



C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 32:	
Consideration of communications relating to the cessation of the transmission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (<i>continued</i>)	
(a) Communication from the Government of the Netherlands concerning the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam (<i>continued</i>)	295

Chairman: Mr. Luciano JOUBLANC RIVAS
 (Mexico).

AGENDA ITEM 32

Consideration of communications relating to the cessation of the transmission of information under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*):

(a) Communication from the Government of the Netherlands concerning the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam (A/2908/Add.1, A/AC.35/L.206, A/C.4/L.421, A/C.4/L.422) (*continued*)

1. Mr. FERRIER (Netherlands) recalled that, at the previous meeting, the Thai and Venezuelan representatives has asked for information on the functions of the Governor in Surinam and in the Netherlands Antilles. Those functions were defined in article 2 of the Charter for the Kingdom of the Netherlands, according to which the Governor represented both the sovereign and the Government of the Kingdom. The Governor's powers were prescribed by Kingdom legislation specifically in order to prevent him from infringing the domestic jurisdiction of the countries members of the Kingdom. As the sovereign's representative, the Governor acted in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Constitution of the country concerned. In such capacity he acted only on the sovereign's behalf whenever the sovereign was not in the country. As head of the Government of the country, the Governor was bound by the decisions of the Cabinet, which in turn was responsible to the Parliament.

2. In reply to the Burmese representative, he explained that the Charter for the Kingdom was the outcome of a long process of development. It had been discussed in the Parliament and at meetings of the political parties. As the people had been able to follow those discussions through the Press, there had been no point in consulting them directly.

3. In reply to the question asked at the previous meeting concerning the Ministers Plenipotentiary, he

stated that they were appointed by the Cabinet and were thus responsible to the Parliament.

4. With regard to the right of secession, he repeated that his country had never intended to sever its ties with the Netherlands. As the Queen had said, a union like that of the Kingdom of the Netherlands could only function if it was accepted by a majority of the citizens. As the peoples concerned had accepted the Charter for the Kingdom, the question of secession had never arisen. It would, however, be possible to amend the Charter for the Kingdom in such a way that a secession might result.

5. Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) noted that under article 10, paragraph 1, of the Charter for the Kingdom, the Minister Plenipotentiary participated in the deliberations of the Council of Ministers whenever Kingdom affairs were discussed which affected the country in question. He asked for further details on that point.

6. With regard to the application for exemption referred to in article 12 of the Charter for the Kingdom, he envisaged a case in which Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles might jointly appeal against a measure affecting them. He wished to know whether in that event the two countries would each have two representatives, i.e., four representatives in all, and the Netherlands only three representatives for the deliberations described in that article.

7. Article 26 provided that the Government of the Kingdom should co-operate in concluding an agreement unless that would be inconsistent with the partnership of the country of the Kingdom. He wished to know whose function it was to decide whether there was any inconsistency with the partnership. That question also applied to the reservation contained in article 29, paragraph 2.

8. Mr. JONCKHEER (Netherlands) explained that article 10 was supplemented by article 11, in particular paragraph 6 thereof, under which the Governments of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles were always entirely at liberty to indicate Kingdom affairs which affected their respective countries.

9. The application for exemption referred to in article 12 concerned a procedure known as "internal appeal", under which two Netherlands Ministers and two Ministers of the overseas countries conferred under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister. In the case envisaged by the Venezuelan delegation, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles would each have one Minister. If they each had two votes, they would be able to impose their decisions on the Netherlands, and that would clearly be unjust. He explained that the Prime Minister had a casting vote and, by his very position, was able to judge a case impartially.

10. Turning to article 26, he pointed out that that article complemented article 25. Article 25 gave Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles the option of not being bound by an international agreement, while ar-

article 26 empowered them to ask the Government of the Kingdom to conclude such an agreement applying exclusively to one country in the partnership. If the Government of the Kingdom considered the conclusion of such an agreement inconsistent with the partnership, the deliberation procedure provided for in article 12 could be applied. That explanation also applied to the reservation contained in article 29.

