

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWELFTH SESSION

Official Records

GENERAL COMMITTEE 111th
MEETINGWednesday, 18 September 1957,
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Organization of the twelfth session of the General Assembly: memorandum by the Secretary-General	
Consideration of the agenda of the twelfth session and allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General.	1

Chairman: Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand).

Organization of the Twelfth Session of the General Assembly: Memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/146)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/BUR/146) on the organization of the twelfth session of the General Assembly.
2. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation generally supported the Secretary-General's observations and suggestions regarding the arrangements for the meetings of the General Assembly and its Main Committees during the twelfth session.
3. However, it saw no reason for the suggestion that, after the general debate on an item, a limitation of ten minutes on the time allowed for subsequent interventions and for explanations of vote should be the general practice (A/BUR/146, para. 2(c)). Rule 74 of the rules of procedure already provided that the General Assembly could limit the time to be allowed to each speaker and the number of times each representative could speak on any question; under rule 90 the time allowed for explanations of vote could be limited. A specific time-limit was therefore unnecessary. It was impractical and contrary to the democratic principles governing the United Nations. Paragraph 2 (c) should be deleted from the General Committee's recommendations to the General Assembly.
4. The USSR delegation also proposed the deletion of the suggestion in paragraph 2 (e) that, on points of order, the Chairman should immediately consider whether an intervention was a point of order and, if he so considered it, should give an immediate ruling in accordance with rule 73 of the rules of procedure. The point was fully covered in rule 73 and no specific ruling by the Chairman was necessary.
5. The CHAIRMAN observed that no specific action by the Committee was required on the Secretary-General's suggestions concerning the conduct of work. They were not intended to affect the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. The question of adoption or deletion did not arise, as the suggestions were submitted in a memorandum by the Secretary-General.
6. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) felt that the Secretary-General's suggestions might well be

endorsed by the General Assembly. They were intended to expedite the work of the Assembly, which now consisted of eighty-two Member States, while allowing every latitude for a full discussion of items.

7. The SECRETARY-GENERAL said that, while he had submitted certain suggestions, the General Assembly and its Main Committees would naturally decide on the course they wished to adopt. With regard to the time-limit on interventions and explanations of vote after the general debate on an item, the Committee would note that he had suggested that a limitation of ten minutes "should be the general practice". His suggestions were based on the experience of the General Assembly and its Main Committees.

8. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the Secretary-General had also suggested a time-limit at the eleventh session^{1/}. At that time, the Committee had adopted a proposal by India (107th meeting) that the Secretary-General's recommendation should be amended by adding the phrase "except on resolutions or substantive amendments". That amendment had not been included in the Secretary-General's present suggestion.

9. The CHAIRMAN said that the Chairman of each committee would be guided by the rules of procedure. The Committee would note the observations made by the representative of the Soviet Union.

10. He drew attention to the Secretary-General's suggestion that 14 December 1957 should be the closing date of the twelfth session.

The Committee decided to recommend 14 December 1957 as the closing date of the twelfth session.

Consideration of the agenda of the Twelfth Session and allocation of items: Memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/147 and Add.1/Rev.1)

11. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the agenda of the twelfth session as set forth in

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Annexes, agenda item 8, document A/BUR/142, para. 15.

The printed Official Records of the General Assembly are published in fascicle form, the record of each meeting being issued separately. In order that the fascicles may subsequently be bound in volumes by organ and session, the pagination is continuous throughout each series of records of a single body. At the end of the session, a prefatory fascicle is issued for each series, containing a table of contents, list of members, agenda and other prefatory matter.

After the close of the session, collated sets of fascicles will be placed on sale for the general public.

the memorandum by the Secretary-General (A/BUR/147). He drew attention to the change in the wording of item 24 as set forth in paragraph 3 of the Secretary-General's memorandum. Moreover, the Committee might act immediately on the Secretary-General's suggestion in paragraph 4 concerning sub-item (f) of item 42.

The Committee decided to recommend the deletion of sub-item (f) of item 42.

12. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that items 1 - 6 had already been taken up by the General Assembly. The Committee would now consider the items proposed for inclusion in the twelfth session of the General Assembly, beginning with item 7.

