



CONTENTS

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 . . .	1
---	---

*President:* Miss Angie E. BROOKS (Liberia).

**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 (A/7723 and Corr.1)**

1. The PRESIDENT: The report of the Secretary-General regarding the act of self-determination in West Irian [A/7723 and Corr.1], a letter dated 11 November 1969 from the Permanent Representatives of Indonesia and the Netherlands to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General [A/7763] and a draft resolution submitted by Belgium, Indonesia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, the Netherlands and Thailand [A/L.574] are now before the Assembly.

2. Mr. MALIK (Indonesia): The General Assembly has before it a report of the Secretary-General [A/7723 and Corr.1], dated 6 November 1969, on the implementation of an Agreement between two Member States, Indonesia and the Netherlands, signed in New York on 15 August 1962,<sup>1</sup> an Agreement in which the Secretary-General was entrusted with certain tasks. The Agreement itself, being a bilateral one, was merely "taken note of" by the General Assembly in its resolution 1752 (XVII) of 21 September 1962.

3. In that resolution the General Assembly acknowledged the role of the Secretary-General and authorized him to carry out the tasks entrusted to him in the Agreement. The first task of the Secretary-General was to set up a United Nations Temporary Executive Authority in West Irian, as an instrument for the transfer of the administration from the Netherlands Government to the Indonesian Government. The transfer of full administrative control to the Government of Indonesia took place on 1 May 1963.

<sup>1</sup> Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian)—see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 437 (1962), No. 6311, pp. 273-291.

4. The accomplishment of that task was reported to the General Assembly by the Secretary-General in a report<sup>2</sup> which was also "taken note of" by a plenary meeting of the General Assembly held on 6 November 1963 [1255th meeting].

5. The present report of the Secretary-General relates to his second and final task, which was the dispatch of a special representative who, on his behalf and pursuant to article XVII of the Agreement, was to "assist, advise and participate" in the arrangements for the act of free choice of the people in West Irian.

6. The arrangements for that act of free choice, which was to take place in 1969 and has now been completed, were, according to the terms of the Agreement, the responsibility of the Indonesian Government. In accordance with article XXI, paragraph 1, of the Agreement both the Indonesian Government and the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Ambassador Ortiz Sanz, have submitted reports to the Secretary-General on the conduct and results of the act of free choice. Those two reports, presumably for practical purposes, have been annexed to the Secretary-General's report now before this Assembly.

7. From those reports Members of this Assembly can read clearly that the Indonesian Government has carried out its responsibility to hold an act of free choice for the people of West Irian, under the terms of the New York Agreement of 1962, with the assistance, advice and participation of the Secretary-General's representative in the arrangements therefor.

8. All details on the question are comprehensively described in those reports. The special difficulties of the area, geographical as well as human, have been pointed out; the political background of the New York Agreement has been explained; sentiments regarding that Agreement, both in Indonesia and the Netherlands, have been mentioned. As far as Indonesia is concerned, I refer to my earlier statement in this Assembly during the general debate on 1 October 1969 [1744th meeting]. The Indonesia-Netherlands Agreement of 1962 cannot be separated from the Indonesian struggle for the freedom and independence of the whole of Indonesia, the former "Netherlands East Indies", of which West Irian was an integral part.

9. The implementation of the Agreement, as it has now been completed, is therefore not merely the honouring of an international agreement with the Netherlands, but is the end of a long road, the end of a long, difficult and thorny struggle for the freedom, unity and independence of a

<sup>2</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighteenth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 20, document A/5578.

nation, the Indonesian nation. Whatever the difficulties, political, technical or otherwise, which the Indonesian Government has had to surmount in implementing this last phase of the Agreement, as evidenced in the reports, my Government has accomplished its task and fulfilled its responsibility under the Agreement with the utmost care and dedication. I must stress that it was not only a matter of international concern but also one of national importance with all its intricate and emotional aspects. That has been elaborated on in my Government's report.

10. It is easy, of course, for one to criticize the implementation of a complex and even controversial political exercise—and that was indeed the case with the arrangements for, and the holding of, the act of free choice—especially when one tries to measure it with so-called international standards, which usually means the application of “Western” standards to conditions and situations in Asia, which those standards do not necessarily fit. And particularly for West Irian, known to be one of the most undeveloped areas in the world, one should have specific consideration for specific circumstances. One should also take into account the complex political background of the question, inseparable as it was from the Indonesian revolution for freedom and independence. We also have our own democracy, our own laws and regulations pertaining to the promotion of the welfare and progress of our own people, and our own methods for their implementation.

11. Since the full establishment of our administration and responsibility in West Irian in 1963, the progress made by the people, especially in the social and cultural fields, has been tremendous indeed. To mention one small example, in 1962 elementary schools, which offered only a three-year course, numbered 809, with 49,844 schoolchildren, while in 1969 those schools, which have been upgraded to a six-year course, numbered 1020, with 94,634 pupils. In 1962 there was only one senior high school, with 43 students. In 1969 there are 21 senior high schools, accommodating 1,847 students, or more than forty times as many as in 1962. Numerous educational facilities in all practical fields have been opened for the West Irian youth in the whole of Indonesia. A university has been established in Djajapura which now has about 600 students, of whom about 60 per cent are sons and daughters of West Irian itself. This is a development of great importance. The socio-cultural level of the people has been greatly improved and consequently their human dignity, as citizens of a free and independent nation, has been advanced.

