



CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 98:

Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian): report of the Secretary-General regarding the act of self-determination in West Irian (concluded)

1

President: Miss Angie E. BROOKS (Liberia).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Boyd (Panama) took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 98

Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian): report of the Secretary-General regarding the act of self-determination in West Irian (concluded)

1. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait): My delegation has noted with satisfaction the report of the Secretary-General regarding the act of free choice in West Irian [A/7723 and Corr.1]. We were happy to learn that an act of free choice had taken place in that country, which is an integral part of Indonesia—an act in which the representatives of the population expressed their wish to remain with Indonesia as an integral part of it. It is a source of great gratification to learn that the answer given by the consultative assemblies to the question put to them was a positive one, a consensus reflecting their wish to remain an integral part of Indonesia.

2. That is why I find it useful to insist, on behalf of my delegation, that it would be in the interests of everyone here, and especially those who have dedicated themselves to the cause of the freedom of all those peoples who are still dominated by foreign countries, to realize that the question of self-determination is one thing and the question of territorial integrity and national unity is another. As far as the act of free choice in West Irian is concerned, it was only the normal conclusion to which the processes which were initiated in 1962 were bound to come, namely, to decide, in accordance with the wish of the people, to maintain the territorial integrity of Indonesia and the national unity of its people.

3. My Government has always supported the struggle of the friendly people of Indonesia for unity, freedom and independence. The struggle of national liberation movements is normally arduous and protracted. However, it is pleasant to note that in the present instance it has been possible to resolve the issue conclusively by peaceful means.

4. I should like to pay a tribute to the Government of the Netherlands for organizing the results of the act of free choice. I should also like to commend the efforts of the Secretary-General of the United Nations for promoting and bringing about a happy settlement of the conflict by peaceful means. I should not forget to pay a due tribute to the Government of Indonesia, which has co-operated and taken an active part in that achievement.

5. The question of West Irian is only the final phase of the struggle of the entire Indonesian nation. It can only be viewed as part of the question of the territorial integrity and national unity of the whole Indonesian nation. Indonesia has always extended its support to the struggle of all nations and of all peoples striving for their freedom and independence. If we rejoice today with our Indonesian brethren, it is because we believe in the unity of our cause and in the identity of our destiny, which are those of all peoples fighting for their independence and freedom, whether in South Africa, in Southern Rhodesia, in Palestine or in South West Africa.

6. Before I conclude, I should like to welcome the role of the United Nations in terminating the dispute, a role which considerably enhances the prestige of our Organization. We hope that that success will augur well for the future so that the process of decolonization may be completed by peaceful means under the auspices of the United Nations. We also hope that the act of free choice will herald an era of progress and prosperity for the people of Indonesia.

7. My delegation would like to lend its support to the draft resolution on the Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West Irian [A/L.574], and would like to wish the Government of Indonesia success in its efforts to promote the economic and social development of West Irian.

8. This last chapter in the national life of Indonesia has until now been crowned with success, thanks to the determination of its people to achieve completely its independence and its freedom not in a piecemeal manner but for the whole nation altogether, including the part of the Indonesian nation which is living in Western Irian. If the colonial era had made it possible for that part to be doubtfully considered as separated from Indonesia, I should like to express our satisfaction that that era has been terminated and that the aspirations of the peoples of Indonesia, including those of the people of West Irian, have been fulfilled.

9. Mr. DAVIN (Gabon) (*translated from French*): I should like first to pay a much-deserved tribute to His Excellency, Ambassador Fernando Ortiz Sanz, for the outstanding work he accomplished in the course of his difficult mission to Indonesia where, as the Representative of the Secretary-General, he was entrusted with the task of participating in

the arrangements for the act of free choice by which the people of West Irian were to be invited to indicate whether or not they wished to remain with Indonesia. These remarkable and most commendable efforts are described in a report [A/7723 and Corr.1, annex 1] which impresses by the weight of its content, the accuracy of its information and the objectivity of its presentation.

10. In view of the exceptional gravity of the subject matter, we can only regret that we had so little time to examine such an important document.

11. After studying this report, the Gabonese delegation finds itself extremely perplexed. It is very hard for us to pass judgement on the methods and procedures that were used to consult the people of West Irian. We are greatly disturbed by the reservations formulated by Mr. Ortiz Sanz in the final remarks at the close of his report.

12. As regards these methods and procedures, if my delegation had thought it necessary to speak on the substance of the question, it would certainly have drawn the Assembly's attention to certain aspects which are, to say the least, unusual. We might have expressed our surprise and requested an explanation concerning a number of facts brought out in the report of the Representative of the Secretary-General. For example, we might have asked why the vast majority of the deputies were appointed by the Government and not elected by the people; why the United Nations observers were able to be present at the election of only 20 per cent of the deputies, some of whom, incidentally, were elected automatically because they belonged to official representative bodies; why the consultative assemblies were presided over by the Governor of the district, in other words, by the representative of governmental authority; why only Government-authorized organizations, and not opposition movements, were able to present candidates.

13. We might have asked why the principle of "one man, one vote", recommended by the Representative of the Secretary-General, was not adopted; why there was not a secret ballot, but a public consultation in the presence of the governmental authorities and the army; why the attending Ministers deliberately and publicly influenced the deputies by informing them in plain terms that "the only right answer to the question would be to declare that they wished to remain united with Indonesia"; why the rights recognized in article XXII of the Agreement, concerning freedom of opinion, expression, association and assembly, were not enjoyed by all citizens.

14. The list of questions could include a good many more, but my delegation has no intention of starting a debate on the substance of the question. I will therefore confine myself to these few questions to which, unfortunately, I have not found satisfactory answers in the report. That fact heightens our concern, which is increased, if possible, by the following reservations made by the Representative of the Secretary-General:

"I regret to have to express my reservation regarding the implementation of article XXII of the Agreement, relating to 'the rights, including the rights of free speech, freedom of movement and of assembly, of the inhabitants

of the area'. In spite of my constant efforts, this important provision was not fully implemented and the Administration exercised at all times a tight political control over the population." [A/7723 and Corr.1, annex I, para. 251.]

15. As I have already said, my delegation is not speaking on the substance of the question, but solely in order to explain the position it will adopt in the vote on the draft resolution before us [A/L.574]. This draft resolution invites us, in paragraph 1, to take note of the report of the Secretary-General and to acknowledge with appreciation the fulfilment by the Secretary-General and his representative of the tasks entrusted to them under the Agreement of 1962 between Indonesia and the Netherlands [A/L.574, para. 1]. I am sorry to have to state that my delegation cannot agree with the opinion expressed. In fact it takes precisely the opposite view, as it is convinced that the Secretary-General and his representative were not privileged to enjoy all the conditions which would have enabled them to fulfil their task in the best possible way. This conviction is based on two observations concerning, respectively, the duration of the mission of the United Nations observers and the size of that mission or number of staff.

16. At the time of the transfer of administrative authority to Indonesia, it was decided that United Nations experts should remain *in situ*. Although the latter had been appointed, they had never been able to take up their duties, owing to well-known circumstances, as we are told by Mr. Ortiz Sanz, who adds:

"Consequently, their essential functions of advising on and assisting in preparations for carrying out the provisions for self-determination had not been performed during the period of 1 May 1963 to 23 August 1968. Upon my arrival in the territory, and for the purposes of my mission, I therefore had to begin with the collection of basic information about the territory and its population, trying to fulfil in a few months, with a limited staff not well acquainted with the territory, the important and complex functions which under article XVI of the Agreement should have been carried out during the preceding five years by a number of experts." [A/7723 and Corr.1, annex I, para. 11.]

17. I apologize for this long quotation, but I thought it necessary to reproduce *in extenso* the statements made by the representative of the Secretary-General, which prove that it was impossible for the United Nations experts to perform their duties properly, for reasons—and this fact must be understood—beyond their control.

18. As regards staff, Mr. Ortiz Sanz informs us that originally the mission was to comprise 50 staff members. Later, because of the housing and financial difficulties, arising from the fact that the two Parties to the Agreement had requested that the budget be limited to a minimum, this figure was reduced to 25, and finally to 16. Can we accept the idea that 16 persons are capable of carrying out in a few months the work which should have been accomplished by 50 experts in 6 years? It is difficult for my delegation to subscribe to such a view. Thus, while expressing to the Secretary-General and his representative our warmest appreciation for their laudable efforts, we

consider that it was impossible for them to fulfil properly the task entrusted to them under the terms of article XVI of the Agreement. My delegation will therefore be obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/L.574.

19. My delegation has noted with interest that amendments [A/L.576] have been submitted to this draft resolution. Perhaps these will help us to arrive at a compromise text which will reflect the various viewpoints that have emerged, thereby enabling us to adopt on a majority basis a resolution which will take account of the preoccupations of all concerned. My delegation is quite prepared to give due consideration to these amendments.