ITEMS 7 TO 57

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of items 7 - 57.

ITEM 58

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Averoff-Tossizza (Greece) and Mr. Esin (Turkey) took seats at the Committee table.

13. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSIZZAZ (Greece) said that his delegation once again deemed it necessary to request the inclusion of an item on Cyprus in the agenda of the General Assembly. It did so because the situation on the island had remained virtually unchanged despite the adoption by the General Assembly of its resolution 1013 (XI). While the situation in Cyprus had improved slightly in recent months, it remained serious. Archbishop Makarios had been released from captivity but had not been permitted to return to Cyprus, and repressive measures were still being taken against the civilian population. Moreover, the United Kingdom had not resumed negotiations with the people of Cyprus, as recommended by the General Assembly. In short, the United Kingdom had not complied with resolution 1013 (XI). It treated Cyprus like a colony and continued to deny the people of Cyprus their independence. It sought to solve the question of the status of their island without their participation. But a solution not based on freedom and justice would be no solution at all. Cyprus was and would remain a question of concern to the United Nations and that question must be solved in accordance with the principles of the Charter. The Government of Greece had therefore been requested by the people of Cyprus to bring the matter up again in the General Assembly.

14. On the question of the violations of human rights and atrocities by the British colonial administration against the Cypriots, the United Kingdom had not accepted an impartial investigation of the charges made by Greece the previous year. Prisoners were still being tortured by the local administration on the island of Cyprus, a fact of which the British people were not even aware. While the United Kingdom Government had probably not ordered the actions of which Greece complained, it refused to admit that they had occurred. In view of that negative attitude, of the moral and human aspects involved, and of the evidence which Greece was prepared to submit in support of its charges, the Greek delegation also asked for the inclusion of that aspect of the Cyprus question in the agenda of the General Assembly.

15. Mr. LLOYD (United Kingdom) said that his delegation objected to the inclusion of item 58 in its present

form. The application of the principle of self-determination was a matter exclusively within the jurisdiction of the United Kingdom. While his country had no reason to be on the defensive regarding its application of the principle of self-determination - the Federation of Malaya was a case in point - that did not affect the legal position.

16. Enosis was another factor. At the eleventh session of the General Assembly, the United Kingdom had introduced an item concerning support by Greece for terrorism on Cyprus^{2/} and certain facts had emerged during the debate on that item.

17. While the United Kingdom would not object to a discussion of the Cyprus question in the General Assembly, if such a discussion was deemed useful, it would vote against inclusion of the item in the form proposed by Greece.

18. The United Kingdom delegation would also vote against inclusion of sub-item (b) not because it would have any difficulty in refuting the charges but because one of the fundamental principles of the Charter was at stake. Under Article 2 (7), the United Nations was not competent to consider complaints against the internal administration of a Member State. That principle could not lightly be set aside without grave consequences. While he would not go into the substance of the charges, the fact remained that each charge had been examined and investigated. In the one or two cases in which a prisoner had been ill-treated, disciplinary action had openly been taken. The charge of "atrocities", however, was ridiculous.

19. The United Kingdom had taken a number of constructive steps in Cyprus since the previous year. It was the duty of the three Governments most directly concerned to relax the tension in the area. As at the ninth session of the General Assembly, a debate would add to the difficulty of procuring a settlement. However, if it was felt that such a debate on the Cyprus question might be fruitful at the present session, the United Kingdom would not object to the inclusion of an appropriate item in the agenda of the General Assembly; but it would vote against the inclusion of the item as proposed by Greece.

20. Mr. ESIN (Turkey) recalled that the island of Cyprus lay off Turkey's shores, that part of its population was Turkish, and that its status had been decided between Turkey, the United Kingdom and other countries in the Treaty of Lausanne, so that the subject was of direct interest to the Turkish Government.

21. The present item had been proposed by the Greek delegation for several years running, and the General Assembly had only very recently adopted a resolution on it (resolution 1013 (XI)). It was surprising that Greece should ask for another debate on the matter before the methods of settlement indicated in the resolution had been fully explored.

