

48. Mr. KOH (Singapore), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that, in fact, the Committee had before it a twofold motion: on the one hand, the closure of the debate, and on the other, the vote on the draft resolutions before it. His delegation was in favour of the first part, but so far as the second part was concerned, it agreed with the representative of Yugoslavia that the vote on the draft resolutions before the Committee should be deferred, as one of them (A/C.4/L.1132) had been introduced only that morning and the other had been modified by various amendments. The delegations had not had time to receive instructions from their Governments, so that it would be reasonable to grant a postponement. It would therefore be

better if the two parts of the Portuguese motion were put to the vote separately.

49. Mr. BAUDOUIN (Canada) moved the adjournment of the meeting until the following day, in accordance with rule 118 of the rules of procedure, and pointed out that, according to rule 119, his motion took precedence over that of the representative of Portugal.

The Canadian motion to adjourn the meeting was adopted by 49 votes to 21, with 34 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

2188th meeting

Thursday, 11 December 1975, at 11.05 a.m.

Chairman: Mrs. Famah JOKA-BANGURA (Sierra Leone).

A/C.4/SR.2188

AGENDA ITEM 88

Question of Territories under Portuguese administration (continued) (A/9998-S/11598, A/10023/Add.1, A/10040, A/10054, A/10055, A/10058, A/10207-S/11811, A/10208, A/10209-S/11813, A/10212, A/10214, A/10227, A/10277, A/10353, A/10402-S/11887, A/10403-S/11890, A/C.4/802, A/C.4/803, A/C.4/808 and Corr.1, A/C.4/L.1131-1134, A/C.4/L.1135 and Add.1, A/C.4/L.1136)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Committee had before it two draft resolutions on the question of Timor (A/C.4/L.1131 and A/C.4/L.1132) and four sets of amendments to draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131.

2. She pointed out that at the previous meeting the representative of Portugal, under rule 117 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, had requested the closure of the debate on agenda item 88, and that the representatives of Senegal and Saudi Arabia had spoken against that motion. If there were no further objections, she would take it that the Committee agreed to the motion.

The Portuguese motion was adopted.

3. Mr. RIFAI (Secretary of the Committee), referring to the financial implications of draft resolutions A/C.4/L.1131 and A/C.4/L.1132, informed the Committee that the Secretary-General expected the costs of their implementation, in particular the dispatch of the proposed fact-finding mission, to be financed from the appropriations for the over-all programme of work for the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples for 1976, and that the adoption of the draft resolutions would therefore not entail any additional financial implications.

4. The CHAIRMAN, replying to a request for clarification by Mr. RICHARDSON (United Kingdom), explained that the Committee would vote first on the amendments to draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131, then on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 as a whole, and finally on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1132.

5. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), speaking on a point of order, said he hoped that delegations which had proposed amendments would have an opportunity to introduce them and explain the reasons for them.

6. Speaking on his own amendments to draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131, which were contained in documents A/C.4/L.1135 and Add.1, he observed that, after having listened with interest to the statements made at the previous meeting, he had reached the conclusion that many delegations thought that Indonesia had acted in an arbitrary manner with the intention of annexing Portuguese Timor, and it appeared from draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 that Indonesia had been guilty of a reprehensible act. Yet Indonesia had no designs on the people of Portuguese Timor and it certainly intended to comply with the recommendations of the fact-finding mission which it was proposed to send to the Territory. The amendments he proposed to the draft resolution did not alter it radically and were indeed intended to allay any doubt as to the annexationist aims of Indonesia and to avoid any imbroglio in the Far East and any forces of infection which might be caused by foreign interference. They were also aimed at giving a clear picture of the real situation which currently prevailed in the Territory, where the "administering Power" was no longer administering. He then proceeded to read out his amendments.

7. He expressed the hope that the representative of Indonesia would give the Committee an assurance that it was not his country's ultimate ambition to dominate Portuguese Timor unless the people of the Territory decided, in the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination, to unite themselves with the fraternal people living on the other side of the frontier.

8. Mr. YANGO (Philippines) said that he wished first of all to state that the amendments which the representative of Saudi Arabia had just introduced in essence supplemented the amendments which he himself would introduce and which appeared in document A/C.4/L.1136.