20. Mr. GONSALVES (India): I would wish to make a few brief remarks on the subject now under our consideration. When the item concerning the Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West Irian¹ came up for consideration before the General Assembly at its 1810th meeting held on 13 November 1969, the representative of Dahomey, on a point of order, requested postponement of action by the Assembly on this question exclusively on the ground that his and other delegations would like to have sufficient time to study the relevant reports. He stated that his request was in no way an indication of any ill-will whatsoever towards the subject under discussion. He had on that occasion displayed his customary courtesy in raising his point of order only after the Foreign Ministers of Indonesia and the Netherlands had spoken, and he was gracious enough to limit the requested postponement to a period of one week. The President of the General Assembly then proposed a postponement of six days in a spirit of compromise, and her proposal was unanimously accepted by the Assembly. It is in accordance with that decision that we are assembled here today.

21. It is not my intention to go into the substance of the question under consideration in any detail. The representatives of Malaysia, Burma, Kuwait and Japan have dealt with the substance of the problem adequately. I need only say that we share their views fully. The representative of Algeria explained the problem in its historical perspective only too brilliantly. I just wish to point out that the General Assembly is merely being called upon to take note of the report of the Secretary-General in regard to the act of free choice which has been undertaken in West Irian. It should be made clear that the draft resolution [A/L.574] does not seek the approval of the membership of the United Nations of the report. In the practice of the United Nations in the past an interpretation has emerged to the effect that the process of taking note of a particular document involves indirect approval of that document. I think it can be stated quite clearly that that is not the intention in the present case. It is our understanding that the co-sponsors of the draft resolution would be prepared to make this position quite clear.

22. It is clear from the report before us that, with certain inescapable and freely acknowledged limitations, an act of free choice has taken place in which the representatives of the population of West Irian have expressed their wish to

remain with Indonesia. It now remains for the General Assembly merely to take cognizance of this decision. It would not be appropriate or proper for the General Assembly to question the methods or procedures followed for exercising the act of free choice in a part of a sovereign State in implementation of an agreement to which that State is a party. These are matters exclusively within the jurisdiction of the sovereign State.

23. The decisions which have been taken in implementation of the terms of the Agreement are final and are not subject to further discussion by the United Nations. The question under our consideration cannot be regarded as an act of self-determination in the normal understanding of the term, since West Irian must be regarded as being an integral part of the sovereign State of the Republic of Indonesia. Having said that, I need only refer to the assurances extended by the Government of Indonesia that it will pay special attention to the promotion of the welfare and progress of its people in West Irian.

24. It should also be pointed out that the action undertaken by the Government of Indonesia under the provisions of article 18 of the Agreement between that Government and the Government of the Netherlands made it possible for the act of free choice to take place. This action must be regarded as a method that is appropriate for the special circumstances of West Irian and cannot under any circumstances be considered a precedent for the process of the exercise of the right of self-determination under completely different conditions in territories still under colonial domination.

25. It is our sincere hope that, having had the necessary time to study the relevant reports and taking into account the important fact that the Foreign Ministers of the Netherlands and Indonesia have been detained in New York pending finalization of this item, the Assembly will proceed to vote on the draft resolution submitted for our consideration without undue delay. It is equally our hope that the amendments presented to the draft resolution will not be pressed to a vote. Consultations are at present taking place to produce a mutually acceptable text of a draft resolution. We should like to express the hope that these efforts will produce early and successful results.

26. Mr. OHIN (Togo) (*translated from French*): I have no intention whatsoever of making a speech. My position on this painful problem of West Irian was defined, clearly and concisely, in the statement I made last week [1810th meeting]. Yesterday, however, the Indonesian delegation distributed a document from which I should like to quote the following rather surprising passage:

“The Agreement of 1962 exists whether Members of the General Assembly like it or not. It is not their Agreement.”

We are told that this Agreement, which was signed between Indonesia and the Netherlands and which is not a trade agreement but an agreement on which the future of a people depends, does not concern the United Nations. Whether or not it is accepted is of no interest to anyone. Nevertheless, it was thought necessary to request the Secretary-General to send one of his colleagues to assist in

¹ Signed in New York on 15 August 1962. See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 437 (1962), No. 6311, pp. 273-291.

the arrangements for what they would have us consider to be an act of free choice, of self-determination by the people.

27. I should here like to pay a tribute to Mr. Ortiz Sanz for his indefatigable efforts to achieve success in his particularly difficult mission. I have no intention of reverting to the Agreement which was signed here in New York in 1962. We were all there and we all more or less endorsed it, but the Indonesian Government itself has said:

“The Agreement in its content and wording was juridically probably rather a peculiar document. It was, however, evident that the Agreement was a political rather than a juridical document.” [A/7723 and Corr.1, annex II, para. 9.]

28. I believe that if there exists a political organization in the world, it is the United Nations. If the Organization cannot discuss such a grave political problem, I do not know exactly what we are doing here. The fact remains that since the Agreement was not approved by the whole population, Mr. Ortiz Sanz, once on the spot, made a point of establishing contact with the population, and wrote to the Indonesian Government as follows:

“... I pointed out that, in my capacity as United Nations Representative, I could suggest no other method for this delicate political exercise than the democratic, orthodox and universally accepted method of ‘one man, one vote’.” [Ibid., annex I, para. 82.]

29. Of course we are all aware of the geographical difficulties and of the non-preparedness, culturally and politically, of the population. And Mr. Ortiz Sanz, with that spirit of compromise, that special flexibility which are characteristic of the consummate, dedicated and experienced diplomat, found a panacea, an intermediate solution to replace the “one man, one vote” formula, which is the classic method adopted in developed democratic circles in Europe as well as by us in Africa. Thus he found a middle way, which consisted in holding regular elections in the towns and creating representative councils in inaccessible areas. But what happened?

“I received no official reaction to my suggestions concerning the questions to be submitted to the representative councils and a possible method to be followed for the act of free choice until a meeting held at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 10 February 1969, when the Government informed me of the method it proposed to submit to the representative councils in consultations to be held during the month of March 1969.” [Ibid., annex I, para. 83.]

30. This method, the act of free choice, would be exercised by a consultative assembly in each district in accordance with the *musjawarah* system. But—as someone said this morning—is this system applicable to the elections in Indonesia? Is it applicable elsewhere in the world? Why do they want to apply it in West Irian, even though they consider its inhabitants to be incapable of voting because of their backwardness?

31. I should like to recall here that the General Assembly, in its resolution 1514 (XV) of 1960, declared that the inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence in any country. I refer to this declaration in order to make the point that the important reservations which have been made by the Representative of the United Nations are sufficiently convincing for each one to ask himself whether what has happened in West Irian was really an act of free choice by the population.

32. That is why, in these circumstances, my delegation cannot accept this resolution. On the other hand, I would ask the Assembly, and all those who believe in democracy, to consider seriously the amendments [A/L.576] which were submitted this morning [1812th meeting] by the Ambassador of Ghana.

33. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I call upon the representative of Saudi Arabia who wishes to speak on a point of order.

34. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): First of all, I wish to tender my thanks to my brother from Ghana having formulated his amendments [A/L.576]. He thereby gave us a chance to ponder over them, to consider and weigh them. And I must say that I have been vindicated in what I said last week and this morning. Much as we value and respect the motive which drove our brother from Ghana to submit these amendments, I still maintain that they are irrelevant, constitutionally speaking, to the draft resolution which is before us.

35. This morning [1812th meeting] I made suggestions but did not press for a ruling by the President, for the simple reason that I did not want to appear as if I were obstructing the free flow of thoughts on self-determination, all the more so because I spent eight years of my life in this same Organization, between 1949 and 1956 or 1957, in elaborating the principle of self-determination into a right—a right which now figures as such in the draft covenants on human rights.

36. I cannot express my ideas better than did my colleague from India, who put the whole question before us in its proper perspective; and in order not to repeat and go into the substance—although I will address myself to the substance if and when a separate item or a separate draft resolution is placed before this house—I must hasten to say, for the sake of preserving the order of our work, that I believe the amendments of our brother from Ghana are irrelevant, inasmuch as they amount to a draft resolution that could stand on its own feet. Therefore, I repeat what I said this morning, that the door is open to do one of two things. He can, with the approval of the Assembly, formulate and submit a separate draft resolution; or he can ask for a new item to be included in the agenda of this session, which would have to be done through the steering committee, or the General Committee as it is known.

37. I shall now take a few minutes to show why these amendments are irrelevant. In this, my Indian colleague has made my task much easier.

38. We are not dealing here with the question of the self-determination of any people, including the people of West Irian. We are dealing here with a report. And if we take note of a report, it does not mean that we fully agree with every word in it. No one agrees with everything that is said in any report, for that matter. However, there is something in the amendments that should give us food for thought.

39. According to the seventh amendment submitted by Ghana, the General Assembly:

“*Decides* that the people of West Irian should be given a further opportunity, by the end of 1975, to carry out the act of free choice envisaged in the Agreement.”

That in itself constitutes a new idea. Whom is he asking to decide? The General Assembly? Can we decide hastily about such a matter? We took note of the arrangement made in 1962 between two sovereign States, and in the light of that decision the Secretary-General later appointed a Representative, who has presented us at this session with a report of his findings. Those are two separate questions. I shall have a lot to say about self-determination when we come to the substance. I withhold my remarks now because they may lead to a long debate on the question of self-determination and its application, on the philosophy and practicability of self-determination, not only in West Irian but also in certain sovereign States.