11. At the previous meeting, the Iraqi representative had asked for information on article 44. That article was designed to safeguard fundamental rights and freedoms, the powers of the Governor, the powers of the representative bodies of the countries and the administration of justice. Such matters were submitted to the Government of the Kingdom because of their importance.

12. The Iraqi representative had also asked for details concerning the further consultations referred to in article 18. If a proposal for a statute had failed to obtain a sufficient majority in the Second Chamber and further consultations had been held on it, the appeal procedure provided for in article 12 could, where appropriate, be applied.

13. In reply to the question put by the Philippine representative at the previous meeting, he explained that the preponderantly large population of the Netherlands in relation to that of Surinam and the Antilles in no way prevented the three countries from being on a basis of equality. They had chosen a system which guaranteed them equal rights. They were completely free in internal matters and co-operated on matters of common concern. There was nothing extraordinary in that; federal States, as well as international organizations, were in a similar position. Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles had not chosen complete self-government because they had felt that it was not in their best interests to do so.

14. The Peruvian representative had asked whether the members of the Kingdom had not considered the establishment of an organ on which each of them would have an equal number of seats. The question of representation was a delicate one, and the partners had chosen a solution acceptable to all of them. If the Peruvian representative's idea had been put into practice, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles would have been in a position to impose their will on the Netherlands, and that would clearly have been unacceptable.

15. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) asked for further information on article 44. He wished to know why the allocation of the seats of the representative body of the Netherlands Antilles to the various island areas was submitted to the Government of the Kingdom.

16. Mr. JONCKHEER (Netherlands) replied that it had been necessary to determine the allocation of the seats so that the number of seats could not be altered without the approval of the Government of the Kingdom. That Government thus exercised supervision over the allocation of seats in the different countries. The provision was simply a safeguard.

17. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) still felt that the allocation of seats was within the domestic jurisdiction of the countries.

18. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) asked how the inhabitants of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles had been consulted about their new status.

19. Mr. FERRIER (Netherlands) said his country's Parliament had adopted the Charter for the Kingdom unanimously. Furthermore, the Charter had not been an issue in the 1955 elections. Lastly, the Government had explained to the new Parliament in its programme that it would respect the letter and spirit of the Charter for the Kingdom, and that statement had not been challenged. It was clear, therefore, that the people had accepted the Charter.

20. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) doubted whether that consultation had been as democratic as she would have liked. She reserved the right to ask further questions later on in the discussion.

21. In reply to a question from Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia), Mr. FERRIER (Netherlands), said that article 3, paragraph 1 (g), had been included in the Charter for the Kingdom at the request of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles for primarily economic reasons. It had been designed to prevent Netherlands citizens, who were in a better economic position, from entering Surinam or the Netherlands Antilles without restriction.

22. Mr. JONCKHEER (Netherlands) added that the provision was designed to avoid all discrimination between the populations of the different parts of the Kingdom. The Kingdom not only made the regulations required but also had the right to supervise their application to ensure that no part of the Kingdom would discriminate against the citizens of another part who wished to establish themselves in its territory.

23. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) felt that between equal parts of one and the same Kingdom there should be no discrimination. The provision probably had a protective character, but in his view it might have the opposite effect.

24. Article 2 of the Charter for the Kingdom appeared to assign a twofold role to the Governor. If the Governor's powers had been determined before the Charter came into force, as they normally should have been, Mr. Bozovic would be glad to know what those powers were.

25. Mr. JONCKHEER (Netherlands) replied that the powers, duties and responsibilities of the Governor of the Netherlands Antilles had been fixed before the drafting of the Charter for the Kingdom, but only in the Constitution of the Antilles. All the articles dealing with the Governor's responsibilities and duties had been taken from the Constitution of the Netherlands Antilles and had been included in the Charter for the Kingdom. Under article 59 of that Charter, they now had the character of an ordinance of the Kingdom.

26. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) pointed out that the Charter for the Kingdom made no mention of the Governor's powers in his capacity as the sovereign's representative, but only of his powers, duties and responsibilities as head of the Government of Surinam or the Netherlands Antilles. Mr. Bozovic would like to have details on the former role.

27. He would also like to know whether the organizations mentioned in article 28 of the Charter for the Kingdom comprised the United Nations.

28. Mr. JONCKHEER (Netherlands) replied that under the article in question Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles could join any international organization whose statutes permitted it.

29. Mr. CALLE Y CALLE (Peru) asked whether or not article 49 of the Netherlands Antilles Constitution of 1950, which dealt with the Governor's powers, had been amended. Under that article the Governor was, in particular, empowered to suspend the promulgation or application of statutes within his jurisdiction, if he had important reasons for doing so.

30. He also asked for information on how the organs of the judiciary of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles were appointed, and whether such appointments were made on the recommendation of the Council of State, the Council of Ministers of the country or the parliament of the country.

31. In some States the supreme judicial organ was responsible for examining the constitutionality of statutes. Was that the case in the Kingdom of the Netherlands? Was the constitutionality of statutes examined with reference to the Charter for the Kingdom or to the Constitution of the relevant part of the Kingdom?

32. Mr. JONCKHEER (Netherlands) replied that the Government of the country concerned proposed the names of the members of judicial organs and that appointments were made by the Government of the Kingdom, in which Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles were represented. The organization of the judiciary was determined by the laws of the country itself.

33. With respect to the power to decide on the constitutionality of statutes, the judiciary had no such authority whether in Surinam, the Netherlands Antilles or in the Netherlands.

34. Mr. SERAPHIN (Haiti) referred to the statement made by Mr. Irausquin, President of the Parliament of the Netherlands Antilles, at the 520th meeting, in which he had said that if some day the country's interests should call for a change in the existing status, it would assuredly have no difficulty in realizing its aspirations. That observation, he thought, implied that with time the people of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles might desire a change in the existing status. He asked whether in that case there was a legislative provision permitting such a change.

35. At the previous meeting, Mr. Ferrier had said that in such event article 55 of the Charter for the Kingdom could be invoked. Paragraph 1 of article 55 provided that the Charter for the Kingdom could be amended by a statute of the Kingdom, and paragraph 3 contemplated the inconsistency of a proposed amendment of the Charter for the Kingdom with the Constitution. According, however, to article 5, paragraph 2, the Constitution respected the provisions of the Charter, and that would therefore include the provisions of article 55.

36. It was easy to lose one's way in the tangle of those rather contradictory provisions. He asked whether either the Constitution or the laws provided any criteria for determining to what extent a proposed amendment of the Charter for the Kingdom was or was not inconsistent with the provisions of the existing Constitution.

37. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands) replied that in the Constitution of the Netherlands there was no provision concerning a possible inconsistency between the Constitution and the Charter for the Kingdom.

38. An amendment to the Netherlands Constitution involved a long and difficult procedure according to which the amendment had to be examined several times, Parliament had to be dissolved, new elections had to be held, and the new Parliament had to approve the amendment again. The two other parts of the Kingdom had considered it undesirable to be required to undergo such a procedure in order to amend the Charter for the Kingdom. That was why article 55 had been included in that Charter. The intention was to make the amending of the Charter for the Kingdom easier than the amendment of the Netherlands Constitution.

39. The Charter for the Kingdom could not be amended without the prior consent of the Parliaments of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles.

40. Mr. SAAB (Lebanon) considered that article 50 was the most important of the whole Charter, which was a charter for a kingdom with a pluralist structure. In most such cases the constitutionality of statutes was decided by the supreme judicial organ. According, however, to article 50, the King, as the Head of the Kingdom, could suspend or annul legislative or administrative measures in Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles which were inconsistent with the Charter for the Kingdom, an international arrangement, etc., by virtue of a decree stating the reasons. The executive thus seemed to be all-powerful.

41. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands) explained that under the Netherlands legal system all judges had to apply the statutes, i.e., the decisions of the Parliament, whether or not those statutes were in conflict with the Constitution. If a statute was inconsistent with the Constitution, the remedy lay with the Parliament. That had always been a basic principle in the Netherlands and had been retained in the Charter for the Kingdom. It had been considered inadmissible for a court to have the right to set aside a statute, whether in the Netherlands, Surinam or the Netherlands Antilles.

42. When the pluralist kingdom had been established, a means had to be found for dealing with possible inconsistencies between the Charter for the Kingdom and local legislation. The decision arrived at had been that the right to pronounce on such cases should be vested not in the judiciary, but in the executive. That was why article 50 provided that the King as Head of the Kingdom, could suspend or annul such legislative measures.

43. Article 50 further provided that a recommendation for annulment should be made by the Council of Ministers, in which Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles were represented. If differences of opinion arose, article 12 applied.

44. Mr. SAAB (Lebanon) reserved the right to return to the question in the general discussion.

45. He asked whether consideration had been given to bringing Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, as American countries, into relationship with the Organization of American States.

46. Mr. JONCKHEER (Netherlands) repeated that the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam could join any regional organization if the statutes of the organization permitted it. He did not yet know whether such was the case with the Organization of American States. If so, there was no reason why the two countries should not become members. Any decision in the

matter rested, of course, with the Government of each country.

47. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) thought that the two basic elements of the question before the Committee were the competence of the General Assembly to determine whether a Non-Self-Governing Territory had or had not attained a full measure of self-government, and the cessation of the transmission of information under Article 73 e of the United Nations Charter.

48. As article 7 of the Charter for the Kingdom of the Netherlands did not specify the number of ministers to be appointed by the King, he feared that the Ministers Plenipotentiary of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles would always be under the domination of the Ministers of the Netherlands.

49. With regard to possible amendments to the Charter for the Kingdom, he wished to know who could propose such amendments.

50. He also asked who in Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles had drawn up the resolution accepting the Charter for the Kingdom, and he wished to have information on the electoral system in force in those territories.

51. With reference to the representation of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles in the Organization of American States, he pointed out that the American nations were linked mainly by ties of a legal character resulting from inter-American agreements. He wondered whether the authors of the Charter for the Kingdom had taken into account that the two countries in question were situated in the centre of America and that the aim of certain inter-American agreements was the defence of the continent in the common interest.

52. Mr. JONCKHEER (Netherlands) replied that all the inhabitants of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles took part in the election of members of Parliament. No distinction was made between any of the inhabitants. The only conditions were that they should be of Netherlands nationality and at least twenty-three years of age. The right to vote was exercised by 90 per cent of the electorate.

53. He explained that the Charter for the Kingdom had been prepared by representatives of the Netherlands Antilles, Surinam and the Netherlands over the past seven years. There had been a very lengthy discussion; differences of opinion had gradually disappeared and compromises had been reached. The representatives of Surinam and of the Netherlands Antilles had been elected on the basis of general franchise for men and women. They therefore represented the entire population of those two countries. He emphasized that all the representatives had agreed on the question of domestic autonomy of the various countries of the Kingdom and that the Charter had been accepted by all political parties in the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam.

54. The question of the number of members of the Council of Ministers appointed by the King was in no way a cause of concern for the representatives of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, since article 12 provided for an appeal procedure.

55. The Charter for the Kingdom did not place the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam under jurisdiction of the Netherlands. No country was superior to any other, but all three were of equal standing.

56. As to the fact that Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles were part of the American hemisphere, the Charter for the Kingdom clearly indicated that that had been borne in mind. As citizens of the Antilles, the inhabitants of the two countries were proud to call themselves American Netherlanders. It was because they were Americans that they had not agreed to their countries being provinces of the Kingdom of the Netherlands but had wished to be two independent countries managing their own affairs. Their countries were free countries within the framework of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

57. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) would have liked to know exactly who had the power to amend the Charter for the Kingdom. However, he already had enough information to take part in the general discussion and to submit his amendment (A/C.4/L.422) to the draft resolution proposed by Brazil and the United States (A/C.4/L.421), which merely set forth anew the principles followed by the Uruguayan delegation and the General Assembly when similar questions had arisen.

58. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala), referring to article 34 of the Charter for the Kingdom, pointed out that the question of internal security would seem to be among the matters of domestic concern in each country. In the case, however, of a disturbance of internal peace or order, a Kingdom statute provided that a state of siege must be proclaimed. He wished to know how it happened that affairs which came under the domestic jurisdiction of a country were dealt with in a Kingdom statute. He asked whether that statute had already been promulgated and, if not, whether it would be promulgated in accordance with the conditions laid down in articles 14 to 18 of the Charter for the Kingdom.

59. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands) pointed out that the defence of the Realm came under Kingdom affairs. The maintenance of external or internal security, the object of which was to defend the Realm, thus also came under Kingdom affairs. The same consequently applied to the right to proclaim a state of siege, a right that was naturally vested in the King. The provision also applied to the Netherlands proper.

60. Under normal conditions, internal security was, of course, a concern of each particular country and was assured by the local police. Exceptional circumstances were, however, conceivable in which the police would be unable to maintain order. In such event the Kingdom would be threatened and the King would therefore have to intervene.

61. The statute mentioned in article 34, paragraph 2, had not yet been promulgated but shortly would be in accordance with the provisions of articles 14 to 18.

62. Mr. ROLZ BENNETT (Guatemala), referring to article 14, paragraph 4, of the Charter for the Kingdom, wished to know whether naturalization was governed by a Kingdom statute in respect of persons resident in all parts of the Kingdom or in respect only of those resident in Surinam or the Netherlands Antilles.

63. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands) explained that the inhabitants of the three countries had Netherlands nationality and that naturalization in the three countries was a Kingdom affair.

64. Mr. CORTINA (Argentina) noted that Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles were situated in the American security area established by the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance concluded at Rio de Janeiro in 1947, and that both the preamble and the provisions of the Charter for the Kingdom of the Netherlands provided that the Netherlands, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles would accord each other reciprocal assistance. What would be the position if Surinam or the Netherlands Antilles had a dispute with any country on the American continent, as even in that case it might request extra-continental assistance? His delegation was concerned about that point and felt that it should be carefully considered.

65. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands) said that the Committee was discussing the legal relations which now existed between the three associated countries. As he was not a military expert, he was not in a position to answer the Argentine representative's question, which was concerned with the way in which the defence of the Kingdom would be assured in practice.

66. Mr. BENITES VINUEZA (Ecuador) said that there was no need to be a strategist to answer the Argentine representative's question. It was clear that Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles came within two systems of legal obligations, those imposed by the Charter for the Kingdom of the Netherlands and those arising from inter-American treaties. It was therefore essential to ascertain whether the obligations under the two legal systems were compatible.

67. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands) observed that the question did not arise as neither Surinam, the Netherlands Antilles nor the Netherlands itself at present belonged to the Organization of American States or was bound by the provisions of the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro.

68. Mr. BENITES VINUEZA (Ecuador) said that the function of the lawmaker, and of the United Nations in the case under discussion, should not be merely to be familiar with existing problems but also to foresee those which might arise in future. He recalled that in his statement at the 520th meeting, Mr. Jonckheer had said that if the relations freely accepted by the Netherlands Antilles developed in a manner not in conformity with the will of the people of the Antilles, they would not hesitate to apply to the United Nations again as they had done in 1948. He wondered by what means the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam would be able to make such an appeal if the United Nations decided that they ceased to come under Article 73 of the Charter and if they could not acquire the status of Member States. In that connexion, he recalled the statement made by the Mexican representative to the Fourth Committee at the eighth session (344th meeting). Mr. Espinosa y Prieto had then said it would be useless to apply a list of factors in order to decide whether or not a Territory had attained full self-government, and that it would be enough to find out if the Territory in question fulfilled the conditions necessary for membership in the United Nations.