22. The fact that the Greek explanatory memorandum (A/3616/Add.1) had been submitted two months after the item itself seemed to show that the official reasons for submission had been prepared after the submission had taken place, and the wording of the item revealed a desire to use the forum of the United Nations for propaganda purposes. The Turkish Government fully supported the principle of self-determination of

^{2/} Ibid., agenda item 55, document A/3204 and Add.1.

peoples, which was mentioned in sub-item (a), but it could not agree that the principle should be invoked for the purpose of furthering annexation plans. Sub-item (b) was plainly in contravention of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter; and its language was reminiscent of the worst days of the cold war. His delegation wished to draw the attention of the General Committee to those views and reserved its right to speak on the matter on a later occasion.

23. Mrs. LIONAES (Norway) said her delegation would vote for the inclusion of the item, provided it was worded in a neutral form. She therefore proposed that it should be called simply: "The Cyprus question". Such a heading would permit a full discussion of the international aspects of the matter.

24. Mr. ABDOH (Iran) felt that the wording chosen by the Greek Government pre-judged the substance of the question, and he therefore warmly supported the Norwegian proposal.

25. Mr. PEREZ PEREZ (Venezuela), Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand), Mr. VAN ASCH VAN WJCK (Netherlands) and Mr. GUNewardene (Ceylon) also supported the Norwegian proposal.

26. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, although the question had been discussed a number of times, a pacific and just settlement had not yet been reached. It might have been expected that, in consequence of General Assembly resolution 1013 (XI), the United Kingdom Government would undertake negotiations with the people of Cyprus and recognize their right of self-determination, but unfortunately that people still remained under the colonial yoke in an island which had been turned into a vast concentration camp by martial law. There was no indication that the United Kingdom was taking any real steps to meet the wishes of the Cypriot people; on the contrary, plans for further militarization of the island were afoot. A further discussion of the matter was essential, and he therefore supported the item as proposed by Greece.

27. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) remarked that he had refrained from raising points of substance; but he now felt compelled to reply to some raised by other representatives. His Government took the position that the two parties to the controversy in Cyprus were the United Kingdom Government and the people of the island. Greece had no desire to annex Cyprus; its only concern was that the Cypriot people should be permitted to exercise their right of self-determination, and it would be content with any decision taken by that people in a free plebiscite.

28. Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, which had been invoked by both the United Kingdom and the Turkish representative, did not apply to Cyprus. The relevant article was Article 73. The United Kingdom Government had been the first to recognize that Cyprus was a Non-Self-Governing Territory, and had submitted reports on it under that Article. The people of Cyprus were separated from those of the United Kingdom by religion, language and origin, and, if Cyprus were to be claimed as part of the metropolitan territory of the United Kingdom, no region in the world would qualify as a Non-Self-Governing Territory. He was sure that the Committee would reject such an interpretation.

29. Furthermore, the item as proposed by his Government called for a discussion of violations of human rights - rights guaranteed in Article 55 of the Charter - and Article 10 plainly gave the General Assembly authority to engage in such a discussion. Lastly, the Greek Government would welcome a full investigation of the violations of human rights of which it complained; it was the United Kingdom Government that seemed to be unwilling to have them investigated.

30. The Norwegian proposal, which altered the wording of the item completely, instead of amending it, was contrary to rule 22 of the rules of procedure and was therefore out of order.

31. The CHAIRMAN remarked that rule 22 referred to action by the General Assembly in connexion with items already on the agenda, and did not apply at that stage of consideration of the agenda in the Committee.

32. Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) said that his delegation would vote for the inclusion in the agenda of that item and of all the other items, on the basis of four principles which governed its attitude regarding the inclusion of items:

(1) The principle of the free inclusion and discussion of items, as being the only principle consistent with the philosophy of the United Nations, although his delegation appreciated that political limitations might compel Governments to abstain or to oppose the inclusion of this or that question;

(2) Articles 34 and 35 of the United Nations Charter conferred a right and imposed an obligation on the General Assembly to consider, at least, "any situation which might lead to international friction";

(3) Two arguments might be used against those who unwarrantably cited Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter in opposing the inclusion of any item, or claimed that any particular matter fell "essentially" within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. The first was based on Articles 34 and 35 of the Charter because, when a situation might lead to international friction, the United Nations had jurisdiction to deal with it, even though it might have originated in the domestic sphere, although it was a matter of political judgement to decide how intense or grave any particular situation was. A second exception to Article 2, paragraph 7, could be based on the argument that matters of human rights were subject to international jurisdiction - an argument with which Guatemala had every sympathy, although it realized that constitutional limitations prevented many Governments from subscribing to it unreservedly;

(4) There were items concerning which the United Nations had already affirmed its competence on including them in the agenda or adopting resolutions concerning them.