40. Parenthetically, I would say that if we hastened to accept these amendments as an integral part of the draft resolution before us, we would be encouraging people who have been living at peace within a sovereign State to try and secede and make trouble—if they are activists—within the State. It is very dangerous to inject the right of self-determination without knowing whether a people is in a position to determine its fate. That is why it took us seven or eight years to elaborate that principle into a right. We could not do it overnight. But here, during the few meetings that are allotted to us to deal with this report and vote on it, we are asked to go into all the ramifications of self-determination, not only of the people of West Irian or Indonesia or the Netherlands, but of every people that arrogates to itself a special situation of secession within a sovereign State. That will reflect on African people. It is not as though we were not confronted with enough intractable problems inside some States in Africa, as if we were not confronted with sovereign States that are a conglomeration of republics. This procedure, I submit, will open Pandora's box and there will be no end to it. I foresee that a special session will be required if we follow such a procedure.

41. That is why, with all due respect for his motives, I appeal to my brother from Ghana to consider my remarks and not to complicate this matter. I know he does not intend to complicate this matter, but I am afraid I am witnessing something that I must decry. We should not vote here by solidarity but on the merit of the question, regardless of the area to which we may belong. We should not follow the ancient tribal dictum, “I and my brother against my cousin, my cousin and I against a stranger”. This procedure smacks of regionalism, smacks of a false kind of solidarity—and I have the right to say so. I have been in the

United Nations long enough to muster courage and call a spade a spade.

42. I am sure that many of us here in the United Nations have the independence of people at heart, but let us examine every case on its merits. Let us not dispute certain decisions that have been taken. Let us ponder deeply before taking any decision to opt during this session to open up the entire question of self-determination. We have no time to do that during this session. But I respect the motives of my colleagues from Ghana and those who support him, and I repeat that the door is open for them, if they desire, to ask for the inclusion of a separate item next year—a request which will be debated in the General Committee and, if adopted, will be referred to the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly. Or, if they need a protracted debate—and I would say it would be a futile debate—let them submit a draft resolution which will stand on its own feet, because their amendments, constitutionally speaking, are extraneous to the draft resolution with which we are dealing.

43. In conclusion, Mr. President, I request you to give the floor to one or two persons to refute what I am saying and after that, if possible—I do not want to put you in an embarrassing position—to make a ruling whether these amendments could be considered relevant to the draft resolution before us. With your permission, Sir, and that of my colleagues—and first and foremost with the permission of my good friend from Ghana—I reserve the right to speak again after that.

44. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I believe that at this stage I should clarify my position so that representatives will have some idea of how I propose to guide the debate.

45. This morning [*1812th meeting*] the Ghanaian representative introduced some amendments [*A/L.576*] which were accepted by the acting President at that meeting. These amendments have been distributed and each representative now has the text before him.

46. I thought that, after the list of speakers had been exhausted, it would be the appropriate moment to put to the vote the amendments proposed by the representative of Ghana, which were accepted this morning.

47. The representative of Saudi Arabia has now stated that he proposes to ask the President to give a ruling, presumably with the intention of appealing against that ruling if he or other representatives do not agree with it.

48. In conclusion, I consider that since the proposed Ghanaian amendments were accepted this morning, they are now open for consideration by the General Assembly.

49. I now give the floor to other representatives. If no one wishes to speak on this question, I will ask the Saudi Arabian representative whether he intends to appeal against this ruling by the President.

50. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Before I appeal any ruling, or decide to do so, I must set the record straight. We met here last week [*1810th meeting*]. We had a draft

resolution and a report before us. There was some debate regarding the substance of the report. The protagonists of those who wanted a debate on self-determination of the West Irian people were two gentlemen, the representative of Dahomey and the representative of Ghana. I forthwith raised a point of order and asked the President to apply rule 76 of the rules of procedure, which permits two speakers in favour of the adjournment of the debate requested by the representative of Dahomey, and two speakers against. Unfortunately, several speakers addressed themselves to the adjournment of the debate and the rule of procedure was violated. As if by magic, the generosity of the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands in offering his compromise to delay the vote on the draft resolution until Monday or Tuesday was misinterpreted by none other than the President, who said she would make a compromise and have the debate delayed until Wednesday, 19 November 1969.

51. The gap in the President's compromise was that the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands asked for a delay on the vote, not on the debate. We could have proceeded with the debate if it had been the understanding that there should be a long debate on the question. There were no amendments then. Out of courtesy, the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands acceded to the request for postponing the vote on the draft resolution, but not for postponing the debate. I can be challenged on this, and I hope that I shall be vindicated if anyone should wish to consult the verbatim records.

52. I submit that the compromise was irregular and that a consensus was not taken. That is why I said that the pronouncement was made as if by magic. We cannot go on building on false foundations. I shall suggest something again so as not to embarrass some of the representatives here who unwittingly have confused the postponement of the vote with the postponement of the debate and are introducing new elements into the question before us.

53. For that reason, Mr. President, instead of challenging your ruling I would ask that—and I still would not want to embarrass our illustrious Legal Counsel by asking him to give us a legal ruling; I do not want to embarrass anybody here for we are here to act as brothers rather than to oppose one another—after the list of speakers is exhausted, I should like you to mention whether, as President, and after consulting with legal counsel, and taking into account the bungling that took place last week, you still think that the amendments of the representative of Ghana are relevant. If you do so think, I shall keep silent, but I shall request you to take a vote as to whether there should be more speakers in an open debate or whether we should forthwith proceed to the vote. This is a formal proposal.

54. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): In view of what the representative of Saudi Arabia has just said, I will continue with the list of speakers as previously announced.

55. Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia): Let me at the very outset say that I feel inadequate to challenge anybody, but I feel adequate to state the position of my Government with regard to the problem before this Assembly.

56. I shall begin by expressing my sincere congratulations and those of my delegation to the delegation of the United

States on the successful landing of Apollo 12 on the Ocean of Storms in the early hours of this morning. It is our hope and prayer that the astronauts involved in one of the greatest ventures of our time will return safely to Mother Earth.

57. We are most grateful to the Foreign Ministers of the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands for the statements which they made last Thursday, 13 November 1969 [*1810th meeting*], concerning the all-important question of West New Guinea (West Irian). We are satisfied that the two delegations are sincere in trying to promote a peaceful solution to this problem; and let me reiterate the continued and never-wavering determination of my Government to assist in every possible way, within the accepted norms of international conduct, in achieving this solution.

58. We have before us a draft resolution [*A/L.574*] which in fact asks us to express appreciation for the fulfilment by the Secretary-General and his Representative of the tasks entrusted to them under the Agreement of 1962 between Indonesia and the Netherlands. It is the submission of my delegation that this Assembly has every right to discuss any matters relating to the report of Mr. Ortiz Sanz, which after all deals with the substantive aspects of the whole question. I am sure that no one wishes to deny the General Assembly this right to exercise free speech, which has become a symbol of our high regard for everything that freedom stands for.

59. We have differences in our approach to certain fundamental issues, but let us learn to respect the right of each and every State freely to dissent.

60. The West Irian question in the United Nations has been the subject of discussion in the Assembly for several years, and there is no need for me to go into all the details at this stage since they are well known to all delegations.

61. The Agreement between Indonesia and the Netherlands provided for the act of free choice in accordance with "international practice and under United Nations supervision". At the same time it was generally expected that the supervisory role of the United Nations would ensure a certain degree of fairness for all the 800,000 inhabitants of West Irian in their act of self-determination. Article XVIII of the Agreement specified that Indonesia would "make arrangements, with the assistance and participation of the United Nations representative and his staff, to give the people of the Territory the opportunity to exercise freedom of choice." Such arrangements were to include "the eligibility of all adults, male and female, not foreign nationals, to participate in the act of self-determination, to be carried out in accordance with international practice".

62. My delegation has so far been unable to find out why it was considered acceptable to the Secretary-General's Representative in West Irian to agree to a formula of free choice on the basis of *musjawarah*—consultations—with one thousand notables appointed by the Indonesian Government, something which was not clearly stipulated in the original Agreement, unless, of course, the Agreement has been amended since—and if that is so, I am not ashamed to confess publicly the staggering ignorance of my delegation.

63. From paragraph 57 of Mr. Ortiz Sanz's report [A/7723 and Corr.1, annex I] it is clear that he received, in the course of his delicate assignment, complaints both written and oral from West Irianese individuals and organizations within and outside the territory concerning suppression of the rights and freedoms of the inhabitants, in violation of article XXII of the Agreement, by which Indonesia undertook to "guarantee fully the rights, including the rights of free speech, freedom of movement and of assembly, of the inhabitants of the area". The report further states that without such rights and freedoms to enable people to develop and to pursue their convictions within the framework of law and order, the international community would not be satisfied that a fair and truly democratic judgement had been rendered by the people.

64. What is even more disturbing to my delegation is the following conclusion in the report:

"I regret to have to express my reservation regarding the implementation of article XXII of the Agreement, relating to 'the rights, including the rights of free speech, freedom of movement and of assembly, of the inhabitants of the area'. In spite of my constant efforts, this important provision was not fully implemented and the Administration exercised at all times a tight political control over the population." [A/7723 and Corr.1, annex I, para. 251.]

