



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda items 88 and 22:</i>	
<i>The situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (concluded)</i>	861
<i>Assistance to Africa:</i>	
<i>(a) A United Nations programme for independence (continued)</i>	861
<i>Statement by the President</i>	878

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEMS 88 AND 22

The situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (concluded)

Assistance to Africa:

(a) A United Nations programme for independence (continued)

1. Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): I wish to explain briefly some of the ideas underlying the draft resolution submitted by the Mexican delegation [A/L.369].

2. Last year, in resolution 1514 (XV), the General Assembly set its goal: the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. This year we are seeking the best ways, means and procedures for reaching this goal as quickly as possible. That is to say, we are seeking a way to make resolution 1514 (XV) fully effective. We wish to take practical and genuine action, consistent with the realities of the situation, towards the proclaimed goal. We shall not give resolution 1514 (XV) real effect merely by adopting new resolutions to reaffirm it; we shall not implement it just by repeating the word fiat from time to time.

3. One of this Assembly's most serious problems is to arrive at satisfactory procedures and methods whereby to complete the process of bringing independence to the colonial peoples. Recent tragic experiences, especially in the Congo, have made it clear that the manner in which these problems are solved will have a decisive influence on the future of the colonial peoples and, indeed, on the maintenance of international peace.

4. Hitherto there has not, in most cases, been any organized effort by the international community to prepare for the advent of new countries. The United Nations has presided over and assisted the emergence of new States in only a few cases, such as the former Italian colonies of Libya and Somalia, and on

the occasion of the plebiscites held in such countries as Ghana and Cameroon. So far the conditions in which the new States have attained an independent existence have been determined exclusively by a struggle between the nationalist fervour of the indigenous population and the resistance of the former colonial authority.

5. The spirit of resolution 1514 (XV), in the opinion of my delegation, demands not merely that States should emerge into independent existence, but that they should do so under circumstances in which their economic life, and indeed their very independence, are not mortgaged to any Power. We therefore believe it to be this Assembly's duty to ensure that decolonization is carried out in circumstances which represent no threat to international peace and security and which do not make sovereignty and independence a hollow sham for the territories and peoples that win their freedom.

6. It is already clear that the circumstances and procedure under which the colonial peoples receive their freedom are the responsibility of the United Nations. This, in our judgement, is the underlying meaning of the General Assembly's historic resolution 1514 (XV), namely, the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

7. The General Assembly decreed the end of colonialism in an action that was both deliberate and solemn, but in doing so it drew attention, in one of the preambular paragraphs of the resolution in question, to the important role of the United Nations in assisting the movement for independence in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories.

8. This means that the Assembly has assumed responsibility for ensuring that independence is attained under the conditions most favourable to the indigenous population and not in chaotic or harmful fashion. These are the considerations on which the Mexican draft resolution is based.

9. We do not believe that independence should be granted as a matter of blind, mechanical routine on a fixed date and under conditions which are the same in all cases. Freedom and independence are not secured through solemn affirmations, nor is sovereignty conferred merely by the official absence of the Administering Authority. The eighty-odd dependent territories present an extraordinary range of possible conditions and the same procedure cannot be followed in all cases.

10. It is neither the duty nor the desire of the United Nations to stir up revolutions in Non-Self-Governing Territories, or to create a tense atmosphere of purposeless hostility to the colonial Powers in this Assembly.

11. A prerequisite of any form of ordered and peaceful progress towards self-determination or independ-

ence is the co-operation of the administering Powers and the Administering Authorities of the colonies and Trust Territories. The Powers administering such territories pursue a very wide variety of policies and cannot all be dealt with in the same way.

12. All men and all peoples have the same right to freedom whatever their degree of development and progress, but there are in addition marked differences between territories as regards their suitability for conversion into sovereign international entities in the form of States.

13. As my delegation sees it, our ultimate and real objective is self-determination for those peoples which have not yet exercised this right. While, however, a people's self-determination is normally expressed, translated and reflected in the establishment of independent States, it is not always practical, or even possible to establish political entities with a separate international personality—i.e., new States. It is necessary to know in which cases this is, and in which cases it is not, or is not yet, possible and practical. In the affirmative case, certain obvious conditions must be met. For example, considerations of geography, size of population and other factors will determine whether or not the new entity can be expected to be viable.

14. Think, for example, of Tristan da Cunha, an island lost in the vast Atlantic, which had fewer than 300 inhabitants; or again, Clipperton Island. Several of the dependent territories are in a similar or identical case. In such instances, independence, in the traditional sense of the term, would be meaningless, but it makes perfect sense to think in terms of genuine self-government and autonomy.

15. Next, think of other territories with greater population and resources, adjacent to other States and territories but separated from them by artificial boundaries notwithstanding numerous ethnic and cultural ties between the populations on either side of the line. These may be cases where the problem should be solved, not necessarily by setting up new independent entities, but by such means as encouraging the two territories to federate or merge if that is how the peoples wish to exercise their right to self-determination.

16. Lastly, in some very special cases where a territory is geographically separated from a State but linked to it by close ties, independence may take the form of union on a basis of complete equality if that is what the people genuinely want. Thus the Hawaiian Islands and Alaska attained true independence through union with the United States as States of the Union, on a basis of complete equality, instead of forming independent international entities.

17. As I have said, there may be many different situations and a wide variety of cases. Each must be decided in the light of its particular circumstances and characteristics. We therefore propose that the ad hoc committee to be appointed for the purpose should study all the specific cases and suggest to this Assembly next year what steps or measures might be taken, in co-operation with the administering Powers, to expedite the attainment of freedom or independence by those territories that still await them.

18. Consistently with these ideas, the draft resolution we have submitted provides for the necessary contact with the administering Power and presupposes a co-operation which, in the last analysis, will benefit not

only the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories but also the States that administer them.

19. The draft resolution I have introduced is a sincere effort on the part of my Government to assist in speeding up the liquidation of colonialism. I am convinced that, by the procedure we suggest, this noble aim could be fully achieved in an orderly and sustained fashion.

20. Mr. UYS (South Africa): We have listened carefully to the general debate on the question of colonialism in the hope that on this occasion considerable attention would be given also to the 200 million people who have lost their independence through conquest and who have lived in subjugation since 1945. Although this aspect has been raised by several speakers, the vast majority of delegations concentrated on one type of colonialism. Is this another case of the application of the double standard? Not one of the draft resolutions now before the General Assembly makes any mention of those millions who languish under the new type of virulent suppression. To crown it all, one of the draft resolutions has been submitted by the chief architect of this modern form of oppression.

21. It is also interesting to note that many of those who made unsubstantiated charges against my country, often in an unbridled manner and also contrary to the Rules of Procedure, showed no concern for the many millions living under the yoke of the new imperialist Power of our day.

22. Parts of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.366 and Add.1-3 are acceptable to my country. We also appreciate the spirit in which this draft resolution has been put forward. Unfortunately, however, there are certain provisions which, in our opinion, go beyond the obligations provided for in the Charter, and it would therefore be impossible for my delegation to vote for that draft resolution. This also applies to the draft resolutions contained in documents A/L.357 and Add.1 and A/L.369. We shall of course vote against the Soviet draft resolution [A/L.355].

23. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): I should like to state briefly the position of the United States Government on the several draft resolutions which we have before us.

24. First, on the general draft resolutions, we are extremely grateful to the many sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.366 and Add.1-3 for their patient and painstaking efforts, over many weeks of arduous discussions, to arrive at a text which will both be acceptable, we believe, to the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations and, more importantly, will work.

25. My delegation therefore plans to vote in favour of the so-called African-Asian draft resolution if it is put to the vote in its present form. We are strenuously opposed to the Soviet amendments [A/L.370] to that draft resolution which have been circulated. We believe that they would upset the careful balance in draft resolution A/L.366 and Add.1-3 as it now stands, which was achieved by the process of give and take through these weeks of negotiations, and it is important, in our view, that that balance should not be destroyed. Adoption of these amendments would make the draft resolution unacceptable to my Government.

26. We have been most interested in the draft resolution submitted by the Government of Mexico [A/L.369]. We feel that it is provocative and contains

many interesting ideas, particularly as elaborated by the representative of Mexico just now. However, we feel that insufficient time has been available for the proper study of all the implications of this draft resolution. Moreover, we feel that it is inconsistent with draft resolution A/L.366 and Add.1-3, and since it is quite obvious that that draft resolution will be adopted by this Assembly by an overwhelming majority, we hope that the draft resolution submitted by the Government of Mexico will not thereafter be pressed.

27. With regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/L.357 and Add.1, submitted originally by the delegation of Nigeria, we were most impressed by the statements made in support of that draft resolution by the Foreign Minister of Nigeria at the time that he introduced it [1050th meeting]. If that draft resolution is brought to a vote, we will support it.

28. We will vote against draft resolution A/L.355, submitted by the Soviet Union, not because it was submitted by the Soviet Union, but because we consider it tendentious and unrealistic.

29. I now turn to the specific draft resolutions which relate to the subject of West New Guinea. Speaking in the general debate the other day [1061st meeting], I indicated that for different reasons we were somewhat critical of the draft resolution submitted by the Government of the Netherlands [A/L.354] and also the draft resolution submitted by the Government of India [A/L.367/Rev.1]. We felt that the Netherlands draft resolution did not sufficiently take account of the position of the Government of Indonesia in this matter. We felt, on the other hand, that the draft resolution submitted by India would serve no useful purpose and that it was faulty in that it omitted reference to the principle of self-determination. We were not convinced in this matter by the very able presentation made this afternoon by the representative of India, Mr. Jha. He did point out that that draft resolution made reference to the Charter and to the principles of the Charter in a general way, and that those principles include self-determination. But we think that Mr. Jha made it clear in his own statement that, in the view of the Indian delegation—and also presumably in the view of the other sponsors of the draft resolution—self-determination is not to be applied in this particular case, because the delegations in question—and again Mr. Jha made this quite clear—accept the argument of the Government of Indonesia that we are dealing here with one integral State, and that that is the reason that self-determination cannot be applied.