9. The events that had occurred in Portuguese Timor could not fail to be of interest to the Philippines, which was in the same region. His delegation did not feel it was appropriate to condemn Indonesia before the Committee had clear and first-hand information regarding the real situation in Portuguese Timor. The United Nations should instead endeavour to work out practical measures, which would make it possible to safeguard the inalienable rights of the people of the Territory. As a matter of priority, the United Nations should put an end to the anarchy and help to guarantee the maintenance of peace and order in the Territory, and all States should ensure that the Territory did not suffer from any power vacuum which would threaten peace in the region.

10. Referring to paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131, he said that the Committee should not hastily prejudge Indonesia's action. At the talks held at Rome on 1 and 2 November 1975 between the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Portugal and Indonesia, it had been agreed that the responsibility for the Territory rested with the administering Power and that Portugal would convene a meeting of political parties from the Territory to consider the way in which the people of Portuguese Timor could decide on their future political status. Indonesia had declared that it would help towards that end. But, before it had been possible to hold that meeting, one political party had unilaterally proclaimed the independence of the Territory. On their side, the other political parties had expressed their desire to integrate Portuguese Timor with Indonesia. Referring to paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, he pointed out that the representative of Indonesia had stated at the previous meeting that his country was ready to withdraw from Portuguese Timor, that it supported the right of the people of the Territory to self-determination, and that it would welcome a United Nations presence in the Territory. It was important to note that the people of Portuguese Timor had invited Indonesia to help them in the situation in which they found themselves and that, moreover, Indonesia had felt its security threatened.

11. The amendments submitted by his delegation in document A/C.4/L.1136 were worded in general terms and did not prejudge the situation in Portuguese Timor. They were in keeping with the policy followed by the Philippines with regard to decolonization.

12. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria), speaking on a point of order, observed that the aim of the amendments submitted by Saudi Arabia in document A/C.4/L.1135/Add.1 was in fact to replace the whole of the operative part of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 with the exception of paragraph 1. In the circumstances, they could not be regarded as amendments, since in fact they constituted a new draft resolution. He hoped that the Chairman would take a decision in that connexion and, if necessary, would apply the relevant provisions of the rules of procedure. Moreover, although he did not intend to reopen the debate, he pointed out to the Committee that the question before it

should be judged on the facts and that the amendments submitted by the representative of Saudi Arabia referred solely to good intentions, with which, as the proverb said, the road to hell was paved.

13. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), speaking on a point of order, observed that it had only been a concern to submit a clear text, which would not be weighed down and obscured by the direct introduction into the original version of the amendments which he wished to make to it—as frequently happened with texts amended in that way—that had led him to reformulate the whole of the operative part of the draft resolution. However, if members of the Committee would consider his text carefully, they would see that it in no way changed the nature of the original draft resolution.

14. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia), speaking on a point of order, said he wished to know whether delegations would have an opportunity to explain their vote before the vote on the draft resolution as a whole once the amendments had been voted on. His delegation hoped that they would.

15. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the Committee had a large number of amendments before it. It seemed to him, however, that only some of them were currently under consideration.

16. The CHAIRMAN explained that the Committee was in the process of considering and voting on the four sets of amendments submitted to it. Mauritania and Thailand had introduced their amendments at the previous meeting; it was therefore only normal that the Committee should discuss the subsequent amendments at the current meeting.

17. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the explanations given by the sponsors of the amendments that had just been introduced (A/C.4/L.1135 and Add.1 and A/C.4/L.1136) had been very useful in convincing those members of the Committee who might still have had doubts on the matter that the amendments could not be supported. The point of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 was to secure the right of the people of Timor to determine its future in a manner consistent with the goal of peaceful decolonization. However, East Timor had been invaded by Indonesia, and the amendments represented an attempt to convince the members of the Committee that that State had done nothing wrong. The countries of the third world, which maintained excellent relations with Indonesia in many areas, were bound to recognize in the current instance that Indonesia was wrong. No one could deny that Indonesian forces were in Timor; otherwise it would scarcely be necessary, under the terms of the new paragraph 5 proposed by the representative of Saudi Arabia, to call upon "the Government of Indonesia to co-operate with the United Nations fact-finding mission . . .". That Government claimed that Indonesian forces had entered East Timor in order to go to the aid of the people. However, according to all available information, the people were being terrorized. Therefore, if Indonesia really wanted to help the people of Timor, it should first withdraw from the Territory and allow it freely to determine its own future. It was clear that the Indonesian Government had sought to create a fait accompli enabling it to justify what it had done. Adoption of the amendments submitted by Saudi Arabia (A/C.4/L.1135 and Add.1) would be tantamount to