12. The Governor of the province of West Irian, Mr. Frans Kaisiepo, the Speaker of the Provincial House of Representatives, Mr. Dirk Ajamiseba, and one of the West Irianese members of the Indonesian Parliament, Mr. Lucas Jouwe, all native sons of West Irian, are now here present with our delegation in this Assembly. They represent the people of West Irian, who have gained freedom, progress and self-esteem in the Republic of Indonesia. It should be known that many sons and daughters of West Irian participated in the national struggle for the freedom and independence of Indonesia, with all the sacrifices entailed.

13. As it is the most undeveloped part of Indonesia, the Indonesian Government has given special attention to the development of that area, in particular to the needs and

progress of its population. This is no more than our national duty. For, after all, it is because of these considerations and our concern for the freedom and progress of our brethren in West Irian that, since 1950, the Indonesian Government and the whole Indonesian people have fought for the liberation of West Irian, prepared to sacrifice life and blood for their sake.

14. Therefore, it sounds extraordinary to Indonesian ears when some people outside Indonesia profess to have more concern regarding the welfare of our people in West Irian than the Indonesian Government and people themselves.

15. After the positive result of the act of free choice in West Irian, my Government, under the personal attention of President Suharto himself, embarked upon the acceleration of the development of its people in West Irian—one of the twenty-six provinces in the Republic—to bring their condition up to the level of the other parts of Indonesia. Special task forces for urgent branches of development are being created to serve in West Irian, especially for areas in the interior. Special attention is being given to the social, cultural and educational conditions of the people, particularly the young. The further education of about 200,000 children of school age in West Irian should now be guaranteed for attending schools mostly already available in West Irian itself. For that purpose President Suharto has set up a special project called the “humanitarian project”, to be sustained and financed by the Indonesian people themselves. It is a great and noble task, to which the Indonesian Government has consciously and willingly committed itself.

16. The result of the act of free choice in West Irian has been reported by the Secretary-General in his present report. The people of West Irian have, through their elected representatives in the consultative assemblies, firmly expressed their will to remain a part of the Republic of Indonesia. For those who have adequate knowledge of the background and history of the West Irian question and the history of the Indonesian revolution for national freedom, the decision and outcome of the act of free choice in West Irian could not have been a surprise. On the contrary, such a decision was only legitimate and logical, in the interest of the people in West Irian themselves and their future. Nobody can deny, as is acknowledged in the reports, that the act of free choice in West Irian, held between 14 July and 2 August 1969, despite all kinds of difficulties was exercised and completed in a peaceful and orderly way. This was certainly an achievement in itself. It was indeed a strengthening of Indonesian national unity and the confirmation of the territorial integrity of the Indonesian Republic, of which West Irian had already constituted administratively a province; in the former Netherlands East Indies, West Irian—at that time called the “re\_ncy” of New Guinea—was also an administrative district within the national unity of Indonesia. The Indonesian Parliament in its decision of 18 September 1969 regarded the results of the act of free choice as an important contribution towards the preservation of peace in South-East Asia.

17. It is a matter of gratification that in the implementation of this last phase of the Agreement my Government has had not only the co-operation but also the understanding of the Secretary-General, U Thant, and of his

Special Representative, Ambassador Ortiz Sanz, and, due to the ever-growing friendly relations with the Netherlands, the understanding of the Netherlands Government. Criticism has sometimes been voiced in some quarters in the Netherlands and elsewhere, but we believe that one should not remain emotionally stuck to the unsatisfactory situation of conflict before and up to August 1962, but should be guided rather by the fact that the 1962 Agreement was, after all, a peaceful solution and the termination of a long-standing dispute between the two countries which was not the least in the interest of the peace, welfare and future of the people of West Irian itself. Moreover, West Irian today is not the West New Guinea of 1961.

18. The result of the act of free choice, as reported by the Secretary-General, is legal, conclusive and irrevocable. I agree fully with the Netherlands Prime Minister, Mr. de Jong, in his statement of 15 October last before his Parliament, that what now counts is not the past but the future. Cognizant of this fact, and in the framework of the most friendly relations now existing between Indonesia and the Netherlands, my Government has welcomed the Netherlands Government's interest in contributing to the efforts of my Government to promote and accelerate the progress and welfare of our people in West Irian. The Fund for West Irian was instituted in 1963 because of a generous Netherlands contribution of \$30 million in the course of three years, and now the Netherlands Government is again prepared to contribute initially another \$5 million to a special fund which my Government, in co-operation with the Netherlands Government, is contemplating creating with the Asian Development Bank. A joint statement on this matter was issued in Manila on 10 November 1969 by both the Netherlands Minister for Development Co-operation, Mr. Udink, and the Indonesian Minister of Finance, Mr. Ali Wardhana. The text of that joint statement has been circulated to members of this Assembly [A/7763].