65. This report, in our view, is understandably cautious and raises more questions than it answers. In our approach to the problem we shall accordingly be as cautious as the report. It is the submission of my delegation that there is room for further improvement in the draft resolution before us and, in the usual United Nations spirit of consultation and compromise, I would hope very sincerely, that the co-sponsors of this draft will not be averse to further consultations on this problem, with a view to arriving at a draft resolution which will cut across religious and colour lines.

66. My delegation will be guided in its approach to the draft resolution before us by those fundamental considerations. Our relations with Indonesia have always been cordial and our positions on most, if not all, international issues have always been identical. Our hope is that the reservations we have just expressed will be taken by our Indonesian brothers in the friendly and cordial spirit in which they have been made.

67. The amendments which have now been formulated by Mr. Akwei of Ghana [A/L.576] go a long way towards meeting some of our fears, which we consider justified, and we would appeal to Members of this Assembly to give them the weighty consideration they deserve. We shall always remain sensitive and responsive to the problems and needs of all our friends.

68. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): The question under consideration here today is the "Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian)".

69. After many years of bitter struggle for national independence and the unity of the people of Indonesia,

which proved to be costly both in human lives and material destruction to the two disputing parties, namely, Indonesia and the Netherlands, the dark pages of history were brought to an end by the conclusion of the 1962 New York Agreement.

70. The fact that those two Members of the United Nations were able to change their course of action from armed conflict to peaceful negotiations and succeeded in arriving at an agreement was a source of satisfaction to the entire international community, whose primary interest was to see an end to the fighting. We in Thailand commended the efforts of the Governments of Indonesia and the Netherlands in their search for a political and peaceful solution to an essentially political problem.

71. Before I proceed to make comments on the report of the Secretary-General, I believe that the following three factors should be borne in mind: first, the item under discussion is the Indonesian-Netherlands Agreement on West Irian and the report of the Secretary-General. This is not the old item known as the "Question of West Irian (West New Guinea)" which was before the Assembly from 1954 to 1961, which dealt with the question of self-determination; secondly, even the old question of West Irian should not be regarded as a question of self-determination *per se*, to be considered separately from the independence movement of the entire Indonesian nation. Indonesia proclaimed its independence in 1945 and the people of West Irian were also participants in the national struggle for independence, territorial integrity and the unity of the nation; thirdly, the two disputing parties have overcome the basic difficulty which confronted them when the question of West Irian was raised in the United Nations. The Agreement is the result of their labours and the implementation of the Agreement took into account the historical, political and geographical circumstances. West Irian is a special case and the specific method of solution to the problem is not one which can be applied to other parts of the world.

72. Now that the responsibility of the act of free choice, as entrusted to the Government of Indonesia by the Agreement, has been conclusively discharged with the advice, assistance and participation of a special representative of the Secretary-General, the international community should resort to no other mode of action but should rejoice at the full implementation of the obligations incumbent upon the Indonesian Government.

73. In this connexion, in his general statement to the General Assembly on 1 October 1969, the Foreign Minister of Thailand referred to this question in particular. He said:

"The delegation of Thailand is gratified at the recent completion of the act of free choice in the territory of West Irian, which marked the implementation of the final part of the Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian) signed in New York on 15 August 1962 under the aegis of the United Nations. The nations concerned, as well as the United Nations, are to be congratulated on having successfully demonstrated their determination to settle this complex matter in such a smooth and constructive manner. The Government of

Indonesia, in particular, has shown its good faith towards the obligations incumbent upon it as a member of the international community and has accordingly upheld and strengthened the principle of self-determination for all people." [1773rd meeting, para. 98.]

74. While my delegation recognizes the important fact that the 1962 Agreement is a bilateral agreement between the two Governments directly concerned and submitted jointly by both contracting parties to the General Assembly of the United Nations, we nonetheless feel, as all delegations must, indebted to the United Nations Secretary-General for the positive role he played in rendering assistance to the two parties during their negotiations. We are all the more appreciative of the continuing interest and participation of the Secretary-General and the United Nations in the implementation of the Agreement.

75. The delegation of Thailand would like to pay a special tribute to the work carried out by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Fernando Ortiz Sanz. The report of the Secretary-General that we have before us gives a very candid account of the task that was assigned to him. One cannot fail to be impressed by his objectivity, thoroughness and attachment to the principles involved in the question. And yet while the Special Representative raised a number of salient and pertinent points in his handling of the difficult situation, he has never lost sight of the fact that the Agreement, political in nature, is the outcome of a peaceful settlement of a long-standing political dispute which then threatened to erupt into a major war. On that basis, the Special Representative adopted a flexible and constructive approach to the Secretary-General's responsibilities to "advise, assist and participate" in the arrangements for the act of free choice which were the responsibility of the Government of Indonesia.

76. In our view it is only right that the Special Representative should have forwarded his views to the Government of Indonesia in regard to the conduct of the act of free choice. At the same time, he rightly conceded that:

"As the arrangements were the responsibility of Indonesia, the views, counsel, recommendations and suggestions offered in fulfilment of the Secretary-General's responsibilities were not of a binding character for the Government." [A/7723 and Corr.1, annex I, para. 12.]

Indonesia was expected to take all these views into consideration and this it did in good faith. Some of the suggestions and recommendations were accepted and others were found to be not compatible with the special conditions and situation in West Irian.

77. The report gives the General Assembly a clear insight into the difficulties involved and faithfully reflects the points of disagreement between the Special Representative and the Government of Indonesia. But the Special Representative, in paragraph 25 of the report, also draws our attention to the "positive attitude on the part of the Government" and he observes that in his "contacts with senior officials of the Central Government and local authorities" he "met with understanding and a willingness to give serious consideration" to his suggestions and recommendations.

78. It is to the credit of the Special Representative that, in his impartial and constructive manner, he concluded that

"it can be stated that, with the limitations imposed by the geographical characteristics of the territory and the general political situation in the area, an act of free choice has taken place in West Irian, in accordance with Indonesian practice, in which the representatives of the population have expressed their wish to remain with Indonesia." [Ibid., para. 253.]

79. The act of free choice for the people of West Irian was completed on 2 August 1969. The people of West Irian through their elected representatives in the consultative assemblies expressed their views and their decision to remain a part of the Republic of Indonesia. The Government of the Netherlands, the other party directly concerned, "is prepared to recognize and to abide by the outcome of the act of self-determination as stipulated in paragraph 2 of article XXI of the 1962 Agreement" [1810th meeting, para. 29]. The Foreign Minister of the Netherlands categorically stated in his speech on 13 November 1969 that "the Netherlands Government does not consider the method adopted by the Indonesian Government to be, in itself, contrary to the provisions of the Agreement..." [ibid.].

80. Now, the Agreement, which averted a large-scale war between Indonesia and the Netherlands, has brought about not only a political settlement to a dispute in a peaceful and orderly manner but also a new chapter of mutual understanding and active co-operation between the two countries. A new era has started for the people of West Irian, whose future well-being and development can be assured by the determined efforts of the Government of Indonesia.

81. In the difficult and enormous task which lies ahead, the international community, as represented by the General Assembly, should give unstintingly its understanding, co-operation and good wishes to the Government of Indonesia. We should all take pride in the fact that we have had the opportunity of witnessing the positive results of a peaceful negotiation, and the discharge by both parties of their obligations under the Agreement, as well as the active participation of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security.

82. My delegation extends its best wishes to Indonesia for the result of the act of free choice, which not only permitted the wishes of the people of West Irian to be ascertained but also lent substance to the principle of territorial integrity, non-observance of which would spell disintegration and disaster to a large number of newly independent countries.

83. On 16 August 1969 His Excellency President Suharto of Indonesia, in his address to the nation before the Parliament in Djakarta said:

"This success of the act of free choice in West Irian has really strengthened the unity of our country and our people. At the same time we have shown our goodwill in implementing an international agreement we had agreed upon."

The President further stated that the act of free choice was obviously not an end in itself, but that the objective of urgent and paramount importance was the development of West Irian in all fields in the framework of the Government's five-year development plan.

84. We warmly welcome the positive attitude of the Indonesian Government to this problem. We have every confidence that the Indonesian Government will continue to pursue and carry out this policy which aims at protecting the rights and promoting the interests and well-being of the Indonesian people in West Irian.

85. For the reasons I have outlined, the delegation of Thailand has co-sponsored draft resolution A/L.574, together with the delegations of Belgium, Indonesia, Luxembourg, Malaysia and the Netherlands, and we urge the General Assembly to consider the question in the light of the historical background relating to the Indonesian people's struggle to achieve freedom and independence and the territorial integrity of the entire Indonesian nation.

86. Mr. NAYERI (Iran) (*translated from French*): The speakers who have preceded me in this debate have greatly facilitated my task and I should like to join with them in congratulating the Governments of the Netherlands and Indonesia for the spirit of understanding and co-operation they have shown in resolving objectively the problem of West Irian.

87. My task is made all the easier because many representatives have touched upon the various aspects of the problem before us. I gladly associate myself with those of them who have supported the report by Mr. Ortiz Sanz [A/7723 and Corr.1, annex I] and the relevant draft resolution [A/L.574]. In this connexion, the statement by the Indian representative appears to us to be of particular importance.