establishing an unacceptable precedent—unacceptable, especially, to all of the small countries because it would offer a pretext to all States that had ideas of expansion to justify their aggressive schemes. Moreover, the representative of Saudi Arabia had amended paragraph 6 of the original draft to read as follows:

"Draws the attention of the Security Council to the question in the event the situation in Portuguese Timor becomes so critical as to threaten the peace and security of the region".

But the press everywhere had reported the Indonesian Government's repeated statements that the situation in the region was critical and that security and stability there had been seriously endangered. That was a fact, but it should be borne in mind that that situation had come about precisely because of the Indonesian invasion.

18. Therefore none of the Saudi Arabia amendments was acceptable, and his delegation would vote against the new draft resolution constituted by these amendments.

19. Mr. BARREIRO (Paraguay) said that he would like to know whether the Committee was in the process of adopting the proposed amendments. If so, he would support Australia's proposal that the explanations of vote should be given before the voting on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 as a whole. A reopening of the debate should be avoided under any circumstances.

20. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee was about to vote on the amendments to draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131, and she observed that the representative of Australia had merely made a suggestion. Furthermore, she pointed out to the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania that the proposals of the representative of Saudi Arabia were to be regarded as amendments to the draft resolution in question and that therefore rule 130 of the rules of procedure, relating to the voting on amendments, would apply.

21. Mr. ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen) said he also hoped that, in order to save time, the Committee would support the proposal of the representative of Australia and that the delegations would explain their vote only when the time came for the adoption of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 as a whole, since that draft resolution might in any case be substantially changed.

22. Mr. KAMARA (Senegal) agreed with the representative of Democratic Yemen and asked for an immediate vote on the amendments.

23. Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal) said that the delegations that wished to do so had the right to present their explanations of vote before the voting, both with respect to the amendments and with respect to the draft resolution as a whole.

24. Mr. WU Miao-fa (China) said that his delegation wished to make a few observations before voting. The amendments submitted by the representative of Saudi Arabia (A/C.4/L.1135 and Add.1) had radically changed the basic content, and thus the nature, of the original draft

resolution. The situation in Timor was serious. East Timor had been invaded by Indonesian forces. The Fourth Committee should condemn that invasion and demand the immediate withdrawal of the Indonesian forces. It was absolutely necessary to preserve the right of the people of East Timor to independence. The amendments submitted by the representative of Saudi Arabia were aimed at justifying Indonesia's aggression, and his delegation would therefore vote against them.

25. Mr. PAQUI (Benin) pointed out to the members of the Committee that the debate in progress completely missed the point. Two facts had to be kept in mind—that Timor had already proclaimed its independence and that its territory had been invaded by Indonesia. The draft resolutions before the Committee implied that the problem was one of a country to be decolonized, whereas actually it was purely and simply a matter of military aggression being perpetrated against an independent country, an aggression which was merely being deplored when it ought to be categorically condemned. The amendments proposed by Saudi Arabia were neither fish nor fowl, and his delegation could not support them. It would therefore vote against those amendments.