19. Needless to say, the Netherlands Government, on its part, has already complied with the provisions of article XXI, paragraph 2, of the Agreement, in that it has recognized and abided by the result of the act of free choice in West Irian, as has been reported by the Secretary-General. This was clearly pronounced by the Prime Minister of the Netherlands, in his statement to Parliament to which I referred before.

20. That generous and continued co-operation and understanding of the Netherlands Government should therefore at least be acknowledged by this Assembly.

21. As far as my Government is concerned, it can be seen from its report that the Indonesian Government is paying special attention to the acceleration of the development of the people in West Irian, both in terms of physical and administrative efforts and in terms of specific allocations from the national budget. I am pleased to note that the Secretary-General in his report acknowledges these specific efforts of my Government and people, when he says that he is

“...encouraged to note from the report of the Government of Indonesia its determination to concentrate the efforts of the Government and the people of

Indonesia on the development and progress of West New Guinea (West Irian).” [A/7723 and Corr.1, para. 4.]

22. In the light of all this understanding and co-operation, the Indonesian and the Netherlands delegations have jointly sponsored, in co-operation with others, a draft resolution [A/L.574] which has been duly distributed to Members of this Assembly. After the detailed explanations given, both in the report of the Secretary-General and in my present statement, I do not think I should elaborate further on the text of the draft resolution. The considerations contain only the recalling of some relevant historical data and what the parties to the Agreement (Indonesia and the Netherlands) are now undertaking in common efforts, and the operative part of the draft resolution is, in this context, self-explanatory. We firmly believe that if this draft resolution is adopted it will constitute the best and most constructive attitude this Assembly could take concerning the report of the Secretary-General, while encouraging the continued co-operation of friendly nations in the United Nations for Indonesia's efforts in the proper fulfilment of a national task towards its people in West Irian. This resolution will, moreover, augur well as a salutary conclusion of a United Nations participation in the peaceful solution and final termination of a long dispute and conflict between two Member States, confirming its commendable replacement by mutual and friendly co-operation and understanding, in the interest of peace and progress.

23. Therefore I earnestly recommend this draft resolution for unanimous adoption by this Assembly.

24. Mr. LUNS (Netherlands): Today's discussion of the item entitled “Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian)” constitutes in more than one respect the last page of a long chapter, a chapter in the history of more than one nation, an episode in the history of the United Nations. The story is one of strife and conflict, of sorrow and disappointment, of unfulfilled expectations, but, given the necessary patience and goodwill, it may actually contain a promise of future co-operation. All the elements in this story are embodied in the Agreement of 1962, which did not come into being without hesitation and doubts on the part of the Netherlands.

25. I do not intend at this juncture to trace in detail its origin and previous history. The official records of the General Assembly and its Main Committees provide ample material for the purpose. They also set forth the motives that led us to conclude and ratify the Agreement. Suffice it to state that the interests of West Irian and its population have been our paramount concern. We shall continue to translate this undiminished concern in a concrete fashion which will reflect the modified circumstances.

26. In conformity with the provisions of the Agreement, the Secretary-General has submitted a report to this Assembly regarding the act of self-determination in West Irian. As he states, the act of self-determination has now been completed. The method whereby it was accomplished and the outcome are set forth in the two statutory reports submitted by the Indonesian Government and by the Secretary-General's Representative, Ambassador Ortiz Sanz.

27. At this stage I wish to express the grateful feelings of my Government towards the Secretary-General for having appointed as United Nations Representative a person with the high qualifications of Mr. Ortiz Sanz. This eminent Bolivian diplomat, whose integrity and intelligence were proven when he represented his country at the United Nations, has acquitted himself of his delicate task in a manner which may be called exemplary for all future cases where the United Nations is called upon to provide advice, assistance and participation.

28. A few moments ago I referred to hesitation and doubts on the part of the Netherlands with respect to the 1962 Agreement. They were not removed in the final phase of the Agreement's implementation. It is true that the responsibility for the organization and implementation of the act of free choice in West Irian rested entirely with the Indonesian Government. Yet all the phases of the act of free choice, including the interim reports thereon submitted by Mr. Ortiz Sanz, were followed closely in the Netherlands. I should be less than frank if I were to disguise the fact that both in the Netherlands Parliament and in our Press renewed doubts have been expressed as regards the method whereby the will of the people was ascertained and, more particularly, the circumstances under which they had to exercise their right of self-determination. These sentiments were conveyed to the Secretary-General and to the Indonesian Government at the time. Now Mr. Ortiz Sanz's final report confirms that, to a certain extent, those doubts were not unjustified.

29. In spite of that fact the Netherlands Government 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. If certain elements of doubt remain, I wish to reiterate what I said in the First Chamber of the States-General on 25 June 1969, namely, 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, which left sufficient latitude for the Indonesian interpretation. Accordingly, I think no useful purpose would be served by commenting further on the manner in which the act of free choice took place or on the outcome.