88. The report before us is among those which reawaken our hopes in the Organization's capacity to settle problems peacefully. Accordingly, it is my delegation's pleasant duty to congratulate the Secretary-General and Mr. Ortiz Sanz on their outstanding performance in this matter. We are all the more happy to do so because of the excellent relations we maintain with both the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

89. The results of all the consultations show that the inhabitants of West Irian have expressed a wish to remain Indonesian, and we are happy to take note of the statement by the Indonesian Minister for Foreign Affairs on the progress made since his country took over the administration in 1963.

90. My delegation is particularly gratified to recall that the United Nations Temporary Executive Authority in West Irian was entrusted by the Secretary-General to one of my distinguished compatriots, Mr. Abdoh, and we are delighted to see that a matter with which he was associated has led to this satisfactory conclusion.

91. Finally, I can state here and now that my delegation firmly supports draft resolution A/L.574 and will vote in favour of it.

92. Mr. SUDJARWO (Indonesia): My delegation had not intended to take the floor again, but after having heard several speakers who have made some references to what we have done in West Irian in the implementation of the last phase of the Agreement of 1962 we feel compelled to speak again, and I should like to thank you, Mr. President, for giving us the opportunity to do so.

93. My delegation has listened with care to the statements made by several speakers both this morning and this afternoon [1812th and 1813th meeting]. Some have shown great understanding of the real issues under the specific item before the Assembly and I should like to thank the delegations which spoke so generously of Indonesia's role in the fight for self-determination of peoples, for freedom against colonialism.

94. Others have expressed misgivings or reservations regarding the implementation of the 1962 Agreement as reported by the Secretary-General. Let me, however, emphasize again that—as has been rightly pointed out by some delegations—the present item before the Assembly is the Agreement between Indonesia and the Netherlands and the report of the Secretary-General regarding the last phase of its implementation. It is, therefore, not the old question of West Irian, as debated and left unresolved by the General Assembly from 1954 to 1957 and again in 1961, but is now a different item. Whereas 15 years ago it was an item of conflict, a political dispute between two Member States, it is now an item of agreement between two Member States. That alone is a commendable development, a commendable change which should be welcomed by the General Assembly.

95. This Agreement, in the realization of which the Secretary-General of the United Nations was also instrumental, has developed even further understanding and co-operation between the two Contracting Parties—as evidenced also in the joint draft resolution before this Assembly—with due regard to the progress and welfare of the people of West Irian as part of the Indonesian people as a whole.

96. The spirit of agreement, understanding and co-operation should, to my mind, be preserved, if not promoted, in this Assembly. I believe that that was also the spirit in which the Secretary-General submitted his report to this Assembly. And let us be clear, no approval of any kind is required or requested either of the Agreement itself or of the Secretary-General's report [A/7763 and Corr.1].

97. Members of the Assembly may, of course, like or dislike the Indonesia-Netherlands Agreement of 1962. They may also like or dislike the report. They are of course free to do so although it is, as a matter of fact, not their Agreement. They may criticize the report. They may criticize the implementation of the last phase of the Agreement by Indonesia. But we are not seeking their approval or consent. My Government in its voluminous reports—they are in fact annexes to the main report—has given a full and complete account of what it has done in carrying out its responsibilities under the Agreement in West Irian, despite the enormous difficulties—as conceded by the Secretary-General's representative, Ambassador Ortiz Sanz. Any point which has been raised in this

question of implementation and which is, according to the Agreement, Indonesia's exclusive responsibility, finds its answer or clarification in the Government's report—including the reservations made in the report of Ambassador Ortiz Sanz. One only has to read the Indonesian Government's report more attentively. I do not think I should repeat what has been already said, argued and clarified abundantly in the Indonesian report with all the annexes, and indeed it will serve no useful purpose, as was suggested by the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, a Party to the Agreement, to comment further on the matters of the act of free choice or on its outcome. If we here were to discuss what democracy is and whether each of us should or should not practise it in our respective countries, we would, I am afraid, have a mockery of a discussion indeed.

98. It is really extraordinary that this proposition, coupled with some accusations towards my country and my people, should come from my dear friend from Ghana. He may now know, however, what was done by Indonesia, as recalled by my friend Mr. Yazid from Algeria [*1812th meeting*], previously in the name of the right of self-determination of peoples—notably for the rights of the Ghanaian people—to have the Ghana representative seated at the Bandung Conference in 1955 when Ghana at that time had not yet gained its full independence. I think it is good now and then to recall a bit of history of anti-colonial history which even our friends sometimes forget.

99. The results of the act of free choice in West Irian are—again in accordance with the Agreement—legal, conclusive and final. That has been reported by the Secretary-General, and the Netherlands Government—again in accordance with the Agreement—has recognized it and abides by it. For that reason I agree fully with the Netherlands Foreign Minister in his statement last Thursday [*1810th meeting*] when he said that it really serves no useful purpose to comment, and much less to debate, further on the manner in which the act of free choice took place or on the outcome of it.

100. To respect the prevailing atmosphere of agreement, understanding and co-operation, I do not therefore intend to enter into a debate on questions raised by some speakers which, in the present context, are not called for. Doing so would only reopen wounds of an old conflict between Indonesia and the Netherlands which would solve nothing but would only bring the parties into their old opposition and conflict once again. The prevailing spirit of agreement and understanding might be changed into a spirit of conflict and enmity once again. That cannot be the intention or function of this august Assembly of the United Nations.

101. With regard to the question of self-determination relating to the struggle of peoples for freedom and independence in our anti-colonial fight, I believe that Indonesia is clear in its record both within and outside the United Nations. As may be recalled, in 1955 Indonesia was co-sponsor and host of the Afro-Asian Conference in Bandung which rallied Asian-African strength and solidarity in the anti-colonial fight for freedom and independence for all peoples in Africa and Asia and I believe that even our brothers who at that time could not be present at the Bandung Conference are aware of the importance of our common efforts and struggles.

102. Indonesia has certainly contributed, as generously mentioned by my friend, Mr. Yazid the representative of Algeria [*1812th meeting*], in that struggle for the achievement of the freedom and independence of our brothers in Africa. Indeed, Asia and Africa, in their joint collaboration have an impressive record in that common struggle of which we should all be proud.

103. The act of free choice in West Irian was not, however, a matter of self-determination in the sense of an anti-colonial struggle. For Indonesia the question was the completion of our anti-colonial struggle, the completion of our national unity and territorial integrity, a principle which is of the highest importance for a sovereign country—and for any country, I presume—and for which Indonesia in 1962, as members may recall, was even prepared to go to war.

104. That state of affairs and that ominous conflict are now happily past history. To assume that the method of the act of free choice in West Irian might become a precedent for cases of self-determination in other areas of the world is therefore erroneous.

105. The Netherlands Government agrees with us that that was a specific method, not contrary to the Agreement, for a specific case resulting from a specific Agreement. That method and the implementation of the act of free choice are exclusively Indonesia's responsibility.

106. Indonesia has supported, and will of course continue to support, struggles for the implementation of the right of self-determination of peoples, for freedom and independence in Africa or elsewhere, based on any methods desired by the peoples themselves. There should be no doubt about that, because that is an established policy of the Indonesian Government. The right of self-determination of peoples, however, should not be abused in such a matter that it would be aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country, which would be incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter. That principle, among others, is also laid down, as will be remembered, in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

107. Having said all that, I should like to emphasize again that no approval is required or requested of the General Assembly either of the 1962 Agreement or of its implementation as reported by the Secretary-General. Ample clarification on Indonesia's part on matters relating to it can be found in the report of my Government, which is annexed to the Secretary-General's report.

108. With respect to the amendments submitted by Ghana [*A/L.576*], my delegation, of course, finds it very difficult, if not impossible, to accept the amendments in their entirety as they stand, since their spirit and substance are entirely in disagreement with the spirit and the understanding which the Indonesian-Netherlands Agreement of 1962 has engendered between the parties, as embodied in the draft resolution jointly sponsored by the two countries with four other co-sponsors. The amendments, in our view, are designed to amend not only draft resolution A/L.574,

but also the 1962 Agreement between Indonesia and the Netherlands, which, I believe, is not the task of the General Assembly.

109. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I give the floor to the representative of Ghana, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

110. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana): I have come to the rostrum in an attempt to be helpful. But at the same time I cannot refrain from commenting on the remarks made both this morning and this afternoon by my brother, friend and colleague the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia. Much of what the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia said did not come to us in the delegation of Ghana as a surprise. We have become used to his interventions and while we enjoy them and respect him, sometimes we are doubtful whether his interventions actually have the effect which they are probably intended to have.

111. This morning [*1812th meeting*] the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia challenged the relevance of the amendments which I had the honour to introduce [*A/L.576*] and which have been supported by a large number of delegations. I think I need not inform the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia that amendments can take the form of revisions to a proposal or to part of a proposal, and additions to or deletions from a proposal or part of a proposal. The amendments which I introduced were purposely designed for that end. I think the grounds on which he challenged the relevance of the amendments were that I was seeking to amend not a draft resolution but an agreement which had been already effectuated between two Member States.