30. But, as I pointed out the other day, this matter is just the matter in dispute. To repeat, therefore, it would seem to us that the adoption of this draft resolution would serve no good purpose and would indeed be a step in the wrong direction, since it would amount to the rejection of the proposal for self-determination under United Nations auspices.

31. In draft resolution A/L.368 we believe that the best of both draft resolutions—that is, of the Netherlands draft resolution and of the Indian draft resolution—has been preserved, and we think that the thirteen delegations of Africa which submitted it are to be highly commended for this initiative. We agree with the statements made in support of this draft resolution by the representatives of Niger, Upper Volta and Dahomey. This draft resolution, in our view, holds out the possibility of a solution through negotiations between Indonesia and the Netherlands, and all of us would, I am sure, prefer that a solution be reached

through that means. The draft resolution, however, goes on to indicate a course of action to be followed if the negotiations produce no result in a reasonable time. It has been suggested, I believe, by the representative of Argentina and others in private conversations, that operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution in document A/L.368 might better be omitted. That paragraph seems to cause some particular difficulties, and we would suggest to the sponsors that they consider the omission of operative paragraph 6.

32. My delegation will vote in favour of this draft resolution sponsored by thirteen African nations, and also for the motion for priority which was alluded to and made by the representative of Niger [1065th meeting, para. 83]. We hope that this draft resolution will be adopted, thereby making unnecessary any vote on either the Netherlands proposal or the Indian proposal.

33. Mr. COMAY (Israel): My delegation has already indicated its support for the African-Asian draft resolution contained in document A/L.366 and Add.1-3 and also for the Nigerian draft resolution [A/L.357 and Add.1]. We shall consider certain other draft resolutions and amendments in the light of their consistency with these two draft resolutions.

34. I shall at this stage confine myself to a few remarks on the draft resolutions which concern Netherlands New Guinea. In principle we are strongly in favour of the settlement of all disputes between States by direct negotiations. However, in the present case I do not believe that any two countries could properly be asked to decide between them what should be the future of a third country. The principle of self-determination must be respected, and the final say must rest with the inhabitants of the territory concerned.

35. We shall vote against the Indian draft resolution [A/L.367/Rev.1], because it presents the problem simply as an unresolved dispute between the Netherlands and Indonesia, and ignores the people of West New Guinea altogether.

36. My delegation regards the draft resolution contained in document A/L.368, submitted by a group of African delegations, as a most constructive and statesmenlike attempt to reconcile the principle of negotiation with the principle of self-determination, and we shall therefore give it our full support. We shall also support the suggestion that this draft resolution be given priority in the voting.

37. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) (translated from French): As we stated during the general discussion on agenda item 88 [1057th meeting], the Yugoslav Government considers that West Irian has been and still is an integral part of Indonesia which, for certain reasons, is still under Netherlands administration. In view of this, and considering that no fair or constructive solution to this problem can be based on any proposal which fails to take Indonesia's lawful rights into account, the Yugoslav delegation will vote against the draft resolution submitted by the Netherlands [A/L.354].

38. The draft resolution of the thirteen African countries [A/L.368], despite the praiseworthy efforts of its sponsors, differs neither in substance nor in purpose from the Netherlands draft resolution; for the reasons which I have given, and which apply equally to this proposal, my delegation will vote against it. If this proposal is put to the vote by division, my delegation will vote against the sixth preambular paragraph, which implies that West Irian is a Non-Self-Governing

Territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter; we do not consider this to be the case, despite the fact that the Netherlands Government has submitted reports on this part of Indonesian territory every year—a practice which, as we all know, has been the subject of reservations and has provoked, on Indonesia's part, the most determined and consistent opposition. We shall also vote against operative paragraphs 1 and 5 of this draft resolution because under them a previously prescribed time-limit is set for the negotiations between the Indonesian and Netherlands Governments and because certain features of these paragraphs, if endorsed now, might be deemed to prejudge the position of one or other party to the dispute.

39. Lastly, my delegation will vote against the remaining paragraphs of this draft resolution, except paragraph 2, and against the draft resolution as a whole, because the establishment of the proposed commission would not merely do nothing to settle the question but would on the contrary, we fear, create a situation which—in the words of the third preambular paragraph—would be likely to endanger international peace and security.

40. In our opinion, the draft resolution submitted by India and several other countries [A/L.367/Rev.1] points the way to a settlement of this question which will contribute to the restoration of normal, friendly relations between Indonesia and the Netherlands and to the stabilization of peace in that part of the world. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of this draft resolution.

41. We shall also vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by thirty-eight African and Asian countries [A/L.366 and Add.1-3]. This proposal might well have been more detailed as regards the terms of reference for the special committee but, even as it stands, it represents an important step towards the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)].

42. On the other hand, unfortunately, my delegation cannot vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Nigeria and Liberia [A/L.357 and Add.1]. If the individual provisions of this draft resolution are put to the vote separately, we shall vote against operative paragraphs 1 and 2, which set 1970 as the date for the attainment of independence by all colonial territories and peoples.

43. After voting against the date proposed, which in our opinion does not reflect the needs and realities of today, we shall be bound to vote against the draft resolution as a whole if the paragraphs in question are accepted, although the remaining paragraphs of this proposal meet with our approval.

44. If the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union [A/L.355], which calls for a series of specific measures with a view to implementing the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, is put to the vote, my delegation will vote in its favour. However, we would add that it would be desirable for the majority on the special commission proposed in that draft resolution to be composed of countries recently liberated from colonialism; my delegation will therefore abstain on operative paragraph 4 if it is put to the vote separately. If the Soviet draft resolution is withdrawn and the Soviet delegation's amendments [A/L.370] are put to the vote, my delegation will vote in their favour.

45. Although we are in sympathy with some of the ideas embodied in the Mexican draft resolution [A/L.369], we cannot support that proposal. We acknowledge that, in principle, the local authorities should possess a degree of political and administrative aptitude which will enable them to elude international pressure and to provide adequately for the economic development and social progress of the inhabitants of their territories. The basic question here is how, and by whom, the presence or absence of such an aptitude should be determined. As we all know, the colonial Powers have always taken, and still take, the view that they alone are competent to make decisions. I need hardly say that we disagree with this interpretation of the function of the Administering Power; that is for the inhabitants of the dependent territories and their political representatives to decide. We hold that, as soon as a people demands independence, the question of political aptitude is disposed of; it arises neither with regard to the performance of political functions, nor with regard to the solution of administrative problems—which, for that matter, will continue to confront many independent countries.

46. Moreover, disputes concerning the title to sovereignty over a territory which is part of a colonial system, or the outcome of a colonial heritage, have always been regarded, in the light of experience, as essentially political disputes. Today, therefore, when conditions have changed, such disputes cannot be settled purely and simply on the basis of the principles of international law which applied in the days of colonial conquest, and on the basis of treaties concluded between the colonial Powers on the one hand and, on the other, those who represented or purported to represent the indigenous peoples.

47. These are a few of the reasons why my delegation cannot support the draft resolution submitted by Mexico.

48. Mr. ABDEL WAHAB (United Arab Republic): I should like to define the position of my delegation with regard to the various draft resolutions before us and to explain our motives in sponsoring the draft resolution contained in document A/L.366 and Add.1-3.

49. The General Assembly, by its resolution 1514 (XV), urged that all powers should be transferred immediately to the peoples of the dependent territories and that immediate steps should be taken to this effect. Yet no substantial steps have been taken in the direction urged by the General Assembly in that resolution. The sponsors of the draft resolution deemed it necessary, therefore, that a committee should be established in order to supervise the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, and to assist the States concerned in its effective application. This committee would be given wide terms of reference in order to enable it effectively to perform the task entrusted to it. It is the considered view of my delegation that this committee should receive petitions and visit the dependent territories so as to be able to give assistance in the situation prevailing in those territories.

50. My delegation has already expressed its views on the draft resolution [A/L.354] submitted by the Netherlands, and we shall vote against it.

51. We have no doubt that the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.368 are moved by an earnest desire to find a solution to the problem of West Irian, but it is my

delegation's submission that the appropriate solution is the one which is acceptable to the parties to the dispute and which would result from negotiations between them. The draft resolution proceeds from the assumption that the Netherlands has sovereignty over the Territory. But it is generally conceded that Indonesia has always contested, and continues to contest, such a claim by the Netherlands. Indonesia has rightly asserted that West Irian is an integral part of its territory, and the validity of the position of Indonesia has been recognized by many delegations, including the delegation of the United Arab Republic.

52. If we admit that there is a dispute, as stated in the draft resolution, over the sovereignty of West Irian between the Netherlands and Indonesia, the parties concerned must be helped to find a solution through negotiations; a solution must not be imposed on one of the parties concerned.

53. For these reasons, my delegation hopes that the draft resolution A/L.367/Rev.1 which my delegation has the honour to sponsor, will be adopted.

54. My delegation ~~not~~ support draft resolution A/L.368 and will vote against it.

55. Although my delegation is a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.366 and Add.1-3 nevertheless it will not hesitate to support any amendment or any other proposal which stands for the immediate abolition of colonialism.

56. With regard to draft resolution A/L.369, this covers the same ground as draft resolution A/L.366 and Add.1-3. Furthermore, we have not had time to study it carefully. Therefore, we appeal to the Mexican delegation to reconsider its position.

57. Mr. LAPIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation deeply appreciates the fact that the African-Asian countries supported the initiative of the Soviet Union in proposing that the General Assembly should discuss the situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)] and that they have tabled their own draft resolution [A/L.366 and Add.1-3] on this question.