33. He had no objection to sub-item (a) as proposed by Greece; since Cyprus was a Non-Self-Governing Territory, he could not agree with the United Kingdom representative that it was for the Administering Power alone to decide whether or not the right of self-determination should be granted to its people; the United Nations also had an interest in the matter. However, the wording of sub-item (b) possibly tended to prejudge the substance, although he was sure that that was unintentional. He therefore preferred the Norwegian proposal, but if it was rejected he would vote for the item as proposed by Greece.

34. Mr. GEORGES-PICOT (France) said he would vote against item 58 in its present form, for the reasons already explained by the United Kingdom representative.

35. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) strongly supported the item in its present wording.

36. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) supported the inclusion of the item for reasons given by previous speakers. The question had already been debated by the General Assembly and it was of direct interest to at least three Member States and of almost equally pressing concern to all Members of the United Nations, since it involved a dispute between a Government and a people anxious to exercise its right of self-determination.

37. Mr. LLOYD (United Kingdom) said that Article 73 of the Charter contained no provision on political development; consequently, as his delegation had maintained, Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter applied in the present case.

38. Since the Cyprus question undoubtedly had some international aspects, he would not oppose the inclusion of the item under that heading, in the hope that both the tone and the substance of the subsequent discussion would contribute to the pacific settlement which his Government so earnestly desired.

39. Mr. TSIANG (China) noted that the majority appeared to be in favour of recommending inclusion of the item as worded by the Norwegian representative. That wording was acceptable to him and he hoped it would be to the Greek representative. If it was not, a possible compromise might be to make sub-item (a) begin with the words "Question of" and sub-item (b) with the words "Complaint of".

40. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) said he was ready to accept the Chinese amendment.

41. Mr. ESIN (Turkey) stated that he would not oppose the Norwegian proposal.

42. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Norwegian proposal that agenda item 58 should be entitled: "The Cyprus question".

The proposal was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

43. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that his delegation had abstained on the Norwegian amendment because the original wording of item 58 was more appropriate.

44. Mr. TSIANG (China) said that he had not insisted upon the suggestion which he had put forward, and had voted in favour of the Norwegian amendment as it appeared to be supported by the majority of the Committee.

45. Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) said he had voted in favour of the Norwegian amendment because it would allow a full discussion of the Cyprus question in the General Assembly.

46. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) explained that his delegation would have preferred the Chinese suggestion, but had deferred to the majority in voting for the Norwegian amendment. His delegation interpreted the new title as being in no way restrictive; it should allow a thorough discussion of the Cyprus question.

47. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said that he had abstained on the Norwegian amendment because he preferred the original wording proposed by the Greek delegation.

48. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) expressed his surprise that the Norwegian proposal had been treated as an amendment whereas in fact it completely changed the wording of item 58. The suggestion made by the Chinese representative had been much more in the nature of an amendment. He shared the hope expressed by the Tunisian representative that the new title would enable the Cyprus problem to be discussed in all its aspects.

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of item 58 under its new title.

Mr. Averoff-Tossizza (Greece) and Mr. Esin (Turkey) withdrew.

ITEM 61

49. Mr. ABDOH (Iran), while approving of the inclusion of the item in the agenda, proposed that it should form part, as sub-item (c), of item 24.

It was so decided.

50. Mr. GEORGES-PICOT (France) proposed that in item 61 the word "nuclear" would be replaced by the word "modern".

It was so decided.

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of item 61 as amended.

ITEM 59

51. Mr. GEORGES-PICOT (France) said he would not oppose the inclusion of the question of Algeria - which came solely within the jurisdiction of the French Government - in the agenda of the General Assembly, as that would allow the French delegation to reply to the slanderous charges which had been brought against the policy followed by the French Government in a part of the metropolitan territory of France. The French delegation would open its files on the Algerian question so as to inform the Assembly of the truth, without necessarily entering into a debate on the subject.