112. With all due respect to my friend the Ambassador, I would say that he is wrong. I was seeking to amend a draft resolution; I was not seeking to amend an agreement. Of course, the latter is impossible. We take the same position from the same source: the agreement—an agreement between Indonesia and the Netherlands, but involving the United Nations and the Secretary-General and his Representative. It was expected that certain functions would be carried out under the terms of that Agreement. A report has come to the General Assembly and many of us have felt very strongly that the actions which were taken, or at least some of them, were not in fulfilment of the Agreement. We are not seeking to change an agreement. We are seeking to help the parties concerned to fulfil the Agreement. And the only way in which we can draw attention to that necessity is through the usual process of introducing amendments. I would have thought that the Ambassador would credit my delegation with some purposefulness and seriousness, and at least with the intelligence to know what we were doing. At any rate, I would have thought that he would extend some courtesy to the delegations which have supported the amendments.

113. Indeed, if the representative of Saudi Arabia had taken the trouble to find out exactly what has been happening since this morning's meeting I think he would have been the first to realize something which he himself probably indicated without knowing, namely, that he was perhaps rather obstructing the work of the Assembly. We have been in consultation with some of the co-sponsors of the basic substantive resolution. We have been in consulta-

tion with friendly delegations. We were in consultation and negotiation right to the very last minute when the Assembly was called to order this afternoon. It is my feeling and judgement that we had made considerable progress. Indeed, I was very much encouraged by the remark which was made by the speaker who preceded me, the representative of Indonesia, when he said that he could not agree to the amendments of the Ghana delegation in their entirety. I think "in their entirety" was the phrase he used.

114. Of course, this is an indication that they could move towards some kind of accommodation, some compromise with some of the amendments which we have proposed—and that was precisely what was happening. This is no mystery to Members of the General Assembly; it should not be a mystery to the representative of Saudi Arabia. He has been here longer than anybody else. He knows very well that when a draft resolution is submitted and amendments are proposed, we have to go through a prolonged process of negotiation and consultation. Sometimes it may not even be necessary to press the amendments to a vote because of the spirit of conciliation which may be forthcoming from both parties. So that with the necessary accommodation and inclusion of some of the ideas contained in the amendments in the substantive draft resolution, it may not be necessary to put the amendments to the vote.

115. He has been asking whether I am going to press the amendments to the vote. But that is contrary to the usual procedure. We try to negotiate first whether there is a common ground, whether there is some measure of compromise—and this is precisely what we have been doing. We were able to reach so sufficient a measure of compromise and accommodation with each other that, to my knowledge, there was only one point outstanding at the time this afternoon's meeting of the General Assembly was convened. I believe there was only one point, although I stand to be corrected. When we interrupted those consultations the understanding was that after the list of speakers had been exhausted this afternoon we probably could continue with the consultations to see what measure of compromise we could reach.

116. So this is the situation, Sir, and I think both you and the President herself were quite right in the rulings that were given about the adjournment of the debate as well as in the recognition of the amendments. It has been almost impossible for me to think aright in my seat in the Assembly because of the constant flow of people coming to consult me on this or that amendment. But I have in my hands now the results of some of the negotiations which we carried out this afternoon. I have also received an indication from many representatives that they would have wished to speak on the substantive aspect of the question if it had not been for the amendments which I submitted, and to which of course, they would wish to give some further consideration before speaking.

117. Therefore, this is really the situation. We are trying our best to help and we are the first to feel sympathy for any inconvenience which may be caused to the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands and to the Foreign Minister of Indonesia. But I would equally hope, and I think that they would be the first to admit, that we have a serious item

here under discussion, and that the inconvenience which might result to two or three individuals should not preclude this Assembly from exercising due care in considering the item under discussion.

118. In view of the remarks I have made and in view of the many contacts which I have made both before this meeting began and during the process of the debate this afternoon, it seems to me that there can be some further progress in the consultations which have been going on. I may be mistaken, but I am hopeful. Also, it seems to me that many delegations which would have liked to speak this afternoon perhaps may not be in a position to speak now because of the consultations which have been going on and because of the amendments.

119. I would therefore humbly suggest that perhaps there might be some value in either suspending the meeting or adjourning it. I think myself that, in view of the circumstances, it might be better to adjourn the meeting to allow for further consultations and negotiations to take place as well as to allow delegations which wish to speak to study the amendments in the light of the rapidly changing scene and to make up their minds what they want to do. I make this request and I hope it will be supported because it is a request which is designed both to facilitate substantive discussion as well as to facilitate the unnecessary predicament of having to press the amendments to a vote.

120. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I consider that since the representative of Ghana had requested the adjournment of the debate, we should apply rule 76 of the rules of procedure, which states:

“During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote. The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule.”

121. The representative of Ghana has proposed that the debate on this item should be adjourned. If any representative wishes to speak on this point, he may do so.

122. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I am speaking for two reasons: first to correct certain erroneous notions which our colleague from Ghana has expressed about my point of order last week [*1810th meeting*] and also about the points of order I made this morning [*1812th meeting*] and this afternoon; second, to address myself to whether we should or should not adjourn the debate on this question.

123. First, I shall exercise what is known as the right of reply. With your permission, I should like to tell my brother from Ghana that I have been here long enough to know what an amendment is. It adds or subtracts or does many things. However, I have witnessed two or three curious amendments during my service with the United Nations. One of them occurred about 10 years ago in one of the committees of the General Assembly. The amendment was to preserve the first line, “*General Assembly decides*,” and to change almost every paragraph of the draft

resolution. In other words, it was an entirely new draft resolution. It was still an amendment, technically speaking, but substantively it was another draft resolution. That is what I was trying to tell my brother from Ghana, that substantively those amendments [*A/L.576*] are not germane to the draft resolution that is before us [*A/L.574*]. I am not so naïve as not to know the rule that an amendment adds or subtracts. In other words, Ghana, for reasons to be commended—I am not disputing why it should have brought these amendments—chose to introduce a new draft resolution in the form of amendments. I thought a line should be drawn between what is a genuine amendment and what might appear, unintentionally I would say, to be a spurious amendment.

124. Having disposed of that point, I should like also to address myself, with your permission, Mr. President, to my brother from Ghana to the following effect. If he had certain ideas which he wanted our colleagues from Indonesia and the Netherlands to take into consideration, as well as the co-sponsors—for, after all, there are co-sponsors of that draft resolution—he would have had ample time either to convince them or be convinced by them since last Thursday or whatever the day last week was when we met on this item [*1810th meeting*]. Instead he produces clear-cut amendments which, I submit, constitute a new draft resolution. I have been making an appeal to him that, if he insists on those amendments, he should introduce them as a separate draft resolution, because, I submit, they are not germane to the essence of the draft resolution before us, although technically anything could be injected into a resolution. If we, like doctors, inject a toxin into a resolution and kill it, then we may say the injection of the toxin is an amendment, but we kill the resolution. This injection, I submit—not in its nefarious sense but as far as its end result is concerned—is a toxin that would kill the draft resolution before us. Of course, he did not intend it as such but I am dramatizing the question by giving an analogy.

125. With regard to the other question before us—whether or not we should adjourn today and come back to the question tomorrow—I do not know what is churning in the mind of my colleague from Ghana. I am sure he is a reasonable man. I have known him since he was appointed to his post, and I envy him his smooth tongue and cogent argument. He is a very capable Ambassador, and we are all proud to have him co-operate with us. However, if we want to dispatch our business, there are two ways open to us. We may either take a vote, as you have mentioned, Sir, on whether or not we should adjourn—and this calls for two speakers for and two speakers against the adjournment motion—or, as my colleague from Ghana himself has suggested, we may suspend the meeting for 15 minutes—we could have some elasticity and make it 15 or not more than 25 minutes—and vote forthwith, after he has had a chance to meet with the co-sponsors of the draft resolution. They may accept his suggestions—but he did not say “suggestions”. He has clear-cut amendments. In the First Committee, you may recall, I made suggestions twice this year. Many representatives came to me and asked, “Do you want to present them as amendments?”. I said, “I am not sure yet.” I did not present them as amendments, as I thought that might irk the two parties to a certain question. I said, “Let them have it the way they want.” If our colleague

from Ghana—and I should like to know what he thinks—wishes us to suspend this meeting for 10 to 20 minutes so as to give him an opportunity to consult the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, I should prefer that procedure. If he thinks it should be done tomorrow, I am reminded of the line from *Macbeth*: “Tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow”. We may have three morrows or four morrows, because this kind of subject generates debate. Self-determination is a very ticklish subject in the United Nations, a very inflammable subject and I may want to take the floor on the substance. I have been taking the floor on procedure. God help me and you when I begin my dissertation on self-determination. Do you think I have spent seven or eight years on it and I am going to say laconically what I think of self-determination? By Jove, I will see to it that this notion is examined in the light of what is happening in Africa, in Europe, in Asia and on the moon, if need be—for there is going to be self-determination on the moon too one day when it is populated. This is not a joke; this is a serious matter.