69. Mr. JONCKHEER (Netherlands) reminded the Committee of the occasion in 1948 when the people of the Netherlands Antilles had appealed to the United Nations. The Netherlands Antilles had accepted the Charter for the Kingdom in the belief that it was the best way of determining its relations with the Netherlands and Surinam; the existence of the United Na-

tions was a guarantee that the Charter would not be merely a piece of paper. He was sure, however, that should the occasion arise, the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam would be able to appeal to the United Nations like any other country where human rights were threatened or where independence was in jeopardy.

70. Mr. ESPINOSA Y PRIETO (Mexico) explained that at the eighth session he had looked forward to the day when the representatives of the two Territories would represent their countries in the Fourth Committee either as Member States or as integral parts of the Netherlands, together with which they would constitute a single nation after having freely exercised their right to determine their own future. He was happy to note, now, from the statements of the representatives of the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam, that they were as sure and proud of the autonomy of their countries as he was of that of Mexico.

71. Mr. BENITES VINUEZA (Ecuador) pointed out that his earlier remarks quoting from a statement made in the Fourth Committee by Mr. Espinosa y Prieto at the eighth session in connexion with the item under discussion had not been intended to show any disagreement between the Mexican representative's views and his own. He had in fact quoted those views to support his own argument. To clarify the point, he read the summary of the speech made by the Mexican representative on the subject, as it appeared in the summary record of the 344th meeting of the Fourth Committee.

72. Miss ROESAD (Indonesia) wondered whether any inhabitants of the Netherlands Antilles or of Surinam had ever expressed a desire for those two countries to have their own citizenship, as would be entirely natural in Territories aspiring to independence.

73. Mr. FERRIER (Netherlands) said that no one had ever thought of a separate citizenship for the Netherlands Antilles and Surinam. Political parties had never mentioned it in their programmes. The question had never arisen. The two countries did not want independence: they wanted self-government in their domestic affairs.

74. Miss ROESAD (Indonesia) asked whether there had never been any open opposition to the Charter, either in the countries at large or on the part of political parties.

75. Mr. FERRIER (Netherlands) said that in Surinam there had never been any open opposition to the Charter. While individuals might have disapproved of the Charter, there had been no expression of disapproval.

76. Mr. JONCKHEER (Netherlands) said that in the Netherlands Antilles the Charter had been unanimously accepted. There had been no opposition whatsoever either in the legislature or among the political parties.

77. Mr. CALLE Y CALLE (Peru) asked whether the political rights of citizenship, namely, the right to vote and the right to be elected, were the same in the three countries. He wondered, for instance, whether a citizen of the Netherlands Antilles who came to the Netherlands could exercise the right to vote or could present himself as a candidate for election to the Netherlands Parliament.

78. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands) said that the only conditions to be fulfilled in order to vote or to

be elected were possession of Netherlands nationality, which of course the inhabitants of all three countries possessed, and residence in the country concerned for a stipulated period of time, the length of which was determined by each country.

79. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Committee had no more questions to put to the representatives of the Netherlands and he declared the general discussion open.

80. Mr. S. S. LIU (China) said that his delegation was entirely in agreement with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.421, Brazil and the United States. Having read the documents provided by the Netherlands and heard the statements of the representatives of the countries concerned and their replies to members of the Committee, his delegation was convinced that the new Charter, which the Parliaments of the

Netherlands Antilles and of Surinam had adopted unanimously, gave those two countries a full measure of self-government such as to render it unnecessary for the Netherlands to continue to transmit information under Article 73 e of the Charter.

81. He congratulated the Governments of the Netherlands Antilles and of Surinam on the progress achieved by their countries and the Government of the Netherlands on its success in settling a question of such importance both for the Netherlands and for the two other integral parts of the Kingdom. He would therefore vote for the joint draft resolution (A/C.4/L.421) as he had voted for a similar resolution in the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/2908/Add.1 para. 20), and he congratulated the two delegations which had submitted it.

The meeting rose at 2 p.m.