26. Mr. KOUAMÉ (Ivory Coast) said that his delegation would vote against all of the amendments in documents A/C.4/L.1134, A/C.4/L.1135 and Add.1 and A/C.4/L.1136, because none of them approached the problem with the proper perspective. The amendment submitted by the Philippines (A/C.4/L.1136), which would quite simply delete paragraphs 4 and 5, was particularly unacceptable. If it had really been necessary, his delegation might, in a spirit of co-operation, have considered a new version to limit the implications of paragraphs 4 and 5, in view of the confusion prevailing in the territory, but it certainly could not accept their outright deletion. In those circumstances, it would vote against all the amendments, except for those in document A/C.4/L.1133, submitted by Thailand, on which it would abstain because the text proposed by Thailand for paragraph 2 was not satisfactory.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 had been amended several times and that the Committee, in accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure, would therefore vote first on the amendment furthest removed in substance from the original proposal, then on the amendment next furthest removed from it, and so on until all the amendments had been put to the vote.

28. She announced that the representative of Guinea-Bissau had requested a roll-call vote on all the amendments before the Committee.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the Saudi Arabian amendments in paragraph 1 of document A/C.4/L.1135/Add.1.

The Central African Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Chile, Colombia, Egypt, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Jordan, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, Bahrain.

Against: Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Zambia, Albania, Algeria, Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Botswana.

Abstaining: Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kuwait, Laos, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada.

The amendments were rejected by 47 votes to 22, with 48 abstentions.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the Mauritanian amendments in paragraph 1 of document A/C.4/L.1134.

Fiji, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Fiji, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Jordan, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, Australia, Austria, Canada, Chile, Egypt.

Against: Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Zambia, Albania, Algeria, Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia.

Abstaining: Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kuwait, Laos, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador.

The amendment was rejected by 41 votes to 29, with 47 abstentions.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the Saudi Arabian amendment in document A/C.4/L.1135.

Honduras, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Jordan, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Chile, Egypt, Fiji.

Against: Iceland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Mozambique, Nepal, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Zambia, Albania, Algeria, Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana.

Abstaining: Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kuwait, Laos, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Singapore, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of).

The amendment was rejected by 48 votes to 19, with 51 abstentions.

29. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said it was becoming clear that delegations were now voting out of solidarity and not on the basis of the merits of the proposed amendments themselves. That was an unproductive attitude and one which he deplored. Nevertheless, in order to avoid a voting process which would from now on be purely mechanical and based on an automatic majority, his delegation was withdrawing all the other amendments it had submitted in document A/C.4/L.1135/Add.1.

30. The CHAIRMAN thanked the representative of Saudi Arabia for his co-operative spirit.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the Mauritanian amendment in paragraph 2 of document A/C.4/L.1134.

Singapore, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Chile, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Jordan, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia.

Against: Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper

Volta, Venezuela, Zambia, Albania, Algeria, Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone.

Abstaining: Singapore, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kuwait, Laos, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Poland, Romania, Rwanda.

The amendment was rejected by 46 votes to 20, with 52 abstentions.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the Thai amendment in paragraph 1 of document A/C.4/L.1133.

The Ivory Coast, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Japan, Jordan, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, Afghanistan, Austria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Egypt, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran.

Against: Jamaica, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Zambia, Albania, Algeria, Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana.

Abstaining: Ivory Coast, Kuwait, Laos, Madagascar, Mongolia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy.

The amendment was rejected by 38 votes to 28, with 52 abstentions.

31. Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan) asked the representative of Guinea-Bissau not to press for a roll-call vote on the rest of the amendments.

32. Mr. ARAUJO (Guinea-Bissau) agreed to the request of the representative of Pakistan.

The Thai amendment in paragraph 2 of document A/C.4/L.1133 was rejected by 38 votes to 24, with 39 abstentions.

The Philippine amendment in document A/C.4/L.1136 was rejected by 50 votes to 21, with 48 abstentions.

33. Mr. JAIPAL (India), speaking on a point of order, said that, for the reasons given by the representative of Saudi Arabia in connexion with the amendments he had submitted to draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1132 would not press their draft to a vote.

34. The CHAIRMAN suggested that if there was no objection, delegations should explain their vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131 before it was put to the vote.

It was so decided.

35. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia) said that draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131, on which the Committee was about to vote, had the merit of combining all the points of importance of an earlier draft resolution (A/C.4/L.1125/Rev.1), with the incorporation of an amendment subsequently proposed by Australia and other delegations. Those points continued to be valid in spite of recent developments; the proposed draft emphasized the right of the people of Portuguese Timor to the free choice of their future political status. It was clear that that people had a choice between direct accession to independence and independence attained by joining the people of Indonesia.