126. Therefore I forthwith request you, Mr. President, to ascertain from our colleague from Ghana whether he would opt for a suspension of, say, 20 minutes to see whether he and his colleagues could come to some sort of understanding with regard to the suggestions—I do not like to call them amendments, for I think he means that they are suggestions—or if he insists on having a full-dress debate on his amendments. If he would allow me to counsel him—he represents a sovereign State, and perhaps I have no right, but I say this to him, as a brother—I believe the first procedure of suspension may be in order. He may surprise us and tell us, “Let us vote and finish with the whole thing.”

127. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The General Assembly is considering a motion for the adjournment until tomorrow of the debate on the item under discussion. This motion was submitted as a point of order by the representative of Ghana. The representative of Saudi Arabia has now requested him to replace that motion by one for suspension of the meeting for 15 minutes. As I have heard no reply from the Ghanaian representative, I take it that his original proposal still stands, and in this connexion I call upon the representative of Indonesia.

128. Mr. SUDJARWO (Indonesia): We have before us a motion to postpone the debate. I am not quite clear about whether it is until tomorrow or for only 15 minutes. However, on the matter of suspension, I should like to say the following.

129. My delegation is always willing and prepared to accommodate other delegations in serious efforts to come to some kind of understanding with regard to draft amendments to be submitted, and so on. Indeed, this afternoon I myself had some conversations with my dear friend from Ghana and we tried, with the assistance of some other friends, to accommodate each other with regard to the joint draft resolution [A/L.574] and his amendments [A/L.576]. To be frank, however, there was no substantial progress. Of course, there was some progress made in mere matters of wording, but on the substance and the spirit of the matter there was no agreement, to my regret and certainly also to the regret of my friend from

Ghana. As I said, his amendments, in spirit and in substance, and also his introduction of the amendments, are entirely in disagreement with the spirit and the substance of the joint draft resolution we have submitted.

130. I have not committed myself to anything this afternoon, because I have to consult the other co-sponsors, especially with the Netherlands delegation. In the light of our discussions with our friends and among my own delegation, we fear that a suspension of the debate for any further talks or discussions would not result in agreement; the differences are really very great in both spirit and substance. I must say that they are honest differences and we have to respect each other. Still I do not feel that any further discussion can be fruitful, certainly not in a short time.

131. We are all anxious, however, that the vote be taken today. As a matter of fact, the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, His Excellency Mr. Luns, is leaving New York tonight. Therefore, having consulted with the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, and with other friends as well, we feel that adjournment will not result in any progress. I must therefore say, with regret, to my friend from Ghana that my delegation will vote against his motion for adjournment.

132. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) (*translated from French*): The Dahomeyan delegation strongly supports the motion for adjournment of the debate just made by the Ambassador of Ghana. We understand that negotiations have begun between the delegation of Ghana, which submitted the amendments distributed to us this afternoon [A/L.576] and some delegations which sponsored the draft resolution before us [A/L.574]. It is possible that agreement may be reached. Consequently, we feel that no effort should be spared to achieve that end. A more personal reason for requesting the adjournment of the debate is that my delegation intends to speak on the substance of the question we are now discussing.

133. On the other other hand, in view of the very important amendments which were submitted to us orally this morning [1812th meeting] by the Ghanaian representative, relating to the actual substance of our discussions, and which were only distributed to us this afternoon, it must be recognized that the situation has completely changed. In these circumstances, it is impossible for us to explain our position on these very important amendments within the framework of the present debate, and it would be still more difficult to take a decision on them. Consequently, my delegation hopes that a reasonably large number of representatives who find themselves in the same situation as ourselves will agree on the advisability of adjourning our debate, considering that there is no urgency about the question.

134. We are, of course, aware that some distinguished persons amongst us are particularly interested in this question and would like it to be dealt with as far as possible in their presence. But they had had ample opportunity to address the General Assembly and to make known their views. As for the decision they are awaiting, we do not think that the necessity for their presence is a sufficient argument for not postponing the debate.

135. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Assembly will now vote on the motion by the representative of Ghana for adjournment of the debate until tomorrow. A roll-call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Australia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Barbados, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Dahomey, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Ghana, Guyana, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Niger, Panama, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Cuba, France, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria.

Abstaining: Austria, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Italy, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Poland, Romania, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina.

The motion for adjournment was rejected by 42 votes to 30, with 42 abstentions.

136. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Since the motion for adjournment has been rejected, the debate will continue.

137. I call on those representatives who have asked for the floor in order to explain their vote.

138. Mr. LUNS (Netherlands): On Thursday of last week I had the honour of addressing this Assembly on behalf of the Netherlands delegation [*1810th meeting*] and quite a few representatives have referred in their statements today to what I said then.

139. Today we have heard a number of statements. Among them I would mention first those of the representatives of Dahomey and Ghana. I should like to assure the representative of Ghana that my delegation appreciates the spirit in which his statement was made. I may refer in this respect to the fact that my delegation has said—and we repeat now—that uppermost in our mind is the fate, the future of the people of New Guinea.

140. But when we cast our thoughts back to what happened in 1962 I cannot but remind the Assembly that

all the developments which preceded the Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands were, so to say, cut off by the fact that that Agreement was reached. Of course, my Government had in the years preceding the Agreement of 1962 made various proposals. One of these, as the Assembly well knows, was a proposal by the Netherlands Government to transfer to the United Nations the administration of the Territory, the whole set-up of the various Government agencies and the educational facilities provided for the Papuan people. The Netherlands Government was prepared to pay for this whole administration until such time as the United Nations saw fit to have the people exercise their right of self-determination.

141. However, that proposal was rejected by the Assembly and after that the new Agreement came. I am not concealing from my colleagues here that the acceptance of that Agreement probably required more heart-searching by the Netherlands than by our partner and friend Indonesia.

142. Now, as I explained in my previous statement, it is a fact—and various delegations have referred to that fact—that a very distinguished Bolivian diplomat, who gave his assistance under the Agreement to the act of free choice, has expressed some criticism, and some of it somewhat severe, about the conditions under which that act of free choice took place. But he added that, considering the whole picture of the circumstances of the country and everything else, he himself came to the conclusion that the act of free choice was carried out, if I may say so, in an acceptable manner.

143. I would echo what some of the speakers who preceded me have said, namely, that we should look to the future. We have heard from several sides—and I think the debate has been very useful in this respect—about the repeated assurances by the Government of Indonesia that the special conditions of the people of West Irian would be taken fully into account, that a measure of autonomy would be granted and that the two countries which have a special interest, Indonesia in the first place and the Netherlands, have reached agreement on a programme of financial assistance in order that the economic and social conditions of the population shall be improved.

144. In those circumstances, in view of the fact that the Netherlands is a co-sponsor of the draft resolution before the Assembly and notwithstanding the sympathy we feel for the delegations of Ghana and Dahomey and so many other African delegations which have expressed certain misgivings in very eloquent words, my delegation feels that it cannot give its vote to the amendments proposed by the representative of Ghana. We shall therefore abstain on those amendments.

145. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*translated from French*): We have listened carefully to the statements made from this rostrum on the question which is now before the General Assembly. We have also read very carefully the report submitted by the Representative of the Secretary-General [*A/7723 and Corr.1, annex I*] and closely examined the draft resolution under consideration [*A/L.574*], together with the amendments which have just been submitted [*A/L.576*].

146. The draft resolution in question invites us, in operative paragraph 1, not only to take note of the report of the Secretary-General, but also to express a value-judgement by acknowledging "with appreciation" the way in which the Secretary-General and his Representative fulfilled the tasks entrusted to them under the 1962 Agreement.

147. My delegation, basing itself on the extremely reserved judgement by the Representative of the Secretary-General of the extent to which he was able to render assistance, can only echo the same reservations. At the same time we neither criticize the procedure nor justify the method of self-determination adopted. Still less do we intend to challenge the results obtained. We merely note that there is a shadow, a shadow which the Netherlands representative did not dissimulate in his statement, and which the Representative of the Secretary-General notes in his report.

148. My sincerest wish is that the truth which this shadow conceals is indeed the expression of the real aspirations of the people of West Irian, who are primarily concerned. Otherwise, it is to be feared that tomorrow another truth will explode, by violence. The world—and Asia still less—has no need for that.

149. Finally, I should like to pay a sincere tribute to the Representative of the Secretary-General for his sense of justice in endeavouring to safeguard the rights of the people of West Irian and for his courageous report to the General Assembly.

150. I also note the undertaking by the Indonesia and Netherlands Governments to promote the economic and social development of West Irian. My delegation sincerely trusts that the Indonesian Government on the one hand, and the Irian people on the other, will find that their new relations mark the beginnings of a prosperous development of the entire community of peoples which have been thus united.

151. At the same time my delegation would like to state that although it is prepared to take note of the Secretary-General's report, it has some difficulty in believing that the United Nations shares the satisfaction expressed in the draft before us, when the Representative of the Secretary-General himself indicates that he was not entirely satisfied with the conditions he encountered in the accomplishment of his task. That is a simple fact and not an accusation.

152. In short, I should like the text of the draft resolution to correspond exactly to the role which the United Nations had agreed to play under the 1962 Agreement. If such a text can be found, my delegation will be willing to support it. Also, my delegation is in favour of the sixth and eighth amendments, provided that in the former amendment the words "and congratulates them" are inserted after the word "Representative", so that the text would read as follows:

"Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General and his representative and congratulates them on their efforts to fulfil their responsibilities under the Agreement of 1962 between Indonesia and the Netherlands."

