integral part of the national territory of Argentina, was part of its domain and was subject to its sovereignty.

32. Mr. AGUERO (Chile) said that his Government reserved its right over its Antarctic territory, information concerning which had been submitted by the United Kingdom Government in connexion with the so-called Falkland Islands Dependencies. That territory, which had rightfully belonged to Chile since the days of Spanish rule, was now an integral part of Chile's Magallanes Province and Chile maintained five permanent bases there where its authorities exercised their functions in the same way as in any other part of the Republic.

33. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that his Government had no doubts concerning its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and the Falkland Islands Dependencies and formally reserved its rights in the matter.

34. Mr. CHAMANDI (Yemen) said that the United Kingdom had once again included in its summaries of information from Non-Self-Governing Territories information on the territory which it called the Aden Colony and surrounding Protectorate (A/4089/Add.4) but which his own Government called the occupied territory of Yemen. As that territory had always been and continued to be an integral part of the Kingdom of Yemen he wished to protest against the illegal inclusion in the summaries of information relating to it. His protest was based on several considerations, the most important of which was the fact that the United Kingdom had alienated that part of Yemen many years earlier by force of arms, imposing dubious treaties and agreements on local sultans and chiefs who had been for the most part illiterate. Those treaties and agreements had never been and never would be recognized by the Government of Yemen. The territory in question was still occupied by British troops despite the repeated protests of the Yemeni Government and its many attempts to reach a satisfactory agreement with the United Kingdom authorities. The United Kingdom representative would presumably state that his Government had no doubts concerning its sovereignty over the territory; yet he knew perfectly well that no sovereignty was valid without the consent of the people over whom it was exercised. The people of Yemen did not accept the authority of any foreign Power and the United Kingdom's claim to sovereignty over the territory was therefore invalid.

35. Mr. ALWAN (Iraq) associated his delegation with the Yemeni representative's protest against the inclusion of the territory in question in the category of Non-Self-Governing Territories. In the view of his delegation that territory was an integral part of the Kingdom of Yemen and its occupation by foreign troops was therefore illegal.

36. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom had no doubts about its sovereignty over the Aden Colony and Protectorate and formally reserved its rights in the matter. There was no foundation to Yemen's claim to sovereignty over the States of the Protectorate. They were under the protection of the United Kingdom Government, which was responsible for the conduct of their external relations, and the representative of Yemen had no claim to act on their behalf. The United Kingdom Government had no intention of abandoning the obligations which it had contracted towards the sultans and other rulers of its territories.

37. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) reserved his Government's position with regard to the transmission of information concerning Gibraltar (A/4089/Add.2). The situation of that territory as the last part of Europe still under colonial rule was not in keeping with the spirit of the time and could no longer be justified even on strategic grounds. Spain was confident, however, that in the natural course of events a satisfactory solution could be negotiated in a spirit of cordiality and harmony.

38. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that his Government had no doubts regarding its sovereignty over the Territory of Gibraltar, and formally reserved its rights on this question.

39. Mr. LUNA HERRERA (Guatemala) said that his delegation wished once again to reserve Guatemala's rights over the territory of Belize, which was improperly known as British Honduras. Guatemala categorically rejected the claims of the United Kingdom or any other State to that territory. His delegation's presence during the debate was to be interpreted as an indication not that Guatemala had abandoned its position but that it wished to take the opportunity to reiterate its claim to the territory. The occupation of Belize by the United Kingdom, which had no legal justification, impaired the territorial integrity of Guatemala and was contrary to the way of thinking of the countries of America, which rejected colonialism in every form.

40. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) said that he wished to reiterate the statement made by his delegation at earlier sessions of the General Assembly that if the status of the territory was altered it would be necessary to take into account Mexico's claim to a part of it.

41. Mr. LUNA HERRERA (Guatemala) said that notwithstanding the centuries-old bonds of friendship between the two countries, Guatemala, whose claim to the territory in question dated back for approximately 100 years, did not recognize the claim asserted by Mexico.

42. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) reaffirmed his country's friendship for Guatemala. As his Government's position on the matter had been set forth by the Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs at the 807th plenary meeting he would not go into detail but would merely reiterate that in the event of a change in the status of the Territory Mexico's claim would have to be taken into consideration.

43. Sir Andrew COHEN (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom had no doubts regarding its sovereignty over British Honduras and formally reserved its rights on that question.

44. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) said that he supported the statement made by the representative of Yemen.

45. He recalled that at the previous session in the Fourth Committee (819th meeting he had contested

France's claim to Mauritania, which was an integral part of Morocco's national territory. France's action in making Mauritania a part of the French Community, on which it based its assertion that the territory was now self-governing, had obviously been designed to keep it under France's colonial rule. As that arrangement did not reflect the will of the people he would reiterate the reservations he had put forward at the previous session, which were based on historical, ethnic and geographical considerations.

46. He also recalled the reservations he had expressed at that time concerning the Spanish Government's letter to the Secretary-General with regard to Ifni and Saguia-el-Hamra, which his Government considered to be integral parts of the Kingdom of Morocco. It was to be hoped that the problem could be settled in the context of the traditional friendship linking Spain and Morocco, as had been the case when Spain had recently relinquished its claim to Tarfaia.

47. Mr. KOSCZIUSKO-MORIZET (France) observed that his Government was, in effect, being criticized for failing to include information on Mauritania in its summaries of information from Non-Self-Governing Territories submitted to the present session, whereas it had been criticized a year earlier because it had included such information. The Moroccan representative's claims were unfounded, for as a result of the referendum of 28 September 1958, which had enabled the inhabitants freely to express their wishes, Mauritania possessed an Assembly, elected by universal suffrage and a democratic government.

48. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) said that it was a well-known fact that the elections in Mauritania had not been either free or democratic, nor had they been based on universal suffrage as that term was understood in democratic countries. Even the name "Mauritania" had been introduced by the French at a relatively recent date as a means of strengthening their claim to what was actually a part of the Kingdom of Morocco.

49. Mr. AZNAR (Spain) thanked the representative of Morocco for his courteous remarks about the relations between his country and Spain. He was confident that in the case of the territories to which the Moroccan representative had referred a satisfactory solution could be worked out by friendly negotiations between the two Governments.

50. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) wished to emphasize that his Government had always maintained that information on Non-Self-Governing Territories, including Territories such as Spanish Guinea and Fernando Po, should be submitted by the Administering Powers; in the present instance, however, the submission of such information would not be in order because the territory in question was an integral part of the territory of a Member State. He wished only to add that it was not possible to distinguish between one form of colonialism and another since all forms were objectionable, whether they existed in Europe, Africa or any other part of the world.

51. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) said that he was surprised at the absence of any information concerning Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea and would like to ask the Portuguese representative if he considered those territories to be colonies in the full sense of the word or integral parts of Portugal's national territory.

52. Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal) replied that no part of Portugal's territory was the subject of the report now before the Committee. The statement by the representative of Guinea was therefore irrelevant.

53. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) said that he had not been talking about metropolitan Portugal. His delegation fully approved of the statements of other delegations concerning the occupation by foreign Powers of parts of their national territory. Hence the question was simply whether such a territory as Portuguese Guinea was to be considered an integral part of the territory of Portugal.

54. Mr. VENKATARAMAN (India) associated himself with the remarks of the Guinean representative. He drew attention in that connexion to paragraph 72 of part one of the report, which indicated that the Guinean intervention was not irrelevant.

55. Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal) observed that the paragraph in question referred only to the views of the delegations of Ceylon, Ghana and India and not to the views of the Committee on Information as a whole. He therefore reiterated his contention that the Guinean representative's statement was out of order. As for the question posed by the representative of Guinea, he stressed that it was left to the discretion of delegations whether they should reply or not, and he did not feel he had anything to add to his previous statement.

56. Mr. CHAMANDI (Yemen) associated his delegation with the statement made by the Moroccan representative concerning Mauritania and Ifni.

57. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia) said that he wished to reiterate the strong protest of the Government and people of Indonesia against the assumption by the Netherlands Government of sovereignty over West Irian (Netherlands West Indies).