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of item 59.

ITEMS 60 AND 62

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Botha (Union of South Africa) and Mr. Lall (India) took seats at the Committee table.

52. Mr. BOTHA (Union of South Africa) said that the South African delegation would protest against the inscription of the two items on the agenda of the General Assembly if the Committee recommended their inclusion.

53. Mr. LALL (India) recalled that on item 60 the General Assembly had adopted resolution 1016 (XI), to which the Government of South Africa had made no reply. For that reason alone it would be appropriate for the General Assembly to discuss the item again and see what further steps could be taken.

54. On item 62 the General Assembly had adopted resolution 1015 (XI) which, *inter alia*, had invited the parties to report as appropriate, jointly or separately, to the General Assembly. Unfortunately, the efforts

made by India to secure a joint report had met with failure and it had been forced to report separately. For that reason, the item should be placed again on the General Assembly's agenda.

The Committee decided to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of items 60 and 62.

Mr. Botha (Union of South Africa) and Mr. Lall (India) withdrew.

ITEM 63

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Casey (Australia) and Mr. Sastroamidjojo (Indonesia) took seats at the Committee table.

55. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia) took seats when Indonesia and the Netherlands had agreed in 1949 on the transfer of sovereignty over the whole territory of the former Netherlands East Indies to Indonesia, there had been no provision in the agreement or any subsequent agreement that West Irian or any other part of Indonesia should be excluded from the transfer.

56. When the transfer of sovereignty had taken place on 27 December 1949, it had been agreed by both parties that the question of the political status of West Irian should be determined by negotiation within a year. However, that year had passed without the expected results, and further negotiations had taken place. The most recent had been held between December 1955 and February 1956 in Geneva. Unfortunately, all those negotiations had failed to produce a solution and the dispute remained a serious obstacle to the development of good relations between Indonesia and the Netherlands.

57. More serious even than the absence of an agreed solution to the question of West Irian had been the repeated attempts made by the Netherlands Government ever since 1951 to include the territory in its Constitution as part of the Netherlands. Such attempts were, of course, in flagrant violation of the earlier agreed provisions relating to the Territory, and had been recognized as such by many responsible sectors of opinion in the Netherlands.

58. The unilateral action taken by the Netherlands Government had aggravated the already strained relations between Indonesia and the Netherlands. It was all the more regrettable to note recent reports of repressive measures taken by the Netherlands authorities against the people of West Irian. As tension continued to mount, it became more and more urgent for the General Assembly to take cognizance of the problem and to include it in its agenda.

59. Mr. VAN ASCH VAN WLICK (Netherlands) said that it was the fourth time in succession that the proposal had been made to place the question of Netherlands New Guinea on the agenda of the General Assembly. During previous sessions, Indonesia's claim that the Netherlands should hand the territory over to it had been amply discussed, and each time the Assembly had decided not to approve the draft resolution that had been submitted.

60. Since 28 February 1957, when the draft resolution had again failed to obtain the requisite majority^{3/}, no new developments had taken place to justify further Assembly debate. The Netherlands Government was

pursuing its vigorous efforts for the cultural, social and economic advancement of the population of Netherlands New Guinea, and remained unalterably committed to its solemn promise to apply the principle of self-determination to its inhabitants as soon as they were able to express their own will. However, the Indonesian Government still maintained that such self-determination, to which the Republic of Indonesia owed its own existence, should not be granted to the inhabitants of Netherlands New Guinea, and persisted in proclaiming that Netherlands New Guinea was already legally part of its territory. It continued to affirm that no solution other than unconditional surrender of that territory by the Netherlands to Indonesia would be acceptable. Even in the explanatory memorandum (A/3644) presented by the twenty-one countries which had requested the inscription of the item on the agenda, the very first sentence referred to the territory in question as "West Irian ... the most eastern part of the Republic of Indonesia".

61. It had been explicitly recognized by nearly all speakers in previous lengthy debates on the subject that the General Assembly had no right either to request the Netherlands to hand over part of its territory to Indonesia or even to express an opinion on the legal merits of Indonesia's territorial claim. The competence to do so rested exclusively with the International Court of Justice, to which Indonesia had persistently refused to submit its claim. All that the General Assembly could do would be to recommend negotiations between the two countries, but that it had already refused to do three times for the sound reason that negotiations such as Indonesia had in mind were doomed to failure.

