

of the arguments in favour of a change in the status of West New Guinea; also there did not seem to be any clear evidence of a desire by the inhabitants of West New Guinea to join Indonesia. In the Canadian view, the Netherlands Government should therefore continue to administer this territory with the purpose, which it had constantly avowed, of educating and assisting the inhabitants to the point where they could govern themselves and choose their own destiny. If, when that day came, the people of West New Guinea chose to affiliate themselves with Indonesia, the situation would be quite different. They might, on the other hand, prefer to remain a separate state or to join with the peoples, more closely related to them, in other parts of the island which they shared. But these were questions which the people of West New Guinea should decide for themselves when the time was ripe, not questions which should be decided for them by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Kashmir

The Kashmir dispute was brought before the Security Council this year for the first time since 1951. Despite the work of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan (UNCIP), and the efforts of various mediators from 1948 to 1953, India and Pakistan have not been able to reach agreement on the disposition of the state of Jammu and Kashmir in the years since a cease-fire was established between their forces by the United Nations in 1948.

On January 2, 1957 Pakistan submitted a letter¹ to the Security Council requesting early consideration of the Kashmir dispute. This letter referred to Dr. F. P. Graham's report of March 27, 1953 (Dr. Graham was the United Nations Representative appointed in 1951 to replace Sir Owen Dixon as mediator in the dispute), and to the UNCIP resolutions of August 13, 1948 and January 5, 1949 which called for: (a) a cease-fire; (b) the demilitarization of the state; (c) an impartial plebiscite conducted under the auspices of the United Nations. The document noted that India had refused "on one pretext or another" to honour the commitments it had accepted under the two UNCIP resolutions. Also mentioned in the document was Pakistan's concern about the constitution adopted by the so-called Constituent Assembly at Srinagar on October 29, 1956 which declared Kashmir "an integral part of the Indian Union" and which, according to Pakistan, contravened the Security Council resolution of March 30, 1951. (The relevant part of this resolution affirms: "that the convening of a Constituent Assembly recommended by the General Council of the all-Jammu and Kashmir Conference, and that any action that the Assembly might attempt to take to determine the future shape and affiliation of the entire state or any part thereof, would not constitute a disposition of the state in accordance with the above principle"—the principle is that referring to a plebiscite). The letter from the Government of Pakistan concluded by asking the Security Council to take "firm and timely action" and by calling for the implementation of the UNCIP resolutions².

On January 16 the Foreign Minister of Pakistan presented the case for Pakistan before the Security Council. He urged that Kashmir be

¹Document S/3767.

²See *Canada and the United Nations 1949*, p. 67.