58. There can be no doubt that the draft resolution signed by thirty-eight countries of Asia and Africa is based upon the aims and principles of the Declaration approved at the fifteenth session. We are happy to note, also, that the sponsors of the draft have endorsed the Soviet proposal for the establishment of a special committee to supervise the implementation of the Declaration. At the same time, the African-Asian group's draft resolution has in our opinion its weak points, as we have already pointed out. Its basic defect lies in the fact that it stipulates no time-limit for the liquidation of the colonial system.

59. In the speeches of a number of delegations it was rightly pointed out that, if the Declaration adopted at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly had contained specific dates for the liquidation of colonialism, as was then suggested by the Soviet delegation, we should not now be faced with the need for placing on record the fact that during 1961 the Declaration had been implemented so slowly. That is why the Soviet delegation proposes amplifying operative paragraph 2 of the African-Asian draft, by the use of the words: "solemnly proclaims 1962 as the year of the elimination of colonialism".

60. Thus, the whole of paragraph 2 would read as follows:

"2. Calls upon States concerned to take action without further delay with a view to the faithful application and implementation of the Declaration and solemnly proclaims 1962 the year of the elimination of colonialism".

61. Such a solution follows directly from the spirit and sense of the Declaration and is consistent with its operative paragraph 5, which requires that immediate steps be taken to transfer all powers to the peoples, without any conditions or reservations.

62. This proposal derives from the fact that in our day there are no peoples unready for independence. A time-limit is also appropriate because the colonial Powers are continuing in one way or another to put forward all kinds of conditions and reservations aimed at deferring as long as possible the complete liquidation of the vestiges of colonialism.

63. We have heard here arguments to the effect that independence must be granted in the case where "a specific level of education and experience has been attained", where "agreement has been reached with the administering Powers", where "there is political stability", and so on and so forth.

64. Conditions and reservations of this kind—and plenty of them have been advanced—are contrary to the Declaration and must be resolutely rejected. With the setting of a time-limit for the complete liquidation of colonialism, as proposed by the Soviet Union, the implementation of the Declaration will be placed on a firm practical basis.

65. Attempts have been made here to propose longer time-limits for the liquidation of colonialism, and objections have been raised to time-limits in general. In this connexion references have been made to varying conditions—to the special situation, for example, of certain sparsely-inhabited islands, etc. It is impossible, however, not to see how far-fetched such doubts are. Differences between the positions of particular territories must not be used as a screen to cloak the principal demand of our day and age—for the termination of the colonial system. What is essential is that, by the end of 1962 at the latest, Algeria, Angola, Kenya, Ruanda-Urundi, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, New Guinea, British Guiana and other countries should be given complete freedom and independence. The main requirement is that, by the next session of the General Assembly, we should be able to welcome the representatives of those countries as members, with equal rights, of the family of nations. It is inadmissible that this central problem should be replaced by the problem of some thinly-inhabited island. There will be no difficulty in settling such partial problems if the main problems are speedily and successfully decided.

66. Adoption of the proposal to complete the liquidation of colonialism would put an end to all colonial wars. It would in fact be the most correct way of ensuring that bloodshed is ended as speedily as possible. The sooner colonialism is liquidated, the fewer will be the sacrifices and sufferings endured by mankind and the broader will be the opportunities for strengthening universal peace.

67. Fears have been expressed that the fixing of a time-limit might give the colonial Powers a pretext to postpone, for a year, the granting of independence

to those countries which could already be given it now. We would like to make it clear that our proposal cannot give rise to any such fears. Certainly, many countries must and will receive independence forthwith—that is to say, before the end of 1962.

68. Voices have also been heard claiming that the date proposed by the Soviet delegation does not make sufficient allowance for the specific peculiarities of Africa and Asia and is purely formal in character. Attempts have, moreover, been made to attribute propagandist aims to the Soviet proposals. In previous statements we have explained our standpoint in detail and have demolished the basis for such suspicions. Possibly, however, we should also refer you to authoritative African leaders who certainly cannot be accused of being inadequately acquainted with Africa or with their own peoples and their desire for freedom and independence. It is precisely because they know Africa that they insist on 1962 being the year for the complete liquidation of colonialism.

69. At the Belgrade Conference of last September,^{1/} the President of Ghana, Mr. Nkrumah, said:

"The colonialists must be warned that they must keep their hands off Africa. The constitutional machinations and various delays designed to prevent the attainment of freedom and independence will be doomed to failure."

Mr. Nkrumah went on:

"I propose that the Conference approve my proposal that by 31 December 1962 all colonialist Powers should leave Africa".

70. President Nkrumah added that if the United Nations failed to do this—to achieve the immediate implementation of its Declaration on the liquidation of colonialism—a serious blow would have been dealt to the cause of peace.

71. That is why we would emphasize, over and over again, that the speediest liquidation of colonialism will not only ensure the freedom and rights of millions of oppressed peoples but will also create conditions for strengthening peace.

72. Colonialism means war and terror. It is a constant source of international tension. All attempts to protract the liquidation of the vestiges of colonialism are fraught with the danger of fresh conflicts and armed clashes and of further sacrifices and calamities. That is why the Soviet delegation considers it necessary to fix a definite date—1962—for the final implementation of the Declaration.

73. The Soviet delegation feels that an addition should also be inserted in operative paragraph 4 of the Afro-Asian draft resolution. In the passage where the Special Committee is requested to examine the application of the Declaration and make suggestions and recommendations, we would think it necessary to insert the following clarification:

"to make suggestions and recommendations on the immediate application of the Declaration and the completion of its implementation, and to report to the General Assembly at its seventeenth session."

74. We feel that such a direction would give the mandate of the Special Committee a more concrete character, commensurate with the aims and principles of

the Declaration. The words which we would like to see added to paragraph 4 of the Afro-Asian resolution stem directly from the preamble of this resolution and from the objectives which the draft's sponsors have set themselves.

75. We trust that the amendments proposed by us will meet with no objections and will be adopted by delegations.

76. I would like to say a couple of words in connexion with the belated statements made by two representatives—those of Portugal and the Republic of South Africa.

77. As you will recall, in the course of the general debate the United States delegation tried to impart to the discussion of certain questions in our Assembly an anti-communist or cold war flavour. The attempts, however, failed. No one was anxious to engage in this distasteful and thankless business, even though the United States so insistently pressed the point. As a result, the United States itself had to assume the unpleasant task. And so, after ill-advised statements which were repudiated and which met with no support here, a document eventually appeared, full of slander, spite and the nonsense by which spite is usually accompanied.

78. I refer to the so-called "comments" on the Soviet memorandum—a document circulated here by a United States representative [A/4985]. Objectively speaking, it should be said that the United States delegation has today won a grand victory: its document was supported by the delegations of Portugal and the Republic of South Africa. This is very significant and is possibly the best evidence of the nature of this document and of the kind of efforts that are being directed towards imparting to our discussion a cold war character.

79. The statements made by the representatives of Portugal and the Republic of South Africa have merely served to emphasize the community of spirit that exists between colonizers, and the fact that the United States intends to go on acting as the colonizers' ideological leader.

80. As you are aware, the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of South Africa in the General Assembly here was condemned. The statement made today by the representative of this so-called Republic also deserves to be similarly condemned. The United States representatives themselves must surely feel that their memorandum smells bad. Otherwise, they would not be trying to slip it in at the end of the general discussion.

81. We have already had occasion to reply to such attempts by the United States to divert the attention of the General Assembly from a discussion of the question of liquidating colonialism. The representative of Czechoslovakia also gave the proper reply here to these attempts—the Polish delegation likewise, in a letter addressed to the President of the Assembly [A/4989]. We too will still have an opportunity of giving an appropriate answer to the United States in connexion with their new attempt to spread senseless and slanderous fabrications. Similar attempts were made last year, and they are now being repeated, with no chance whatsoever of success.

82. I should like to say a few words more, regarding our delegation's attitude to certain draft resolutions.

83. We associate ourselves with the ideas expressed in the draft resolution submitted by India and certain

other countries [A/L.367/Rev.1] concerning the negotiations between Indonesia and the Netherlands. We have already mentioned that the Soviet Union fully supports the lawful rights of Indonesia to West Irian.

84. We shall vote against the Mexican resolution [A/L.369] which, as has been rightly pointed out here, weakens the Declaration. The sponsors of this draft obviously lacked sufficient time in which to think out its wording, and it is no mere chance that this draft resolution met with such ready support here from the representatives of the Netherlands and other colonial Powers, including the representatives of the United States. For the same reasons we cannot support the draft resolution of the Brazzaville group [A/L.368].

85. We should like to emphasize once again that we shall vote against the Nigerian draft resolution [A/L.357 and Add.1], for the reasons which were given in detail in earlier statements by the Soviet delegation.

86. We shall support the resolution of the Afro-Asian group on the general question, which is being discussed at our present General Assembly session, of the situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

87. Mr. FLORES AVENDAÑO (Guatemala) (translated from Spanish): At the meeting held on 17 November [1057th meeting] and in connexion with the debate on items 22 and 88 of our agenda, the delegation of Guatemala indicated the attitude of its Government with regard to the important problem of colonialism and, in doing so, again emphasized the enthusiasm with which it voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). However, I wish to recall that on that occasion the delegation of Guatemala made the following statement:

"At the San Francisco Conference, Guatemala expressly reserved its rights when the International Trusteeship System was discussed and also during the discussion concerning reports from countries administering Non-Self-Governing Territories. It has restated these reservations in this Assembly, in the Trusteeship Council and in various United Nations committees when it was necessary".

On that occasion the delegation of Guatemala also affirmed that the resolution adopted would not affect territories which were the subject of litigation or dispute.

88. In the light of these remarks and having considered the various draft resolutions which are shortly to be voted upon, my delegation will proceed as follows. It will vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by thirty-eight African and Asian countries [A/L.366 and Add.1-3] which in its opinion meets the legitimate desire of this Assembly to implement resolution 1514 (XV) by calling for such measures as are appropriate and advisable to accelerate the process of the liquidation of colonialism. Moreover, this draft resolution does not contain any of the serious discrepancies and impractical features alluded to by the representatives who commented on the other drafts that have been submitted. In voting in favour of this draft resolution, however, my delegation reiterates that this instrument cannot in any way affect the legitimate rights of sovereignty that Guatemala has been maintaining for more than a hundred years regarding the Guatemalan territory of Belize, which has been illegally occupied by a colonialist Power.