58. West Irian was not a Non-Self-Governing Territory and was therefore not covered by Article 73 e of the Charter. It had been a residency, i.e., part of a province, of the former colony of the Netherlands East Indies and by the Netherlands Act of 29 April 1948 it had become a residency of Indonesia, which had been recognized as an independent State by the Netherlands Government on 27 December 1949. It had been clearly stated in the Netherlands Act of 29 April 1948 that Indonesia was the new name for the former territory of the Netherlands East Indies; West Irian was therefore part of a province of Indonesia. If the inhabitants were debarred from enjoying the same rights as those living in the other provinces of Indonesia, it was due to the occupation of West Irian by Netherlands forces, against which his Government and people protested.

59. By its recognition of Indonesia as an independent Republic, the Netherlands had ceased to have any obligations under Article 73 e in respect of the entire territory of Indonesia and had indeed ceased to submit such information. There was therefore no reason why the Netherlands Government should recommence submitting reports on part of a country which it had recognized in 1949 as being an independent Republic. Such action might be interpreted as meaning that the Netherlands had acquired new territory by conquest and that, by providing information concerning West Irian, it was asking the United Nations to recognize that conquest.

60. 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 Governments of Indonesia and the Netherlands. By continuing its occupation the Netherlands had taken unilateral and illegal action, against which his Government protested in the strongest possible terms. A peaceful solution had been rendered impossible by the fact that the Netherlands refused to negotiate.

61. His Government had always expressed its disapproval of administrative unions. The administrative agreement between Australia and the Netherlands about New Guinea was all the more unacceptable to his Government in that there was no legal basis for it; such an agreement would cover the administration of part of the territory of an independent State. There was no basis for the presence of the Netherlands Government in West Irian, much less for the conclusion of an agreement with Australia on its administration. At the time of the conclusion of that agreement his Government had protested in the strongest terms to both Governments concerned and it wished its protest once more to be recorded.

62. It had come to the notice of the Government and people of Indonesia that in United Nations documents West New Guinea was referred to as "Netherlands New Guinea". For the reasons which he had already given, that title was wholly unacceptable and aroused feelings of bitterness and dissatisfaction, not only in Indonesia but among other nations sympathetic to its cause. The use of that title in United Nations documents gave the impression that biased opinions on the issue were held in the United Nations. The only title acceptable to both parties was "West Irian (West New Guinea)". So long as the dispute between the Governments of Indonesia and the Netherlands on the political status of the Territory remained unsolved, it was, in his delegation's view, undesirable to make any changes in the accepted denomination; 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.

63. 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 of isolation pursued by colonial Powers in such Territories and in order to provide some kind of check on their policies; it was not an end in itself. The production of that argument by the Netherlands only confirmed the belief that it was that country's intention to retain the people of West Irian indefinitely in their colonial grip. Those people, when fully reunited to the Republic of Indonesia, would be able to work and progress in freedom together with the other provinces of Indonesia in building up their country.

64. Mr. EL HAMID (United Arab Republic) said that his Government wished to reiterate its support for the Indonesian position with regard to sovereignty over West Irian; that position had also been supported by the African-Asian nations at the Asian-African Conference held at Bandung in April 1955.

65. He also wished to repeat the reservations which he had made at the 819th meeting of the Fourth Committee regarding Aden and Mauritania.

66. Mr. ALWAN (Iraq) expressed his delegation's full support for the Moroccan position with regard to Mauritania. His delegation also acknowledged the sovereignty of Indonesia over West Irian, which it considered to be illegally occupied by the Netherlands.

67. Mr. KORTEWEG (Netherlands) said that the Netherlands regarded its sovereignty over Netherlands New Guinea as beyond question. The Netherlands administered it in accordance with its obligations under Chapter XI of the Charter and presented annual reports on it under Article 73 e of the Charter. His delegation reserved the right to revert to the matter if it deemed it necessary to do so.