62. The item was therefore so conceived that its inclusion in the Assembly's agenda could not possibly lead to any positive results. It would therefore be in the best interests of all concerned not to resume a debate which had repeatedly proved fruitless. His delegation would therefore vote against inclusion of the item, and he appealed to his colleagues to do the same.

63. Mr. CASEY (Australia) fully supported the powerful arguments put forward by the Netherlands representative against the inclusion of item 63 in the Assembly's agenda. Only six months had elapsed since the matter had last been discussed by the Assembly, and no new circumstances had arisen to justify renewed debate.

64. It was stated quite rightly in the explanatory memorandum that the dispute was a persistent deterrent to the improvement of friendlier relations between Indonesia and the Netherlands; but at present the positions of the two Governments were so irreconcilable that further debate by the Assembly would be useless. It would be far better to allow some time to pass rather than to engage in a further acrimonious debate.

65. From the very first sentence of the explanatory memorandum it was obvious that Indonesia was not really seeking negotiations but recognition that West Irian was part of Indonesia. There was no legal basis to such a claim, and it was surprising that twenty-one countries had supported it. The General Assembly was certainly not the place for countries to press territorial demands, and if Indonesia's claim was encouraged it might give rise to unlimited misuse of United Nations machinery. The inclusion of the item in the

^{3/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Plenary meetings, 664th meeting.

Assembly's agenda could only cause a further deterioration in relations between the two parties, and would serve neither the interests of the Netherlands and Indonesia nor of international peace and co-operation.

66. Mr. LLOYD (United Kingdom) endorsed the remarks made by the Netherlands and Australian representatives, and regretted that Indonesia had requested the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the General Assembly. There was no real evidence that the matter was a threat to peace, and there appeared to be no difficulty about the question of self-determination. Indeed, the attitude of Indonesia in persistently pressing its claims to West Irian might create a problem where none really existed and cause trouble among three close friends of the United Kingdom. He fully agreed with Mr. Casey that the inclusion of the item in the Assembly's agenda was uncalled-for, particularly as the matter had only recently been discussed by the General Assembly. The Assembly had no more important things to do than re-engage on items which had already been thoroughly and fruitlessly discussed.

67. Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) said he would vote in favour of the inclusion of the item, since his delegation believed that all matters which gave rise to friction between States should be thoroughly aired in the General Assembly.

68. Mr. GUNewardENE (Ceylon) also supported the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

69. Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand) said that his country entertained very close and cordial relations with all three countries involved in the dispute, and if his delegation intended to vote for the inclusion of the item in the agenda it was not for the purpose of causing them difficulty but merely in the hope that a solution might be found.

70. Mr. ABDON (Iran) said his delegation had joined the twenty others in supporting the request for the inclusion of the item in the agenda for the reasons given

in the explanatory memorandum. The fact that direct negotiations between the two parties had failed was a very strong reason for requesting the General Assembly to take up the matter again.

71. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) said that since direct negotiations had failed it was the duty of the United Nations to re-examine the whole issue and try to find the best way of settling it by peaceful means. For that reason, he would vote in favour of the inclusion of the item.

72. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the United Nations had an obligation to meet the just claims of Indonesia and to settle the dispute over West Irian in a peaceful manner. The twelfth session of the General Assembly should do everything possible to solve the problem in the interests of the people of West Irian and of peace and security. His delegation would vote in favour of the inclusion of the item.

73. Mr. GEORGES-PICOT (France) said he would vote against the inclusion of the item, as he had done in the past, for the reasons adduced by the Netherlands representative.

74. Mr. TSIANG (China) said that he had previously abstained from voting on the question of the inclusion of the item and would do so again, although normally China took an anti-colonial stand. If the people of West Irian had asked for self-determination his delegation would have been glad to support them. However, the Committee had no information about the real wishes of the people of West Irian, and for that reason his delegation would abstain from voting.

75. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the inclusion in the agenda of item 63.

The Committee decided, by 7 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions, to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of item 63.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.