89. With regard to the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Mexico [A/L.369], my delegation recognizes the validity of its intent but will unfortunately have to vote against it, as it considers that the operative part deals with matters which are not within the competence of this Assembly in the light of the principles underlying the San Francisco Charter.

90. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia): I have the honour to come to the rostrum to explain the votes of the Ethiopian delegation.

91. Our views on colonialism and neo-colonialism were expressed at length on 20 November 1961 [1058th meeting]. My delegation has the honour of sponsoring the draft resolution contained in document A/L.366 and Add.1-3. It so happens that this draft has the support of the greatest number of Member States because it is sponsored by the greatest number of delegations. In other words, in accordance with the formula of Jeremy Bentham, this draft resolution is the right one to adopt because that would bring the greatest happiness to the greatest number of delegations.

92. In all seriousness, we feel that after adopting this draft resolution there should not be any need to press for a vote on any of the other draft resolutions. My delegation, along with other friendly delegations, has worked very hard and very assiduously in preparing this draft. In so doing we took great pains and much thought to make it as acceptable as possible without forgetting the essence of the problem, namely, that immediate steps should be taken to liquidate colonialism in the most practical fashion.

93. Operative paragraph 3 of this draft resolution suggests the creation of a special committee of seventeen members for the purpose of examining faithfully the application and implementation of the epoch-making Declaration on colonialism. If things fall out so happily that all dependent territories attain independence before the seventeenth session, all well and good. In fact, it will be reported by the special committee of seventeen to the General Assembly at its seventeenth session. However, if the die-hard colonialists attempt to delay the irresistible and irreversible trend of liberation by marching against the current of this historical movement, then the special committee of seventeen will make appropriate suggestions and recommendations on the ways and means of counteracting this state of affairs. Furthermore, this draft resolution authorizes the special committee of seventeen to meet outside the Headquarters of the United Nations when that is genuinely necessary, in consultation with the appropriate authorities. All Members of the United Nations, including those administering dependent territories, are requested to extend their fullest co-operation to the special committee of seventeen.

94. My delegation had the honour of pointing out a week ago that the aims of agenda item 22 (a) would be met by the creation of the special committee of seventeen. Although there are three times more dependent peoples in Africa than in all other parts of the world, I respectfully submit that we are carrying out a crusade against colonialism, in all its forms and manifestations, all over the world. The special committee of seventeen will be our machinery for the liquidation of colonialism.

95. Therefore, my delegation feels that the Nigerian draft resolution contained in document A/L.357 and Add.1 is unnecessary. We are convinced of the good intentions of the delegation of Nigeria in submitting

this draft resolution. However, in the light of the various observations that have been made on behalf of my delegation I beg leave to appeal formally to the representative of Nigeria not to press this draft resolution at this stage. I hope that my friend from Nigeria will not find it difficult to accede to our appeal in the context of African unity.

96. My delegation would also like to avail itself of this opportunity to thank the delegation of the Soviet Union most profusely for its effort in the interest of colonial liberation. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union draft resolution, contained in document A/L.355, is covered by our own draft resolution [A/L.366 and Add.1-3]. Therefore, my delegation would like to appeal to the Soviet Union not to press its draft resolution to the vote.

97. We have had occasion to express our views on the Netherlands draft resolution contained in document A/L.354. I shall not go into details. I shall simply say that we are obliged to vote against it. However, it is to be recalled that my delegation recently stated before the General Assembly: "... we feel that the United Nations must appeal to both the Netherlands and Indonesia to enter into immediate negotiations to settle their dispute over West Irian" [1058th meeting, para. 305]. We feel that this will solve the problem most amicably and, at the same time, we are confident that this will be acceptable to both the Netherlands and Indonesia. Because of this, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.367/Rev.1.

98. My country enjoys most cordial and friendly relations with Mexico and with the delegation of Mexico. Nevertheless, we find that while the Mexican draft resolution [A/L.369] contains a number of valuable suggestions, again we believe that our draft resolution in general covers the Mexican one. I would therefore appeal with great respect to the delegation of Mexico not to press that draft resolution to the vote. Nevertheless, I would like to express our gratitude and admiration to Mexico and the Mexican delegation for having so vividly and graphically demonstrated their stand against colonialism.

99. Regarding the draft resolution contained in document A/L.368, my delegation feels that the Indian draft resolution covers the question adequately. We respect and appreciate the efforts of our colleagues who have sponsored draft resolution A/L.369. However, we regret that because of our stand we shall be compelled to vote against it.

100. Finally, before I conclude I wish to make a final appeal to all delegations to support the draft resolution contained in document A/L.366 and Add.1-3, in which we repose great faith and boundless hope as a means of the total liquidation of colonialism.

101. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of Nigeria on a point of order.

102. Mr. NGILERUMA (Nigeria): I wish to take this opportunity to thank all the delegations that have expressed their support of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.357 and Add.1, submitted under agenda item 22 entitled "Assistance to Africa: (a) A United Nations programme for independence". This draft resolution has been sponsored by my delegation and the delegation of Liberia.

103. I must also emphasize that my delegation appreciates the sincerity and honesty of most of the delegations that have expressed doubts and apprehensions with regard to the provisions setting 1 December 1970 as a target date by which the entire African continent would be free of colonialism.

104. In the interests of African unity and solidarity, I am happy to announce that in response to the appeal just addressed to us by the representative of Ethiopia, we shall not press our draft resolution to a vote at this time. The Nigerian Government hopes that the African heads of Government who are expected to meet in Lagos, Nigeria, very early in 1962, will be able to harmonize their views on a common position which we shall present in unison during the seventeenth session of the General Assembly.

105. My delegation, therefore, formally requests that item 22 "Assistance to Africa: (a) A United Nations programme for independence", together with our draft resolution on the item, should be postponed for further discussion and action at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly.

106. My delegation will, of course, vote for draft resolution A/L.366 and Add.1-3, which we have the honour to sponsor with other African-Asian countries. We hope it will receive the unanimous support of the Assembly.

107. My delegation must express its appreciation to the delegation of the Soviet Union for the interest and initiative which they have manifested in the problem of the speedy liquidation of the remnants of colonialism. However, my delegation feels compelled to add that we, and by "we" I mean the Africans and the Asians who have worn the shoe of colonialism, know best how and where it pinches. We feel that our draft resolution is carefully and delicately balanced and best designed to meet our needs. I therefore sincerely appeal to the USSR not to press its draft resolution [A/L.355], and the amendments [A/L.370] to draft resolution A/L.366 and Add.1-3, to a vote.

108. My delegation also appreciates the goodwill and the intentions of the delegation of Mexico. Again we appeal for solidarity and also appeal to Mexico not to press its draft resolution [A/L.369] to a vote.

109. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

110. Mr. LAPIN (Union of Soviet Soviet Republics) (translated from Russian): The draft resolution of the Soviet Union and the draft resolution submitted by the Afro-Asian countries [A/L.366 and Add.1-3] are based on the same general principles. We shall, therefore, vote for the thirty-six-nation resolution. We have introduced only minor amendments [A/L.370], which can be adopted without any discord or dissension being provoked. Furthermore, in a spirit of co-operation we are prepared to respond to the appeals of the representatives of Ethiopia and Nigeria and shall not insist on a vote being taken on our own draft resolution.

111. We trust that the other delegations will likewise display goodwill and good intentions and that they will, firstly support our amendments, and secondly—I have in mind the Netherlands, Mexico and the Brazzaville group—withdraw their draft resolutions, so that we may all agree to the draft resolution of the Afro-Asian countries and support the draft resolution of India [A/L.367/Rev.1].

112. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I shall now call upon two speakers who wish to explain their votes before the ballot.

113. Mr. GALLIN-DOUATHE (Central African Republic) (translated from French): If the delegation of the Central African Republic takes, as is natural, a special interest in the questions relating to the liberation of the last colonies of Africa, this does not prevent it from following with close interest the progress of decolonization in the other parts of the world. Indeed, my country considers that this is a question which, wherever it arises, is of vital importance. It involves a series of local problems, the solution of which will help considerably to improve the atmosphere in which we work. I think the Organization will be able to welcome, with a great sigh of relief, the disappearance of the last colonial question from its agenda.

114. Until that moment, we must work unremittingly to find and enforce, for questions of this type, settlements in line with the spirit of the Charter. The Organization must also intervene where its protection is needed in order to enable peoples on the point of being emancipated to express their wishes freely.

115. This is why my country is in favour of the plan which Mr. Luns put forward on 26 September 1961 from the rostrum of the General Assembly [1016th meeting]. My Government notes that, if it is adopted, the Netherlands plan would have the immediate result of placing the administration and the development of Netherlands New Guinea under the active supervision of the United Nations. Subsequently, the Netherlands would be prepared to transfer its present powers to an international body established by and operated under the United Nations, under the authority of which the population would be prepared for the early exercise of the right to self-determination. I think this solution is very appropriate for a territory which is still not very advanced politically. It will ensure that the territory does not suffer the trials and convulsions by which certain regions of the African continent have been and still are affected.

116. On the other hand, my delegation cannot give its support to the theory of the representative of Indonesia, despite all its sympathy for this country. One of the principal arguments used by Mr. Subandrio to support this theory, in his statement in the General Assembly [1050th meeting], is that, when a colonized territory gains independence, its new sovereignty should be exercised wherever the colonial sovereignty was exercised. This is a principle which is no doubt right, in most cases, but which should be moderated when applied to territories whose peoples are not united by racial and cultural links or by common beliefs, which is the case with Indonesia and Netherlands New Guinea.