68. Mr. STÁCIL (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation considered it necessary to reiterate its view that West Irian was illegally included among the Non-Self-Governing Territories and that reports on it should not be submitted by the Netherlands. His delegation also considered it irregular that there should be co-operation between the Netherlands and Australia for the joint administration of West Irian, which was an integral part of Indonesia. When his delegation came to speak on the subject of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, it would not have West Irian in mind and would not deal with other Territories illegally occupied by the colonial Powers.

69. Mr. VENKATARMAN (India) said that his delegation fully supported the Indonesian position on West Irian and regarded West Irian as an integral part of Indonesia.

70. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia), referring to West Irian, said that at the twelfth session his delegation had tried in the First Committee to bring about a settlement of the problem by negotiation. His delegation supported the legal position of Indonesia, which it considered should be fully maintained.

71. Mr. QUAISON-SACKEY (Ghana) said that he wished it to be recorded that his delegation did not regard the Portuguese Territories in Africa as being part of Portugal; they were colonies, concerning which his delegation would ask for information. He supported the request of the Indonesian representative that the name Netherlands New Guinea should be changed to West Irian in accordance with its geographical situation.

72. U TIN MAUNG (Burma) said that his delegation had no doubt about the sovereignty of Indonesia over West Irian and fully supported the Indonesian position.

73. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Ceylon) associated his delegation and Government with the position of Indonesia with regard to West Irian.

74. Mr. KELLY (Australia) said that the Australian Government and people desired to live in close harmony with their neighbour Indonesia and with all the Melanesian peoples of New Guinea. His Government faithfully respected the provisions of Chapters XI and XII of the Charter.

75. Australia had no doubt whatsoever regarding the sovereignty of the Netherlands over Netherlands New Guinea. He wished to emphasize the fact that no administrative union existed between Netherlands New Guinea, on the one hand, and Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea on the other. Measures of administrative co-operation fully in accord with Chapter XI of the Charter were in existence between the three Territories.

76. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) associated her delegation with the views expressed by the representative of Ghana about what was commonly known as Portuguese Africa. Africans did not consider those Territories to be an integral part of Portugal. She also associated her delegation with the Indonesian position with regard to West Irian.

77. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) said that his delegation supported the Indonesian position with regard to West Irian. It supported the Moroccan position, too, especially with respect to Mauritania, which was indirectly occupied by France. It also associated itself unreservedly with the statements made by the representatives of Ghana and Liberia; it considered any statement made by any African or Asian State to be well founded.

78. Mr. MEYET (Libya) associated his delegation with the reservations made by the representative of Morocco with regard to Mauritania and Ifni, and with the Indonesian position with regard to West Irian.

79. Mr. SIDI BABA (Morocco) said that his delegation fully supported the Indonesian representative's point of view on that nation's rights in West Irian.

80. Mr. THAPA (Nepal) said that, since his delegation was entirely opposed to colonialism in any form, it associated itself with the views expressed by the representatives of Indonesia and Ghana.

81. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia) expressed the thanks of his delegation and Government to those representatives who had supported his country's position. He wished to emphasize the fact that the arguments advanced by the representative of Australia in support of administrative co-operation between Australia and the Netherlands were devoid of any legal basis; such an arrangement violated the Charter. Nevertheless, he shared the views of the Australian representative about the friendly relations between their two countries and hoped that they would not be disturbed by that one point of disagreement.

82. Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal) strongly repudiated the implications of the statements made by the representatives of Ghana and Liberia, which his delegation considered to be out of order and with which it dissociated itself entirely.

83. Mr. CARPIO (Philippines) expressed his delegation's grave concern at the existence of so many points of difference between Member States. One of the chief purposes of the United Nations was to provide a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of the common ends of the Charter. Failure to settle those vital problems could have far-reaching consequences. He therefore hoped that all the States concerned would employ wisdom and statemanship in finding an early solution to them with a view to maintaining international peace and harmony.

84. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with the procedure followed at the thirteenth session, a brief reference to the reservations made regarding sovereignty over individual Territories would be included in the summary record and in the Committee's report.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

Litho in U.N. 77401—June 1960—2,550