30. In May 1969 constant consultations between the Governments of Indonesia and the Netherlands led to a meeting in Rome between the Indonesian Foreign Minister, myself and the Netherlands Minister for Development Assistance. At that time we did discuss the implementation of the provisions of the Agreement of 1962 but we also looked ahead and held extensive discussions about economic and social development in West Irian.

31. In a joint statement following the discussions in Rome it was made clear that the two Foreign Ministers would remain in close touch, in the realization that the Agreement of 1962 was signed in a spirit of common concern for the future of West Irian.

32. Although, as I said at the beginning of my address, today's discussion constitutes the last page of a long chapter in the history of more than one nation, history will continue its course. As far as the Netherlands is concerned, we shall strive to guide that course towards understanding,

co-operation and mutual efforts to attain the development of West Irian. If we have been able recently and under greatly changed conditions to pursue a policy calculated to further the interests of West Irian, it is in no small measure due, as Mr. Malik has pointed out, to the re-establishment of good relations between the Netherlands and Indonesia. Indeed, it is the best course for the foreseeable future. We have noted with satisfaction that Indonesia fully understands and appreciates our position.

33. It is in that spirit of mutual understanding that the Netherlands Government is prepared, in close co-operation with the Indonesian Government, to seek new ways of contributing to the economic and social development of West Irian and to the well-being of its peoples.

34. In this context I should like to mention the satisfaction felt in the Netherlands at the assurances given by the Indonesian Government as to granting a degree of autonomy to West Irian. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General, in paragraph 252 of his excellent report [A/7720 and Corr.1, annex I], rightly drew attention to that wise decision of the Indonesian authorities. The special conditions prevailing in the territory and the characteristic needs of its population fully justify a status which underlines this situation. I likewise welcome the declaration of the Indonesian Minister of the Interior on the "Irianization" of the administration, as mentioned in paragraph 237 of the report of Ambassador Ortiz Sanz. Finally, may I be allowed to express the hope that a generous and general amnesty will be proclaimed by the Indonesian Government.

35. Immediately after the transfer of sovereignty over West Irian, the Netherlands participated in an extensive programme directed towards the accelerated development of West Irian. For some years now the Fund of the United Nations for the Development of West Irian has been actively engaged in executing a number of highly important projects. We trust that the competent experts who have been leading the Fund will continue to lend their valuable services in the completion of the projects which that Fund has initiated.

36. Since even more extensive assistance of a more diversified nature was considered essential for the well-being of the peoples of West Irian, we also discussed in Rome the modalities for such assistance and the future undertaking it entails. I am happy to announce that on 10 November 1969, only three days ago, the Indonesian Minister of Finance and the Netherlands Minister of Development Co-operation reached agreement on a proposed new fund. That, too, was mentioned by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia, who preceded me on this rostrum. The Ministers met with the President of the Asian Development Bank at Manila and discussed with him the establishment of a new fund to be administered by that international institution. I sincerely hope that other countries will see fit to add their contributions to those already pledged by the Governments of Indonesia and the Netherlands.

37. From the foregoing it will be clear that at this juncture the Netherlands wishes to direct its attention to the future. We wish to reaffirm our continued interest in the future of the people of West Irian. The accomplishments of this

desire will take shape through the combined efforts of Indonesia and the Netherlands. With that particular goal in mind, my delegation presents to the Assembly a draft resolution [A/L.574] that goes beyond a formal acceptance of the report of the Secretary-General.

38. The draft resolution, which I have the honour to propose on behalf of the delegations of Indonesia, Belgium, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Thailand and, naturally, my own country, the Netherlands, in fact addresses itself mainly to the future. It does not limit itself to established facts, but underlines the importance of speedy progress by the people of West Irian in their social and economic development. The spirit of this draft resolution is one of hope for the realization of steadily improving conditions in that vast territory. To this the Netherlands subscribes and I hope that the Assembly will lend its invaluable support to these aspirations by its action and its vote today.

39. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Dahomey on a point of order.

40. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) (*translated from French*): I have asked to speak on a point of order on behalf of the delegation of Dahomey in order to inform you of the difficulty my delegation faces with regard to the discussion now in progress and the decision which the General Assembly is being requested to make.

41. We are not alone in experiencing this difficulty. Yesterday several delegations contacted you, Madam President, to inform you of it. The report of the Secretary-General and of his Representative in New Guinea [A/7723 and Corr.1] on which we have to take a decision after officially noting its contents has only just been communicated to Members of the General Assembly. It was published last Thursday, 6 November, the last but one working day of the week, and was therefore actually received by the majority of delegations only this week and, for many of us, only yesterday or the day before.

42. It is a bulky document of more than one hundred mimeographed pages, with which we here have not been able to acquaint ourselves because of the circumstances I have just described. Obviously, therefore, we have not been able to transmit it to our respective Governments for study and for instructions on the attitude we should take during the discussion of this item. That is why we urgently request that further discussion and any decision on this item should be postponed for at least ten days or two weeks. This is a relatively short period in view of the fact that we have to send this bulky document to our respective Governments by post and allow them time to study it and to send us their instructions. Some delegations have even asked for a postponement of several weeks, but we are asking for a period of between ten and fifteen days only.