117. My Government would be only too glad if the inhabitants of this colony wanted to become Indonesian and if West Irian united its destiny with that of the great islands of the West placed under the authority of the Government of Djakarta. If that is the position, a free popular vote, based on the right to self-determination of the peoples concerned, will not fail to establish it clearly; and surely one of the tasks of the United Nations supervisory body would be to neutralize this anti-Indonesian spirit about which the Government of Djakarta is so concerned.

118. Such are the reasons why my delegation originally intended to vote for the draft resolution submit-

ted by the Netherlands [A/L.354]. In our view, its adoption would have confirmed the universality of this principle of self-determination, to which the representative of Indonesia and I myself owe the honour of representing our countries here.

119. However, upon reflection and after hearing the forceful statements of the Indonesian delegation, the representatives of a number of African countries, including my own, asked themselves whether the right to self-determination, granted in such a political context, would not involve risks sufficiently great for us to make a last attempt at conciliation.

120. I have no wish to imply that the arguments of Indonesia have led me to doubt the principles which had inclined me to support Mr. Luns' plan; it is simply that I do not think the enmity of a powerful neighbour is a happy gift to make to a young nation which becomes the master of its destiny.

121. This is why my delegation would like a last effort to be made by the Netherlands and Indonesia, with the help of the Secretary-General, to reach before 1 March 1962, a solution acceptable to both parties and in no way prejudicing the right of the people finally to decide the status of the Territory.

122. My delegation will therefore vote for draft resolution A/L.368 and asks that it should be put to the vote first.

123. In addition, although my delegation noted with interest the spirit of conciliation inspiring draft resolution A/L.367/Rev.1, originally submitted by India, it regrets that this draft does not mention the principle of self-determination. Furthermore, since the Netherlands and Indonesia have been negotiating fruitlessly for over ten years on the fate of Netherlands New Guinea, in any future attempt at conciliation a time-limit should be fixed.

124. In conclusion, I shall speak very briefly about two other draft resolutions submitted to the General Assembly, and first about draft resolution A/L.366 and Add.1-3. This was drafted by a large number of delegations, including delegations of countries which have colonial territories, particularly in Africa. I am therefore especially glad to see that the draft resolution deals with decolonization with both the force and the breadth of vision which this important question appears to require. The Central African Republic will therefore be very glad to vote for this text, which it regards as a useful contribution to the solution of our problem.

125. Finally, my delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution submitted by Mexico [A/L.369], since it has literally not had time to study this draft with all the necessary care.

126. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (translated from Spanish): The adoption of resolution 1514 (XV) by the General Assembly at its fifteenth session defined fully, as it were, the attitude of the world with regard to the existence of territories still under foreign rule, that is to say, territories having the status of colonies or administered under the International Trusteeship System provided for in the United Nations Charter.

127. My delegation was one of those which gave the fullest support to that resolution even though it felt that some aspects of it were over-emphasized or perhaps over-ambitious. This is confirmed by the fact that we are now confronted with a large number

of draft resolutions on the situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. Fortunately, the decisions just announced from this rostrum, first by the representative of Nigeria and then by the representative of the Soviet Union, will simplify to some extent the task of the General Assembly in connexion with the vote which will take place shortly on these draft resolutions since it may virtually be inferred that the draft resolution of the Soviet Union [A/L.355] and the draft resolution of Nigeria [A/L.357] have been withdrawn in view of the fact that their sponsors do not insist that they be put to the vote.

128. In the circumstances we are confronted with two groups of draft resolutions. The one group, which I would describe as of a general character, deals with the general problem of implementing the resolution on the independence of colonial territories and comprises the draft resolution submitted by thirty-eight Asian and African countries [A/L.366 and Add.1-3], to which the Soviet Union has submitted amendments [A/L.370], and the Mexican draft resolution [A/L.369]. The other group is more specific and deals only with one of the territories regarded as non-self-governing, namely, the territory of West New Guinea, also known as West Irian. This group consists of three draft resolutions: that of the Netherlands [A/L.354], that of Bolivia and seven other countries [A/L.367/Rev.1] and that of Upper Volta and twelve other African countries [A/L.368].

129. With particular reference to the first two draft resolutions, namely, that of the larger group of African and Asian States and that of Mexico, my delegation finds that they have many points in common and contain valuable elements which could be profitably combined in a better constructed resolution.

130. The draft resolution of the African and Asian countries is more general in character but seems to us to be less systematic than the Mexican draft resolution, although the latter, we feel, has some defects which I do not think it necessary to point out at this stage when we are concerned with explanations of votes. It is a pity that we all feel a certain amount of pressure which impells us to vote today on these draft resolutions, notwithstanding the fact that one of them, that of Mexico, was, I believe, submitted only last Friday and cannot have been given thorough consideration by all delegations.

131. Had it been possible, my delegation would have suggested that a working group consisting of the sponsors of these draft resolutions should be established to determine whether a single draft resolution meeting the desires of the entire Assembly might be drawn up. As we feel, however, that such a suggestion would be regarded as belated at this stage, we are not making any formal proposal in this connexion.

132. Between these draft resolutions and those that are more specific, and in particular the draft resolution of the Netherlands, we also find a connexion to which we would like to draw attention—I refer to the transfer of the territory of West New Guinea or West Irian to the United Nations as proposed by the Netherlands. The Mexican draft resolution contains provisions under which territories of this kind could be placed under a joint United Nations administration, no doubt under the International Trusteeship System dealt with in Chapters XII and XIII of the Charter.

133. Furthermore, the Mexican draft resolution contains a statement which would make more acceptable, as it were, the basic idea underlying the Netherlands draft resolution. I refer to the statement in operative paragraph 2 in which the Assembly solemnly declares "that, in the case of territories where the title to sovereignty is in dispute, their temporary placing under United Nations Trusteeship shall prejudice neither their final destiny nor such rights as other States may claim over them, and shall not limit the right of the population of such territories to self-determination". If wording along these lines could be included in the Netherlands draft resolution, I believe that this would succeed in dispelling some of the misgivings—on the part, as is natural, of the Indonesian delegation in particular—that if this part of the island of New Guinea was handed over to an international group designated by the United Nations, as proposed in the Netherlands draft, it might be thought that Indonesia would then have no legal means of establishing a claim to that Territory.

134. We all know that this area has a special status under the Charter of Transfer of Sovereignty, by which the Netherlands, in 1949, solemnly recognized the independence of Indonesia at a round-table conference held, let it be noted, under United Nations auspices. It is, then, a fact that a dispute exists and that it has not yet been settled despite the efforts that have been made and the discussions in which this General Assembly, at previous sessions, has engaged in the search for a solution.

135. It is also a pity that even at this stage in the consideration of the matter it does not seem possible to reconcile these draft resolutions, for between the Netherlands draft resolution and part of the Mexican draft there is, in my delegation's opinion, a kind of bridge that might make it easier to achieve understanding in these matters and arrive at a general agreement.

136. As matters have now been simplified by the fact that two draft resolutions have practically been withdrawn, it will obviously be easier for the Assembly to vote on the others. A problem nevertheless remains, because if all these draft resolutions are approved, we shall have a large number of committees whose terms of reference may sometimes not be in agreement or in harmony, and hence the tasks and the objective of these committees may in large measure be thwarted. The objective is, of course, to achieve in a relatively short time—although not as short as some people seem to wish—the complete independence of those territories which are under the Trusteeship System or which are simply colonies or Non-Self-Governing Territories and are in many instances covered by the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter.

137. It may perhaps be going too far to want 1962 to be proclaimed the year of the elimination of colonialism, as is stated in one of the amendments of the Soviet Union [A/L.370], because it is an undeniable fact that not all the peoples of these territories are yet in a position to attain full self-government, and still less full independence. In this respect, the Mexican draft contains suggestions and provisions which seem to us to be of inestimable value but which, unfortunately, were not taken into account in the hour of decision.

138. Some delegations seem to have the idea that all the peoples of these territories are of the same kind and live under the same conditions, but this is clearly

not so. To believe it is a mistake. Just as the doctors say that there are no sicknesses but only sick people, we might say that there is no colonialism but only colonies, because each colony is a special case. This is what we like most about the Mexican draft: the idea that a commission should study and report on each case separately so that the Assembly can take a decision and the States concerned can take whatever action is appropriate.

139. These are the ideas which will guide my delegation when it votes on the draft resolutions now before the Assembly. We do not know whether they will all be put to the vote. We shall be very sorry if the Mexican draft resolution is not voted on, but we think that if the draft resolution submitted by thirty-eight African and Asian countries is adopted, it would be very difficult for the Assembly to adopt the Mexican draft as well, for in that case one General Assembly resolution would, to some extent, be incompatible with another. For this reason we are sorry to have to join those delegations which have asked the delegation of Mexico not to press its draft resolution to a vote if the draft resolution of the African and Asian countries, which has priority in point of time, is adopted first. If this draft resolution is adopted, as we believe it will be—we hope so and we shall vote for it—we think it would be better if the Mexican draft were not put to the vote.

140. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We have concluded the explanations of vote. Before the vote is taken, I think it may be useful if I clarify the situation.

141. As a result of the appeal made by certain delegations, the representative of the USSR has stated that his delegation would not insist on its draft resolution [A/L.355] being put to the vote; and as the representative of Nigeria has announced that his delegation would likewise not insist on a vote being taken on its own draft resolution [A/L.357 and Add.1], these two draft resolutions will not be put to the vote. Consequently, the Assembly will not have to take a decision regarding agenda item 22 (a), to which only the draft resolution of Nigeria related, and will have to vote merely on the proposals concerning item 88.

142. In addition, I must point out that an amendment [A/L.371] has just been submitted to draft resolution A/L.367/Rev.1, proposing the addition, at the end of the draft resolution's paragraph 1, of the following phrase: "and, in particular, with the wishes of the peoples and their right of self-determination". The text of this amendment will be distributed immediately.