The sponsor of the amendments agrees to this minor change, which I feel sure will not encounter any difficulty among Member States.

153. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) (*translated from French*): The Dahomeyan delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution [A/L.574], as submitted to us. We merely wish to express our most formal reservations concerning the way in which the destiny of a population of 800,000 persons has been decided. We wish to express the most formal reservations on the non-observance of the right of self-determination of a colonial people and a colonial territory. However, as regards the amendments submitted by the Ghanaian delegation [A/L.576], inasmuch as their main effect, if adopted, would be to ensure the better exercise of a people's sacred right of self-determination, the Dahomeyan delegation will vote in favour of them. If the text of the draft resolution is amended accordingly, it would be ready to vote in favour of it as well.

154. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Assembly will proceed to vote in conformity with rule 92 of the rules of procedure. It will vote first on the amendments in document A/L.576. In the absence of any motion for division, the Assembly will vote on the amendments as a whole.

155. I call upon the representative of Ghana, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

156. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana): I regret very much to have to interrupt you, Mr. President, but I did not quite understand what you meant by "division". If you were asking whether delegations wished to vote on the amendments separately, I would make that request.

157. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): At the request of the representative of Ghana separate votes will be taken on the amendments in document A/L.576. I put to the vote the first Ghanaian amendment, which is to replace the fourth preambular paragraph by the following:

"Having received the report of the Secretary-General and his representative on the latter's work in Indonesia following the Agreement".

158. I call upon the representative of Thailand, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

159. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): Please forgive me, Mr. President, for interrupting your statement in this way. It was not my intention to adopt such a crude method. But my delegation had wished to speak on the subject matter raised by the representative of Ghana and we tried our best to draw your attention to our wish to speak on the subject, but because of the vastness of the General Assembly Hall and also because of the lighting, we were not noticed by you.

160. The request of the representative of Ghana for separate votes on the amendments proposed by his delegation might sound reasonable under normal circumstances. But my delegation, together with the five other sponsors of draft resolution A/L.574, deemed it appropriate to draw the attention of the Assembly, as the representative of

Indonesia already had the opportunity of doing earlier, to the fact that the amendments proposed by the delegation of Ghana, whether to paragraphs of the preamble or to operative paragraphs, do run counter to the spirit and substance of the contents of the draft resolution. Therefore, in all fairness to the draft resolution, I would plead that the General Assembly should refrain from voting on the amendments separately as proposed by the representative of Ghana and should allow us to vote on them as a whole, so as not to tamper with any particular paragraph of the draft resolution which the delegation of Thailand and other delegations have had the honour of sponsoring.

161. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): In view of the Thai representative's objection to the Ghanaian representative's proposal that the amendments should be voted on separately, I consider that we must apply rule 91 of the rules of procedure, which states:

"A representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment shall be voted on separately. If objection is made to the request for division, the motion for division shall be voted upon. Permission to speak on the motion for division shall be given only to two speakers in favour and two speakers against. If the motion for division is carried, those parts of the proposal or of the amendment which are subsequently approved shall be put to the vote as a whole. If all operative parts of the proposal or of the amendment have been rejected, the proposal or the amendment shall be considered to have been rejected as a whole."

162. Does any other representative wish to speak on this question?

163. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*translated from French*): My delegation has so far refrained from speaking on the question of whether or not the amendments submitted are acceptable and whether they are relevant to the draft resolution before us or depart from it.

164. We can understand that representatives are very divided on the question of whether all the amendments submitted, or only some, are relevant to or depart from the draft resolution. In my delegation's opinion, the best way to solve this problem is to vote on the amendments separately.

165. We believe that it would be in the best interests of our work if at this stage we were not obliged to take a position which would perhaps be different from the one we would have liked to adopt. Indeed, if the Assembly should decide against adopting the procedure of separate votes on these amendments, my delegation would be obliged to request a separate vote on certain parts of the draft resolution.

166. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Since no other representative wishes to speak on this question, the General Assembly will now vote on the Ghanaian representative's proposal that the amendments in document A/L.576 should be voted on separately.

The proposal of the representative of Ghana was rejected by 58 votes to 31, with 24 abstentions.

167. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Democratic Republic of the Congo): (*translated from French*): My delegation would like a separate vote on the words "Takes note of the Secretary-General" in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

168. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I put to the vote the amendments contained in document A/L.576. A representative has requested a roll-call vote.

Gabon, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Gabon, Ghana, Guyana, Israel, Jamaica, Kenya, Sierra Leone, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Barbados, Central African Republic, Dahomey.

Against: Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lybia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France.

Abstaining: Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Austria, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland.

The amendments were rejected by 60 votes to 15, with 39 abstentions.

169. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We will now turn to draft resolution A/L.574.

170. The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo has proposed that a separate vote should be taken on the words "Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General" in paragraph 1. I put these words to the vote.

Those words were adopted by 80 votes to 6, with 14 abstentions.

171. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Assembly will now vote on paragraph 1 as a whole.

172. I call on the representative of Malaysia, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

173. Mr. SOPIEE (Malaysia): I am afraid there has been some confusion in the voting that has just taken place because we were all caught unawares as to what was in fact intended. If I understand rightly, the representative of

Thailand came to this rostrum earlier and made a very important proposal opposing voting separately on the amendments submitted by the representative of Ghana [A/L.576]. In his closing remark I think he also made the point that it was the intention of at least the majority, if not all, of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/L.574 that that draft resolution should be taken as a whole also and not be voted on separately.

174. I would urge that we should reconsider the voting that just took place, because most of us did not know what we were voting on. I would suggest we go back and vote again on this draft resolution as a whole, rather than in parts.

175. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I think that some explanation is called for. When the Ghanaian representative proposed that the amendments in document A/L.576 should be voted on separately, the Thai representative objected. The proposal was put to the vote and the majority decided that the Assembly should vote on the amendments as a whole, not separately. But in my opinion, that applied solely to the amendments.

176. We are now voting on draft resolution A/L.574. But the motion for division by the Democratic Republic of the Congo was submitted after the Thai representative's proposal.

177. My understanding is that the representative of Malaysia objects to a separate vote. I therefore feel that we shall have to treat draft resolution A/L.574 in the same way as the amendments in document A/L.576. Accordingly, rule 91 of the rules of procedure would apply, which states:

“A representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment shall be voted on separately. If objection is made to the request for division, the motion for division shall be voted upon . . .”.

178. Nevertheless, with a view to a better understanding, I wish to point out to the Malaysian representative that the voting had already begun and that his proposal that we should vote on the draft resolution as a whole was perhaps made a little late. I would therefore ask him to withdraw it.

179. Mr. SOPIEE (Malaysia): I crave your indulgence for bringing up this little matter, especially at this late hour of the day, but I felt in all honesty that we were not given a chance to express our views regarding the proposal to vote separately. However, in a spirit of co-operation, in a sincere desire not to delay the proceedings any further and with the wish and hope that we can dispose of this matter very quickly, my delegation is prepared to withdraw the proposal that it just made.

180. However, our delegation feels that one way of approaching this might have been the other way round. If we had put to the vote first the part of the paragraph which starts with “and acknowledges” and ends with “the Netherlands, and if that part had been approved, the acceptance of the paragraph as a whole would not have been complicated. However, we are prepared to go along with what you have done, Mr. President, and we agree to proceeding as you suggested.

181. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I wish to thank the representative of Malaysia. We shall now vote on paragraph 1 as a whole.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 86 votes to none, with 27 abstentions.

182. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on draft resolution A/L.574 as a whole. A roll-call vote has been requested.

Mongolia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Niger, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Zambia, Barbados, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Dahomey, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Ghana, Guyana, Israel, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 84 votes to none, with 30 abstentions [resolution 2504 (XXIV)].

183. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I will now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

184. Mr. ZIKIE (Ethiopia): My delegation abstained from voting on the amendments submitted by the delegation of Ghana for the simple reason that we had no time to study them. They were circulated only this afternoon.

185. Mr. ARYUBI (Afghanistan): My delegation voted for draft resolution. We voted against the amendments proposed by the representative of Ghana.

186. In explanation of our vote for the draft resolution and against the amendments I should like to say that the draft resolution only takes note of the Agreement concluded between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West Irian.

187. We maintain our firm position on the question of self-determination, a question which was not the subject of discussion under the draft resolution submitted on the item before the General Assembly.

188. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in full awareness of the importance of the question with which it dealt.

189. My delegation wishes to congratulate Mr. Ortiz Sanz, the Representative of the Secretary-General, whose report [*A/7723 and Corr. 1*] has been extremely useful to us.

190. We would like to point out that for years we have been following the procedure for putting an end to

colonialism in the island of New Guinea or West Irian, and we are gratified that this long and complicated process has now been completed. We would also like to express the hope that, now that the people of West Irian form part of Indonesia, they will be able to co-operate in the building of a great and powerful nation, and that, together with the rest of Indonesian territory of ancient standing, they will enjoy all the rights which will enable them to develop their own particular talents and to exercise self-determination within the framework of a nation which has emerged as a result of the completion, by this Organization, of its task of decolonization.

The meeting rose at 7.5 p.m.