43. Out of courtesy to the Foreign Ministers of the Netherlands and Indonesia, who have come to New York to make statements on the situation, we did not wish to raise this point of order at the beginning of the meeting, but only after they had both made their statements.

44. We hope that this courtesy will be reciprocated and that the difficulty in which the circumstances have placed

us will be understood. This is a reasonable request which we are submitting as a point of order under rule 73 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which provides that:

“During the discussion of any matter, a representative may rise to a point of order, and the point of order shall be immediately decided by the President in accordance with the rules of procedure.”

45. The PRESIDENT: Under rule 73 of the rules of procedure:

“During the discussion of any matter, a representative may rise to a point of order, and the point of order shall be immediately decided by the President in accordance with the rules of procedure.”

I understand the point raised by the representative of Dahomey but, as President of the General Assembly, I should like, if the representative of Dahomey will permit, to hear the views of other delegations.

46. I give the floor to the representative of Saudi Arabia.

47. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I really feel constrained to oppose the point of order of my brother from Dahomey and the request involved in it to the effect that the item before us should be suspended for ten days so as to give our respective Governments an opportunity to study the report.

48. I find it my duty not to delve into motives or into the substance of this question because we might vitiate the purpose of the draft resolution which has been submitted by several States in good faith. It is my understanding—and I stand to be corrected—that the report was submitted by the Secretariat on 8 November 1969. Going by precedent where there have been reports that were voluminous—the description applied by our colleague from Dahomey to the present report—agenda items involving voluminous reports have been dealt with forthwith and sometimes on the same day as two or three days after the reports had been issued. I do not see why in this particular case our friend from Dahomey has a particular interest in seizing his Government of the situation by referring the report to it *in toto*. He could very well have sent a cable stating the salient points of the report and in the interval since last Saturday would have received by this time a reply on what the wishes of his Government are.

49. In practice, should he or any one of us refer this document to our respective Governments I submit, from my knowledge of Governments, that it may take them fifteen or twenty days to look into it and another ten or fifteen days to study it. In other words, the suspension will yield no practical results.

50. We had the privilege of listening to two Foreign Ministers on the item. I for one looked at the sponsors of the draft resolution [A/L.574]. I found that none other than Belgium, Luxembourg, Malaysia and Thailand—leaving aside the Netherlands and Indonesia—have sponsored it, and I have faith in them that they would not have lent their support to the report hastily.

51. I had an opportunity to look at the voluminous report—and it is truly voluminous—and could find many enlightening points which were synthesized, or rather expressed in a summary way by both Foreign Ministers. I do not see any grounds whatsoever for suspending the discussion on this item. If we do suspend it, by vote, then let me warn my colleagues that the reports on the question of disarmament are more voluminous than this document before us. If we were to follow this precedent of suspension this session would be paralysed and we would not be able to proceed with our work in an orderly manner and with dispatch. What would prevent any one of us, for his or his Government's own reasons, when we deal tomorrow with certain questions in the First Committee, asking for a postponement of ten days so that his Government may delve into the whys and wherefores of certain questions on disarmament, which is far more important than the present question.

52. Therefore, whilst reserving my right to speak again should there be debate on this procedure, I appeal to my brother from Dahomey to take what I said into consideration, having been here long enough to know that were we to set such a precedent we may indeed defeat our own purpose.

53. Mr. SUDJARWO (Indonesia): It is rather difficult for my delegation to understand why the debate on this item should be postponed as suggested by the representative of Dahomey.

54. The date for the discussion of this agenda item was, if I am not mistaken, arranged and fixed well in advance—I believe on 9 October 1969—by the General Committee [183rd meeting] and made known to all Members of the Assembly on the next day, 10 October 1969.

55. The report of the Secretary-General was distributed at the end of last week—I believe on 8 November 1969—so that to our mind delegations have had ample time to study it. Also the draft resolution was distributed in due time yesterday and as a matter of fact it is a very simple draft resolution that is self-explanatory, so that we believe it needs not much discussion or study before being voted upon.

56. The Foreign Ministers of the two parties concerned in the Agreement—the Netherlands and Indonesia—have come to this Assembly today from, respectively, The Hague and Djakarta specially for this discussion. They have stated their position and their thoughts on the matter, as representatives have heard this morning, and recommended the adoption of the draft resolution [A/L.574] which they have jointly supported. They are, in fact, the two most interested parties in the question before the Assembly today. I believe that everything should now be clear to everyone in the Assembly and therefore everyone should be prepared to vote on the draft resolution before us.

57. My delegation finds it very difficult to understand why there should be this postponement. The report of the Secretary-General regarding the result of the act of free choice in West Irian, which has been recognized and respected by the two parties concerned—the Netherlands and Indonesia—in fact constitutes the end, the conclusion

and the termination of the problem dealt with in the Agreement, which, as a matter of fact, has now been crowned by a happy relationship between the two countries.

58. Again, the draft resolution before the General Assembly should not create any problem for any delegation in casting its vote. Therefore, my delegation would prefer the draft resolution to be voted upon today—if, of course, no other delegations wish to speak.