143. I think it would be reasonable if the Assembly voted first on the draft resolutions of a general character, and then on the draft resolutions of a specific nature—those that deal with the question of West New Guinea, while voting on each series of drafts in the order in which they were submitted.

144. Therefore—to summarize—I shall put to the vote first the proposals in the first group, that is the amendments [A/L.370] to draft resolution A/L.366 and Add.1-3, then that draft resolution itself, and draft resolution A/L.338. I shall then invite the Assembly to vote on the proposals in the second group: draft resolution A/L.354, the amendment [A/L.371] to draft resolution A/L.367/Rev.1, then that draft resolution itself and draft resolution A/L.368; since a request has been made that a priority vote should be taken on this last draft resolution, I shall consult the Assembly on this subject in due course.

145. If there are no objections, I shall consider that the Assembly accepts this procedure.

It was so decided.

146. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Before proceeding to the vote, I remind you, in order to prevent any misunderstanding, that a two-thirds majority is required for the adoption of the various proposals before us, in accordance with all the precedents.

147. I invite the Assembly to vote on the amendments [A/L.370] which the USSR has proposed to draft resolution A/L.366 and Add.1-3. I first put to the vote the first amendment. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Poland, Romania.

Against: South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines.

Abstaining: Sudan, Togo, Upper Volta, Yemen, Afghanistan, Austria, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia.

Present and not voting: Portugal.

The first amendment was rejected by 46 votes to 19, with 36 abstentions.

148. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I invite the Assembly to vote on the second amendment submitted by the USSR.

The second amendment was rejected by 36 votes to 22, with 35 abstentions.

149. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I put to the vote the 38-Power draft resolution [A/L.366 and Add.1-3]. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet

Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania.

Against: None.

Abstaining: South Africa, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, France.

Present and not voting: Portugal.

The draft resolution was adopted by 97 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

150. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of India on a point of order in connexion with the voting procedure, in accordance with rule 90 of the Rules of Procedure.

151. Mr. JHA (India): We have just concluded the voting on the draft resolution presented by the African-Asian Members. The vote on that draft resolution was most impressive, and it has been carried unanimously with but four abstentions. In the light of that massive vote I have taken the liberty of asking to be allowed to speak in order to make an appeal to the delegation of Mexico not to press its draft resolution [A/L.369] to the vote. As I said in my statement this afternoon [1065th meeting], the sincerity of the motives of the delegation of Mexico and its objectives in placing this draft resolution before the General Assembly are in line with the great contribution that Mexico has made in the past on the subject of freedom for dependent peoples and, if I may so, with the great liberalism it has shown in attitudes in the United Nations. But I also venture to point out at that time the very many facts of detail that were in this draft resolution, and we feel that at this stage the best thing the Assembly could do would be to rest content with the resolution that has just been adopted.

152. If the Mexican draft resolution is not pressed to a vote and is, more or less, left on the table of this Assembly, we feel sure that the objectives of the Mexican delegation will be achieved inasmuch as the special committee that is going to be formed under the resolution just adopted will be able to look into this draft resolution and perhaps consider—and consider sympathetically—some of the ideas incorporated therein. I would, therefore, add my voice to the appeal made by other delegations here requesting the Mexican delegation to consider not pressing its draft resolution to a vote.

153. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of Mexico on a point of order in connexion with the voting procedure.

154. Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): I have listened carefully to the remarks which various representatives have made about the draft resolution submitted by my delegation [A/L.369]. We have taken into account the reasons for their reservations and the difficulties which have prevented them from supporting it.

155. We are grateful for the generous remarks which various friendly delegations have made about the purposes underlying our draft resolution, and we have listened to the amicable appeal to my delegation not to press the draft to a vote on this occasion in the spirit in which this appeal was made.

156. Draft resolution A/L.366 and Add.1-3, submitted by thirty-eight African and Asian countries, has been adopted by an extraordinary majority, which includes my delegation. Although I think the draft submitted by Mexico lays down a clearer procedure for the elimination of colonialism, the fundamental lines of our draft are the same as those of the one just adopted. For this reason I do not insist that our draft resolution should be put to the vote, but I reserve the right to submit it to the Assembly on another occasion.

157. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Since the Mexican representative has announced that he will not press for a vote on his country's draft resolution [A/L.369], the Assembly is not required to take any decision on that proposal.

158. That completes our work on the draft resolutions of a general character. We now have to vote on the specific draft resolutions concerning West New Guinea, which I shall enumerate. They are first, draft resolution A/L.354, then draft resolution A/L.367/Rev.1, to which there is an amendment [A/L.371], and lastly draft resolution A/L.368.

159. The delegations of Niger and Dahomey have requested, on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.368, that their proposal shall be given priority—in other words, that it shall be put to the vote before the other two draft resolutions. Does anyone wish to speak on this motion for priority?

160. Mr. JHA (India): A proposal for priority has been made in connexion with draft resolution A/L.368. This proposal has been moved by Cameroon and twelve other delegations. Draft resolution A/L.367/Rev.1, which is sponsored, among others, by my delegation, chronologically comes before draft resolution A/L.368. This is obvious.

161. We have not heard any convincing arguments as to why draft resolution A/L.368 should precede draft resolution A/L.367/Rev.1. Consequently, my delegation would oppose priority being given to draft resolution A/L.368, and would press for the resolutions being taken in their chronological order.

162. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Since the representative of India opposes the motion that draft resolution A/L.368 should be given priority, I now put that motion to the vote.

The motion was adopted by 42 votes to 37, with 13 abstentions.

163. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The Assembly having agreed that draft resolution A/L.368 should be given priority, I shall put that draft resolution to the vote first.

164. I have received several requests for separate votes on this draft resolution. One of these, from the delegation of Ghana, relates to the last preambular paragraph. In addition, the Liberian delegation has asked for separate votes, first on that part of operative paragraph 1 which begins with the word "Urges" and ends with the words "West New Guinea", secondly on paragraph 5, sub-paragraph (b), and thirdly on paragraph 6.

165. I now call upon the Assembly to vote on the thirteen-Power draft resolution [A/L.368]. At Ghana's request, I shall first put to the vote the last preambular paragraph. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gabon, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland.

Against: Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq.

Abstaining: Japan, Laos, Pakistan, Portugal, South Africa, Thailand, Turkey, Venezuela, Argentina, Austria, Cyprus, Greece, Guatemala, Iran.

The result of the vote was 53 in favour and 36 against, with 14 abstentions.

The last preambular paragraph was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

166. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The representative of Liberia has requested a separate vote on the following part of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution:

["The General Assembly"]

"Urges the Governments of Indonesia and the Netherlands to resume negotiations without delay with a view to reaching an agreement on the future of the territory of West New Guinea".

I shall accordingly put this passage to the vote separately, but I must confess to some perplexity, for if this part of the paragraph is rejected the rest of the text will make no sense.

167. Mr. Henry Ford COOPER (Liberia): Perhaps the President can reverse the procedure. Suppose we take a separate vote on the words "without prejudice to respect for the will and self-determination of the peoples"?

168. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of Dahomey on a point of order in connexion with the conduct of the voting.

169. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) (translated from French): According to rule 91 of the Rules of Procedure, a representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment shall be voted on separately but, if objection is made to the request for division, the motion for division shall be voted upon. In accordance with that rule, I request that the Liberian motion for division should be put to the vote.

170. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The Assembly has just heard the Dahomey representative's request. In accordance with rule 91 of the Rules of Procedure, I shall put to the vote the motion for division made by the representative of Liberia. I would remind you that two speakers are entitled to speak in favour and two speakers against.

171. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan): It is not for me to correct the President but we believe that the voting had started before the intervention of the representative of Dahomey. The President said that the vote would be taken on that phrase—and at that moment the voting started, juridically.

172. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) (translated from French): It is true that, under the Assembly's Rules of Procedure, a point of order cannot be entertained after voting has begun. I would point out, however, that I raised my point of order before the passage in question was put to the vote. As you may have noticed, I kept my hand raised all the time, but was not called upon to state my point of order until the President had read out the passage in question.

173. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): In the interest of bringing our proceedings to a speedy close, I feel that we should not linger on points of this nature. Since the Liberian motion for division has been challenged, I shall ask the Assembly to vote on it. I think that this will be much simpler than embarking on a discussion of whether or not I should put to the Assembly the objection to that motion for division.

174. Does anyone else wish to speak for or against the motion for division made by the representative of Liberia?

175. Mr. SOW (Chad) (translated from French): My delegation is opposed to the motion for division submitted by the representative of Liberia.

176. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Two representatives have spoken against the motion for division submitted by Liberia. Are there any representatives who wish to speak in favour of it?

177. Since no one has asked to speak, I shall ask the Assembly to vote on the motion for division submitted by the representative of Liberia.

The motion was rejected by 45 votes to 38, with 12 abstentions.

178. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The representative of Liberia has asked for a separate vote on paragraph 5 (b) of the draft resolution. I shall accordingly put that paragraph to the vote.

179. I would ask representatives wishing to raise points of order to be good enough to ask to speak before I announce that I am putting a particular part of a resolution to the vote.

180. I call on the representative of Dahomey on a point of order relating to the voting procedure.

181. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) (translated from French): Mr. President, I am grateful for your courtesy. No doubt my voice did not carry as far as the Presidential table, but all my neighbours heard me raise a point of order before you put paragraph 5 (b) to the vote.

182. I am opposed to the request for a separate vote on that sub-paragraph, which is worded as follows:

"(b) To examine the possibilities of establishing, for an interim period, an international system for the administration and supervision of the territory."

This is, in fact, one of the most important passages of our draft resolution. It would have the effect of settling a precedent by placing a Non-Self-Governing Territory under the administration and supervision of the United Nations. This solution is equivalent in practice to withdrawing the administration from the Netherlands, and therefore to eliminating the consequences of the presence of the Netherlands in that part of the world. It follows that this provision favours Indonesia, and we find it difficult to understand why the countries which support Indonesia (and we would point out that we are not opposed to Indonesia) should oppose this paragraph.

183. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Before the representative of Dahomey leaves the rostrum, I wish to remind representatives that the representative of Liberia has also asked for a separate vote on paragraph 6 of the draft resolution. Is the representative of Dahomey also opposed to a separate vote on that paragraph?

184. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) (translated from French): In order to avoid any further misunderstanding, I wish to make it clear here and now that I am also opposed to a separate vote on paragraph 6.

185. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Objection has been made to the Liberian representative's motion for a separate vote on paragraph 5 (b) and on paragraph 6 of the draft resolution. Under rule 91 of the Rules of Procedure, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two representatives against, the motion for division.

186. Mr. Henry Ford COOPER (Liberia): I only wish to read out part of rule 90. You must recall that the representative of Dahomey did not raise a point of order. The first sentence of rule 90 states:

"After the President has announced the beginning of voting, no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connexion with the actual conduct of the voting."

The representative of Dahomey did not raise a point of order.

187. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia): I take the floor simply to try to gain understanding of the motives of my colleagues who have sponsored this draft resolution in their attempt to prevent a number of delegations who wish to take certain positions on certain paragraphs or on certain phrases in draft resolution now before us from expressing themselves. To give an example, a separate vote was requested on the last paragraph of the preamble and a vote was taken. In consequence, a number of delegations took certain positions, as they have a right to do.

188. In a similar exercise of the right conferred on each Member of the Assembly, the representative of Liberia requested a separate vote on the words "without prejudice to respect for the will and self-determination of the peoples". This is a very important phrase and he wished to make known his position. Had this right been given to all of us, we would have made our positions known. However, that right was denied us. Again, another attempt was made to take a separate vote and a request now stands before the Assembly that we should not have to vote on any paragraph upon which we may not have instructions or which

we are against or on which we may wish to abstain. But if we are deprived of this right—and I do not think I have ever seen such matters handled in this manner in the past—we are really being requested either to accept or to reject the draft resolution as a whole. In that case, I think it would be more elegant to say that the sponsors are opposed to all separate votes on the draft resolution, in which case, despite our feelings, we shall take a position on the draft resolution which may not be exactly what we intended in requesting votes by division.

189. Therefore, my proposition is this: If the sponsors of the draft resolution refuse to have it voted on paragraph by paragraph, all I ask now is that the draft resolution be put to the vote as a whole so that we can take a certain position on it as a whole.

190. Mr. JHA (India): Rule 91 of the Rules of Procedure clearly states that: "a representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment shall be voted on separately". This rule has been applied in the General Assembly over the years and sometimes some of us have felt that it has perhaps been applied rather for certain purposes of which we did not approve. Nevertheless, the Assembly has consistently, with but very few exceptions, given the democratic right to its Members to have separate parts of a proposal voted upon separately. The reason for this rule is a good one, and it has just been stated by the representative of Ethiopia.

191. In this particular case, the proposal of the representative of Liberia was a very proper one, because operative paragraph 5 (b) of draft resolution A/L.368 is a very important one and is a separately identifiable part of that draft resolution. If the sponsors of the draft resolution do not want any part to be voted upon separately and if they can muster the necessary majority, as they seem to be doing, in order to prevent voting on separate parts, that is another matter.

192. So far as my delegation is concerned, it is not going to make any difference to the definite attitude which we have already adopted whether we vote on the draft resolution in parts or as a whole. But it seems to me that operative paragraph 5, sub-paragraph (b), on which a separate vote was requested by the representative of Liberia, is a very important part of this draft resolution. As I ventured to say in my statement this afternoon [1065th meeting], this is something which goes very much beyond what is contemplated in the Charter in a specific dispute of this kind. Therefore, we think that this sub-paragraph should be voted upon separately and that the Assembly should respect certain traditions that have been built up over the years and allow to Members the democratic right to have separate parts of a draft resolution voted upon separately. Of course, there may be circumstances, there have been circumstances in this Assembly in the past, although very special circumstances, when the deletion of a particular phrase or of a particular clause completely ruined a solution. In those cases, of course, the Assembly has sometimes taken a decision not to have a separate vote. But I submit that none of those reasons applies in the case of a separate vote on operative paragraph 5, sub-paragraph (b).

193. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Two representatives have spoken in favour of the motion for division. One representative has spoken against it. I can only call on one more speaker who wishes to oppose the motion.

194. Mr. BINDZI (Cameroon) (translated from French): In view of the late hour, I shall not take up much of the Assembly's time. However, the Indian representative has just referred to rule 91 of the Rules of Procedure. This rule provides as follows:

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

Thus I note that the Rules of Procedure provide for two possibilities: first, they give delegations which wish for a separate vote the right to request it; secondly, they grant the Assembly the right to refuse such a vote if it considers that the reasons given are inadequate. That is why we are requesting that the Assembly should vote on the motion for division which has been submitted; I do not think that this in any way restricts the Assembly's democratic freedom.

195. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Two speakers have spoken in favour of the motion for division submitted by the representative of Liberia and two speakers have spoken against it. I shall consequently put to the vote the motion that the Assembly should vote separately on paragraph 5 (b) and on paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/L.368.

The motion was rejected by 42 votes to 36, with 12 abstentions.

196. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/L.368 as a whole with the exception of the last preambular paragraph, which has been rejected. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gabon, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger.

Against: Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal.

Abstaining: Portugal, South Africa, Turkey, Austria, Ecuador, Guatemala, Iran, Japan, Laos.

The result of the vote was 53 in favour, 41 against and 9 abstentions.

The draft resolution was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

197. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We now come to the two draft resolutions that we still have to consider, A/L.354 and A/L.367/Rev.1; an amendment [A/L.371] has been submitted to the latter, proposing that the words "... and, in particular, with the wishes of the people and their right of self-determination" should be added at the end of paragraph 1.

198. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America): I rise, under rule 90 and rule 93, to make an appeal to the delegations which still have draft resolutions pending before the Assembly in this regard not to press those draft resolutions. I refer to the Netherlands draft resolution [A/L.354], and the draft resolution submitted by India and other delegations [A/L.367/Rev.1].

199. It appears to my delegation that it would be fruitless to proceed to a vote on these draft resolutions, since the draft resolution that was proposed as a middle ground between these two positions has failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority, and that to proceed to a vote on these draft resolutions would only exacerbate feelings which need no further exacerbation.

200. With regard to the Netherlands draft resolution, it would seem appropriate to appeal to that delegation not to press for a vote in view of the result obtained by the draft resolution sponsored by the thirteen African States.

201. With regard to the other draft resolution, sponsored by the delegation of India and others, it is strongly opposed by the Netherlands delegation; it was not asked for by the Indonesian delegation. Therefore, we strongly appeal to those delegations which sponsored that draft resolution not to press it to a vote.

202. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands): My delegation regrets that the General Assembly has not adopted the eminently reasonable compromise draft resolution proposed by the thirteen African countries. On the other hand, we were heartened by the fact that, although the two-thirds majority was not obtained, more than half of the Members of the Assembly voted in favour of that draft resolution, thus upholding the right of self-determination of the Papuan people. This, to us, is a proof that in trying to internationalize the administration of West New Guinea, we have taken the right direction. We shall therefore continue on this path with confidence.

203. In view of the result of the vote on the draft resolution proposed by the thirteen African countries we do not consider it opportune to press our own draft resolution [A/L.354] to a vote at the present moment, and we are content to let the case rest as it stands for the time being.

204. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The representative of the Netherlands has just announced that his delegation will not press its draft resolution [A/L.354] to a vote.

205. Mr. JHA (India): I have listened with great attention to the observations and the appeal made by the representative of the United States. I fully appreciate the reasons why he suggests that no vote should be taken on draft resolution A/L.367/Rev.1. I wish that I could accede to his request, but the position that is being reached now, or is likely to be reached—I am not a soothsayer and I do not know what the result will be—is something which was not unexpected by us. If I may say so, the position that was reached a few

moments ago on the draft resolution proposed by the thirteen African countries was also not unexpected by the sponsors and other supporters. The fact that that draft resolution failed to secure a two-thirds majority seems to us to make it all the more necessary that there should be an expression of opinion on draft resolution A/L.367/Rev.1. We do not quite see why this draft resolution should exacerbate feelings; it is not ordering anybody to take any particular action or to decide any particular policy; it only asks for negotiations. And that has been the usual pattern of General Assembly resolutions where there have been disputes and a multitude of issues involved.

206. Thus, while appreciating the observations of the representative of the United States—and we always pay great attention to what Mr. Bingham has to say—I feel that we shall not be able to comply with his suggestion. We believe that this draft resolution, which was drafted with care and which we placed quite seriously before the Assembly, should be put to the vote, whatever may be the result of the voting.

207. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The representative of India has just stated on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.367/Rev.1 that he insists on this proposal being put to the vote.

208. I call on the representative of Liberia on a point of order in connexion with the voting procedure.

209. Mr. Henry Ford COOPER (Liberia): I feel that no useful purpose can be served by putting this draft resolution [A/L.367/Rev.1] to a vote. Although my delegation sponsored the draft resolution, in view of what has happened a vote would be mere procedure. We can never get a two-thirds majority, and I think that the representative of India knows that. So why go through the procedure of putting this draft resolution to a vote?

210. I agree with the representative of the United States that we should take no further votes on this question of West Irian and, therefore, I would appeal to the representative of India and the other sponsors not to press for a vote on our draft resolution. If India still insists, then I would request that the name of Liberia should be withdrawn from the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

211. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia): I have asked for permission to speak in order to draw attention to the fact that the amendment contained in document A/L.371 was submitted only late this evening. As a matter of fact I saw it only a few minutes ago, when the President called our attention to it. I wonder whether it is altogether proper at this time to submit an amendment of this nature. How are we going to vote on it, since we have not had time to consider it? I ask the President, in all seriousness, not to put my delegation in difficulty by asking us to vote on an amendment that has a serious implication, and I would request him to clarify the situation because I find myself in complete disagreement with the procedure adopted in bringing this amendment before the Assembly.

212. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I should like to inform the representative of Ethiopia in connexion with his statement that the amendment in document A/L.371 was introduced at the beginning of this evening's meeting. The President took care to draw the attention of all delegations to this amendment in good time. Under rule 80 of the Rules of Procedure, the President may permit the discussion

and consideration of amendments, or of motions as to procedure, even though these amendments and motions have not been circulated or have only been circulated the same day. I announced that I would put this amendment to the vote. No objections were then raised. I think there would be no difficulty in concluding the discussion of draft resolution A/L.367/Rev.1.

213. I call on the representative of Cameroon on a point of order in connexion with the voting procedure.

214. Mr. BINDZI (Cameroon) (translated from French): I apologize for speaking again at this stage of the debate, but I do so in all good faith and with the best of intentions in an attempt to assist the President.

215. My friends have asked me to come to this rostrum to withdraw the amendment [A/L.371] which we submitted to the draft resolution introduced by India and certain other States [A/L.367/Rev.1]. We believed that this amendment, which in fact adds almost nothing of substance to the text of the proposal and merely makes it more explicit, would enable all of us to vote for this text and would result in a resolution which would command the support of the majority of the whole Assembly.

216. As we now see that some delegations have such doubts about our small amendment, we withdraw it in all humility. This withdrawal means, however, that we shall unfortunately be unable to vote for the draft resolution, because a people is involved and to say that a decision can be made without taking the expressed wishes of that people into account is, in fact, to support a principle to which we cannot subscribe.

217. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): As amendment A/L.371 has just been withdrawn, I shall put the nine-Power draft resolution [A/L.367/Rev.1] to the vote. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The United States of America, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Albania, Austria, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic.

Against: United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, France, Gabon, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Brazil, Canada, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Haiti, Iran, Japan, Laos, Mexico, Nigeria, Panama, Somalia, Togo, Turkey.

Liberia did not participate in the voting.

The result of the vote was 41 in favour, 40 against and 21 abstentions.

The draft resolution was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

218. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call on representatives who wish to explain their vote.

219. Lord DUNDEE (United Kingdom): I wish to explain briefly the reasons for the United Kingdom delegation's vote on the resolution and draft resolutions on which the Assembly has just voted.

220. I begin with the draft resolution submitted by the thirteen African Powers, which would have established a commission appointed by the General Assembly to investigate the conditions prevailing in West New Guinea and to examine the possibilities of establishing an interim system of international administration and supervision in the territory. My delegation voted for this proposal wholeheartedly, both when it was taken to pieces and when it was put together again; and we wish to make it clear that we did so because the New Guinea commission would be established in accordance with the wishes of the Administering Authority. It does not, therefore, create any precedent for any attempt to intervene without invitation in the administration of a Non-Self-Governing Territory.

221. We feel that West New Guinea presents special features. It is clearly an international problem whose solution we are anxious to find. It did not seem to my delegation that the draft resolution which was sponsored by our friends of the Indian delegation and Bolivia would take us nearer to the solution.

222. Four years ago, in November 1957, my delegation voted against a similarly worded proposal which asked the Netherlands and Indonesian Governments to solve their differences through negotiation. This draft resolution ignores the fact that the Assembly has been presented with an offer from the Netherlands Government to place the Territory under international administration, nor does it take any account of the need to bring the Territory to self-government or independence in accordance with the principle of self-determination.

223. The inhabitants, the Papuans, are nowhere mentioned at all; and for these reasons my delegation voted against that draft resolution.

224. Finally, there is the resolution on the granting of independence to colonial countries, arising from resolution 1514 (XV), submitted by thirty-eight States. My delegation abstained on this resolution. We regretted having to do so, and I wish to explain our reasons.

225. I want to make it clear that, subject to what I shall say, we shall be ready to co-operate with the new Special Committee which is set up by paragraph 3 of the resolution. The record of the United Kingdom in the territories under British administration is well known. It is a record based on the principles of self-government, self-determination and national independence. We have already come far along the road we set ourselves, and we have declared our determination to pursue our policies with urgency and energy.

226. Let me therefore say, in the strongest terms, that none of the charges set out in the preamble to this resolution can have any application whatever to

the territories for which the United Kingdom is responsible.

227. Let me also refer to the first and second operative paragraphs of the resolution which mentions resolution 1514 (XV). We have already fully explained our attitude towards that resolution. I particularly refer to and confirm the reservations which were clearly set out in the speech which Sir David Ormsby-Gore made to the Assembly at its fifteenth session [947th meeting].

228. We are ourselves moving ahead rapidly with the process of decolonization in accordance with the Charter. As our Prime Minister, Mr. Macmillan, said when he spoke here in this Assembly at the fifteenth session [877th meeting], these are policies which British Governments of all parties have followed, not only since the war but for many generations. We are proud of our record in helping, over so short a period—for it is a short period in the history of the world—so many peoples to reach a state of social and political development which enables them now to enjoy both free and orderly self-government. These policies of ours did not originate from resolution 1514 (XV).

229. The Assembly has no doubt heard a British proverb which says: "You cannot teach your grandmother to suck eggs". We do not need to be pressed to follow policies which we have long pursued, with the results which we see here at the United Nations in the many countries formerly under our administration but now self-governing and independent. Still less do we need to be supervised in carrying out our task. We have at every stage made it plain that we shall discharge our responsibility fully and fearlessly. We cannot share or shift that responsibility. Neither have we any wish to shirk it. We have made it clear throughout that we cannot accept any form of intervention in the administration of the territories for which we are responsible; and if there were any attempt to intervene in their administration, we should be bound to withdraw our co-operation.

230. We have co-operated very fully with the Committee on Information, and indeed, as far as we are concerned, we see no need for any other committee. Nevertheless in the spirit of co-operation we are willing, subject to its satisfactory composition and on the clear understanding that it will not attempt to interfere in the administration of territories for which we are responsible, to co-operate with this new Special Committee set up by paragraph 3 of the resolution. We are willing to co-operate with the Committee; to participate in it, to provide it with information and join in its discussions.

231. That is the spirit of co-operation which we always show in these matters. It was in this spirit that we announced earlier at this session [1017th meeting, paras. 114-115] our intention to provide the United Nations with full political and constitutional information on all our remaining dependent territories, and it is in that spirit that we make this further declaration of co-operation today.

232. Mr. VAKIL (Iran) (translated from French): I wish to explain briefly the reasons why my delegation abstained from voting on the two draft resolutions concerning West Irian. Both these draft resolutions contained provisions to which we can subscribe. But neither of them commanded the full support of both parties, and we consequently felt that they had no

chance of attaining their intended objective. We have tried from the outset to find a solution which would be acceptable to both parties. We have not so far met with success, but we do not give up hope. We still believe that it is possible to find a solution which will enable this dispute to be settled on an amicable basis, and we are ready to be of service to both parties.

233. Mr. SUBANDRIO (Indonesia): I must apologize for speaking once again, but I hope that this will be the last time that I shall come to this rostrum. I would like to explain the votes that we have cast on the resolution. Once more, we have not come here to seek a resolution, because we do not believe that at this stage the United Nations can find a compromise formula acceptable to both parties since the views of both parties are very far from each other. On the other hand, we have always stated that we want to have negotiations with the Netherlands. If they do not succeed the first time, then we must try a second time and a third time. A conflict between two sovereign States can only be resolved by negotiation, unless one State is annihilated. Of course it might be done through a miracle, but I do not believe in miracles in international relations. It was for that reason that we have always proposed that negotiations should be held. In that way tension can be kept down in that region of conflict. The conflict between us and the Netherlands is not a conflict that is separated by thousands of miles. It is a conflict involving adjacent regions in which two forces are standing, one opposed to the other.

234. My delegation is gratified that the draft resolution which prejudiced our point of view has not been adopted by the General Assembly because it did not obtain the required two-thirds majority. If the representative of the Netherlands has explained that, as the draft resolution sponsored by thirteen countries of Africa got a simple majority, he will proceed in confidence with his plan, I can state here for Indonesia that, as the draft resolution has been rejected by the General Assembly, Indonesia will also proceed in confidence with its plan to liberate West Irian from the colonizer.

Statement by the President

235. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Before adjourning the meeting, I wish to inform the

General Assembly of the manner in which I propose to conduct our work in future. The Assembly will have to consider shortly, in the course of its next few meetings, a number of reports from various committees on items the discussion of which the committees have concluded by approving draft resolutions recommended for adoption by the Assembly. In view of the fact that these items have been discussed at length in committee and in view of the heavy agenda for this session, I consider it necessary at this stage to make the following observations, which are intended to facilitate our work.

236. First, unless it has been decided to hold a discussion in plenary meeting under rule 68 of the Rules of Procedure, statements must be strictly limited to explanations of vote on draft resolutions recommended by committees, or on amendments, if any, to these resolutions. In my opinion, it would be most desirable for delegations to refrain from making such explanations a pretext for the actual discussion of the item concerned.

237. Secondly, in order to facilitate the full application of rule 90 of the Rules of Procedure, a provisional list of representatives wishing to explain their vote in connexion with each item will be drawn up before the relevant report of the committee is introduced so that the President is in a position to decide the best procedure to be followed in this connexion. Depending on the length of this list, the President may, under rule 90 of the Rules of Procedure, either permit Members to explain their votes before the voting, with or without a time-limit on statements, or permit explanations to be made after the voting. Explanations of vote for which permission has been requested after the report has been presented by the Rapporteur will, in principle, be given after the voting.

238. I appeal to all delegations to co-operate in facilitating the President's task by helping him to ensure the sound application of these principles, which I feel are in keeping with the spirit and letter of the Rules of Procedure and will do much to ease our future work.

*The meeting rose at 12.30 a.m. on Tuesday,
28 November.*