36. Indonesia inevitably was affected by the tragedy in Portuguese Timor and was concerned that the Territory should not become another Angola. In seeking to restore law and order in the Territory, Indonesia wished not only to protect the inhabitants and bring to an end a situation which threatened to disrupt Indonesian Timor but, above all, to establish the necessary preconditions for a proper expression by the Timorese people of their own wishes regarding their political future.

37. The draft resolution called upon Portugal to exercise its responsibilities as administering Power. It was, in fact, the inability of Portugal to exercise those responsibilities that had given rise to the current crisis and had moved Indonesia to intervene with a view to restoring order. While that objective was laudable, his delegation nevertheless deeply deplored the fact that Indonesia had thought it necessary to resort to force.

38. The question of Portuguese Timor would be taken up in the Security Council; Australia would seek to contribute to the Council's discussion on the basis of its detailed understanding of the facts and its sincere desire to help bring about a settlement, which, in its opinion, could be reached only by giving the people of Portuguese Timor the opportunity, so far denied to them, of exercising their right

39. The draft resolution dealt with questions which ought not to be prejudged by the Committee, since they were to be considered by the Security Council. In that connexion, his Government had reservations concerning paragraphs 4 and 5; however, it would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

40. His delegation, together with others, had been attempting to secure agreement on a few very simple amendments which would have avoided prejudging the action of the Security Council with respect to the modalities of withdrawing Indonesian forces and which would have avoided direct condemnation of Indonesia; such a resolution would have facilitated the co-operation of Indonesia, which was essential to a real solution. With those amendments, in paragraph 4 the General Assembly would have deplored any military intervention by foreign armed forces, and in paragraph 5 it would have called for the withdrawal without delay of all such armed forces from the Territory. The debate on the question was now closed, but he would pursue his efforts to produce a text acceptable to everyone in the plenary Assembly.

41. Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan) pointed out that, after 500 years of colonialist domination, the transfer of powers in most Territories of the former Portuguese empire had taken place in a peaceable and orderly manner; however, there had been a few exceptions, one of which was Timor. As the situation in that Territory was extremely complex, it was necessary to proceed with the utmost caution, in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter and, in particular, the principles of self-determination, the non-use of force and non-intervention.

42. It was understandable that Indonesia, Timor's neighbour, should be concerned about the Territory; such concern was legitimate and did not contradict Indonesia's respect for the right to self-determination. For his part, he was convinced that there was no reason to doubt Indonesia's professed desire to respect that right. Nevertheless, the fact that Indonesia had intervened by force could not be overlooked.

43. His country's relations with Indonesia had been inspired by feelings of fraternity and solidarity; many Pakistanis had taken part in Indonesia's struggle for independence, and Pakistan had played a role under the United Nations flag in reuniting West Irian with Indonesia. In view of the ties which linked it with Indonesia, his country regretted the need to call for the withdrawal of Indonesian forces from Timor. It would have preferred to see a draft resolution worded in a more appropriate manner, acceptable to all delegations. However, his delegation would vote in favour of the proposed text.

At the request of the representative of Sweden, a vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution A/C.4/L.1131.

El Salvador, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Zambia, Albania, Algeria, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador.

Against: India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, Benin.

Abstaining: Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Libyan Arab Republic, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Qatar, Singapore, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Egypt.

The draft resolution was adopted by 69 votes to 11, with 38 abstentions.

44. Mr. PAQUI (Benin), exercising his right of reply, thanked the representative of Saudi Arabia for withdrawing his amendments and thereby simplifying the work of the Committee. He regretted, however, that Mr. Baroody had accused the African countries of voting mechanically, out of a spirit of solidarity, and had spoken of an automatic majority. He wished to stress that his country was proud of its solidarity with other countries in the struggle for decolonization but that it had never accepted compromise when principles were involved.

45. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said he had meant only that in the existing circumstances the spirit of solidarity with a particular group prevented some delegations from seeing all the aspects of Indonesia's current difficult situation. Solidarity was not always on the side of fair play and justice.

The meeting rose at 1.50 p.m.