59. Mr. LUNS (Netherlands) (*translated from French*): I have listened with much interest, sympathy and certainly with understanding to the statement by the representative of Dahomey which preceded the discussion on the point of order we are now considering. I should, however, like to point out that, as the representative of Saudi Arabia has said, this would certainly not be the first time that the Assembly had had to take a decision on a question placed before it only two days previously. We have been considering the question of New Guinea, the question of West Irian, for many years and it seems to me that most delegations—and certainly such delegations as those of Dahomey and other countries which have shown so much interest in this question in the past—might perhaps have foreseen the decision which the Assembly would be called upon to take today. I have listened with interest and sympathy to, and am also in full agreement with, the statement which Mr. Sudjarwo, the Indonesian Ambassador, has just made from this rostrum.

60. In the interests both of those countries which need a certain time for which I might describe as “rumination”, before they can assume their responsibilities, and of the two countries mainly concerned—Indonesia and the Netherlands—and in view of the fact that both Governments and also both Foreign Ministers are unfortunately concerned with other matters, I wonder whether a compromise proposal might not be acceptable to Dahomey and the other countries requesting an adjournment. I therefore propose that, if unanimous agreement cannot be reached, the vote should be postponed until next Monday, 17 November 1969, and if that should still be too difficult, next Tuesday. But, from a rather selfish point of view, I propose Monday, thus leaving open the possibility for all delegations to study the report and if necessary to postpone this item further until next Tuesday. I hope that unanimity can be reached on this proposal.

61. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): When I asked for the floor I had intended to speak only on the point of order raised by the representative of Dahomey, but the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands has now made a suggestion which is designed to be a compromise between a long postponement of the debate and a vote on Monday, 17 November 1969.

62. My delegation has a great interest in this matter because we feel that the question of West Irian, its origin and subsequent developments represent a chapter in the history of Asia, and particularly that of the South-East Asian region in which Thailand is situated. We regard that act of free choice undertaken by the Government of the Republic of Indonesia as an act also of good faith and, as a close neighbour and one which has the best possible

relations with Indonesia, the Government of Thailand was gratified to see that the act of free choice was conducted fairly and to the satisfaction not only of the people of West Irian, but also of the Government of the Netherlands, which was directly interested in the question.

63. My delegation was particularly gratified to hear the representatives of Indonesia and the Netherlands, in their statements this morning, stress understanding and co-operation.

64. We feel that this Assembly should attempt to give encouragement, goodwill and good wishes to those two Governments and to the people of West Irian. We believe that if the Agreement and the manner in which the act of free choice was conducted are acceptable to the two parties most directly concerned we, the other Members of the General Assembly, should do nothing other than give them our goodwill and good wishes.

65. I should like to support the opposition of the representative of Saudi Arabia to the move to adjourn the debate, as suggested by the representative of Dahomey. On the other hand, if—as suggested by the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands—it is the unanimous agreement of the Assembly that the debate and the voting should be postponed until 17 November 1969 and if that is acceptable to the delegation of Indonesia, my delegation would have no objection to such a procedure.

66. Mr. SEVILLA-BORJA (Ecuador) (*translated from Spanish*): I wish to say a few words in support of the point of order raised by the representative of Dahomey. In my view, the question we are discussing is of great importance and we should consider it with great care.

67. The fact is that the Secretary-General's report was made available to delegations three days ago and the draft resolution only this morning. Many delegations, including my own, have had difficulty in carrying out the necessary consultations and will not find it easy to take a decision. The compromise formula proposed by the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands under which the vote would be postponed until next Tuesday should, in my view, be given due consideration.

68. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana): I have listened very carefully to the statements which have been made on the procedural proposal submitted by the representative of Dahomey. I was impressed by the courtesy and respect which the representative of Dahomey has accorded to the Foreign Ministers of Indonesia and the Netherlands. I should like, however, to disagree with the statement of the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia that in meeting the request of the representative of Dahomey we would be establishing a dangerous precedent. In fact, both in this Assembly and in its Main Committees, several precedents have already been established. Where a representative has felt very strongly that the time was not ripe for a decision to be taken or for a debate to be terminated, I think the reaction of Members has always been to meet that request.

69. I believe that we are dealing not only with a subject which is of great consequence to the people of West Irian and to the Governments of the Netherlands and Indonesia

—with both of which my country has the friendliest relations—but also with a principle of great interest, concern and consequence to the United Nations as a whole.

70. We cannot just rush into taking a decision concerning the destiny of a people when some of us feel that we have not had sufficient time to consider the report dealing with the matter. It has been said that the report was distributed last Saturday. My Mission is not open on Saturday, and I am sure that applies to many other Missions here. In fact, it is not unknown for documents, even when we have been assured that they have been distributed on a certain date, not to reach the hands of representatives. We did not receive the present report in my Mission until about two days ago. I say this not out of any desire to make difficulties for the Secretariat, but merely to indicate what is known to be a fact: that very often documents do not reach us when they should.

71. In listening to the intervention of the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands I was struck by the fact that throughout his speech he seemed to have some mental reservations. He said, for example, that some doubts which had been expressed as to the methods by which this act of self-determination had been effected were not unjustified. In consulting in the corridors with many of my colleagues on this matter, I have felt that that is actually the case, that doubts have been raised in the minds of certain of our colleagues as to the whole course and method by which the act of free choice was effected.

72. I am not here to go into the merits or the substance of the case. I have come here merely to speak about the procedural proposal made by my friend and colleague the representative of Dahomey. Since this is a matter which is of such great concern to many Governments and which should naturally be of great concern to the United Nations as a whole, since the documentation apparently was not received in time for many Governments to consider the matter very seriously, and since we should be acting in accordance with precedent if we were to accede to the request of the representative of Dahomey, I do not see any reason why the simple proposal he made could not be given the consideration it deserves.

73. It has been said that the date for the consideration of this matter was fixed as long ago as 10 October 1969, but my delegation is not convinced by that argument. It may be true that the General Committee fixed a date for the consideration of this matter, but in the absence of the early distribution of the documentation that date has no consequence at all. Since it has come to light now that many delegations did not receive the documentation until a few days ago, I do not think that the argument that the General Committee fixed today as the date for the discussion of this item has much weight. What we are concerned with here is that a matter of such importance should not be rushed by this Assembly. It may be that this may mean some inconvenience to the Foreign Ministers of the Netherlands and Indonesia. We would hope that that would not be the result. But if it were to be the result, we would say that our attachment to the principle that is involved is greater than our friendship for the Governments concerned—and I am sure they would be the first to understand.

74. I therefore humbly submit that we should give very earnest consideration to the very simple request which has been made by the Ambassador of Dahomey. After all, he is not asking for a suspension of the debate. If I understood him correctly, what he was asking for was that a decision on the resolution should not be taken now or in the next few days; but that the debate could go on and the draft resolution could be taken in about ten to fourteen days. When we consider the formulation of the draft resolution, when we are asked to take note, with approval, of the actions taken by the representative of the Secretary-General, I must submit that we are being called upon to commit ourselves to something which is really serious, bearing in mind the basic substantive matter of the item under consideration.

75. I therefore hope that the request of the Ambassador of Dahomey will be given the favourable and sympathetic consideration that it deserves.

76. Mr. OHIN (Togo) (*translated from French*): I have asked to speak to support the proposal made by my friend and colleague, the Ambassador of Dahomey. I have taken the floor because when my country was under the trusteeship of the United Nations, I had the privilege of receiving United Nations missions which had come to study the measures adopted to lead us towards independence. I saw that very often and virtually everywhere—and this is true of Indonesia—these missions encountered hindrances and faced great difficulties created by the Administering Authorities. Consequently, any report submitted by a mission returning from a Trust Territory or non-independent country must be studied with great care.

77. The Secretary-General's report [*A/7723 and Corr.1*], at which I have only been able to glance rapidly, leaves many questions open for discussion. As the speakers who preceded me have emphasized, this report was only distributed to us a few days ago. The Ambassador of Saudi Arabia has advised us to make a brief summary of it for transmission by cable to our Governments. That is all very well. But it is essential that our Governments should define their points of view and send us their instructions through the Foreign Ministers, especially since the Foreign Ministers of the Netherlands and Indonesia have come here to discuss the matter. This is not a mere procedural point: we are deciding the future of a people.

78. I was rather shocked by the discussion which took place a few moments ago, in which only the relations between the two administering countries concerned, the Netherlands and Indonesia, seem to have been taken into account. The fate of the inhabitants of West Irian, the Papuans, seems to have been relegated to the background of the discussion, which has mainly centred on the position of the two administering countries. But a country administering a non-self-governing territory has certain responsibilities. It must focus attention on the area under its protection in order to bring it to independence under the best possible conditions. This responsibility towards non-independent countries is, in fact, a responsibility of mankind as a whole. The problem is important. Decisions cannot be taken lightly. I greatly appreciate the fact that the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands has found a compromise. But will this compromise give us enough time

for discussion: In essence, his proposal has the same purpose as that of the Ambassador of Dahomey, who would like the decision to be taken only after a certain lapse of time. I wish to ask the Assembly to consider the proposal put forward by the Ambassador of Dahomey, which my delegation strongly supports, with the greatest attention. I would like to reiterate that, in taking decisions here, we must not only consider the views of the administering countries and the decisions which they take, but must also take into account the opinion of the people who are most directly affected by our decisions.

79. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Gabon.

80. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) (*from the floor*): Point of order.

81. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly is discussing a point of order.

82. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) (*from the floor*): There is disorder.

83. Mr. DAVIN (Gabon) (*translated from French*): The delegation of Gabon has the same difficulties as the delegation of Dahomey concerning the discussion of the Secretary-General's report regarding the act of self-determination in West Irian [*A/7723 and Corr.1*]. The problem which we are about to study is of paramount importance. The seriousness of the matter requires that full attention and consideration should be devoted to its examination.

84. The Secretary-General's report regarding the act of self-determination in West Irian was not submitted to us until last Monday, 10 November, that is, only three days ago. This means that my delegation has not been able, in so short a time, to make a thorough study of such an important and voluminous document. Nor has it had an opportunity to transmit it to its Government.

85. We have asked for this document several times since the beginning of our work. Each time we were told that it was not yet ready. We therefore thought that, precisely because of this delay, the item concerning the act of self-determination would be discussed after delegations had had sufficient time to acquaint themselves with the report and to obtain instructions from their Governments. But to my delegation's surprise, we are expected to discuss the report now, although we have only just received it. My delegation believes that this procedure is unjustified and that so much haste is not conducive to a serious and thorough discussion leading to a decision taken in tranquillity and after mature reflection. That is why we endorse the comments of the representative of Dahomey. We associate ourselves with his request that the vote on the draft resolution should be postponed for about two weeks so that we may consult our Governments and obtain instructions from them enabling us to take positions conforming to their views on this important problem, the gravity of which—I again emphasize—is not consistent with such precipitate haste.

86. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) (*translated from French*): My delegation greatly appreciates the interest which has

been shown in the reasonable request which it made earlier. That request in no way reflected any ill-will with regard to the matter under discussion. We believe that it was fully justified, and quite a number of Members of the Organization have indeed endorsed it and made it quite clear that they were in the same difficult situation as ourselves.

87. I was particularly impressed by the courtesy shown by the sponsors of the draft resolution submitted to us this morning, in particular, by Mr. Luns, the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, who showed that he understood the real difficulty which we faced as a result of the circumstances.

88. However, in view of the request which he made to my delegation—and through my delegation to all delegations in the same situation—to shorten the period of postponement, which I had suggested should be between ten days and two weeks—rather than several weeks as some other delegations would have wished—my delegation would be prepared to request, under rule 76 of the rules of procedure, that the debate on the item should be adjourned for one week.

89. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with rule 76 of the rules of procedure, I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia.

90. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Madam President, I did not mean to attract attention when I was standing in front of the Hall and said that there was disorder in the Assembly. With your permission, I should like to refer to the statements which elicited that remark from me.

91. Our colleague from Dahomey asked to speak on a point of order and his request was granted. The substance of his point of order was to suspend the discussion on the item before us. As you very rightly explained, Madam President, that point of order was raised under rule 73. If we are going to be governed by procedure, I have something to which rule 76 applies. I was one who spoke in opposition to that point of order, and, Madam President, you could have called on another representative to speak in opposition to it.

92. In order not to bring about more confusion, I shall read out rule 76 for the benefit of those who have spoken. Rule 76 reads:

“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.”

I must say, Madam President, that you have been very generous with all the speakers, including myself.

93. There is another point to which I should like to draw your attention, Madam President. Geographically speaking, with respect to seating location in this hall, some of us are very far from the officers who inscribe our names on the list of speakers, whether to speak on a point of order or to

speak on any item in the debate. The practice has been in the past—I do not know whether it has changed—for those Members who wish to speak on the substance of a subject to go and give their names to the officer seated at the table in the front of the hall on my right. But that practice did not cover those who wished to speak on points of order. The inscription of names to speak on points of order should be recorded by the gentleman who is sitting next to you, Madam President. Otherwise, by the time anyone having a point of order walked from the rear of the hall to the table at the front, several other Members could put points of order—and that would result in discrimination in the submission of points of order.

94. However, we shall forget all that. We have to have order in the Assembly and I am sure, Madam President, that you are a stickler for order, because I know you have presided very efficiently over meetings of committees and sub-committees of the General Assembly.

95. I spoke against the suspension of the debate, and another representative, I believe, spoke against the suspension of the debate. Out of courtesy to the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, who had something to contribute to the procedural debate, you allowed him to speak. He requested our colleague from Dahomey to accept a certain reasonable compromise, namely, that the voting on this subject should be postponed until Monday, 17 November 1969, or Tuesday at the latest. And then there was confusion. More than three or four Members spoke in favour of the postponement of ten days. That is where the irregularity crept in. I submit that after we had heard two speakers in favour of the suspension of the discussion and two speakers against the procedural motion should have been put to the vote.

96. Madam President, I request you to be kind enough and gracious enough not to allow this procedural debate to continue, but to put the motion of suspension to the vote without any further delay. If that is not done, may I ask you or the gentleman sitting next to you to look at the left side of the hall so that if I ask to speak on a point of order I may be called upon again.

97. The PRESIDENT: I wish to say that the request was made by the representative of Dahomey under rule 73 and the President did not wish to exercise her right under that rule. That is why she allowed discussion to take place. I would prefer at this time, because of the interest of the people concerned and because of the conciliatory spirit shown by both sides, to have us agree on a further compromise. That compromise would be to adjourn the meeting until Wednesday, 19 November 1969. The representative of the Netherlands suggested Monday or even Tuesday, the representative of Dahomey suggested a week's delay, and the margin is between the two. I think that Wednesday would be acceptable to both sides. If there is no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.*