



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 98: Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian): report of the Secretary-General regarding the act of self-determination in West Irian (continued)	1

President: Miss Angie E. BROOKS (Liberia).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 98

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

1. The PRESIDENT: The following documents are before the Assembly under this item. First, there is the report of the Secretary-General regarding the act of self-determination in West Irian [A/7723 and Corr.1]. This report has been submitted by the Secretary-General in pursuance of resolution 1752 (XVII) of 21 September 1962, in which the General Assembly took note of the Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian),¹ acknowledged the role conferred upon the Secretary-General in the Agreement and authorized him to carry out the tasks entrusted to him therein. One of those tasks was to report to the General Assembly after the act of self-determination in West Irian. Secondly, there is the letter dated 11 November 1969 from the representatives of Indonesia and the Netherlands to the Secretary-General [A/7763]. Thirdly, there is the draft resolution submitted by Belgium, Indonesia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, the Netherlands and Thailand [A/L.574].

2. Mr. NICOL (Sierra Leone): My delegation would like to commend the granting of economic assistance to the people of West Irian by Indonesia, as outlined in its development plans, and by the Netherlands, as promised in the draft resolution under discussion. The act of free choice appears to have been interpreted differently by the Secretary-General's Representative and the Indonesian officials. The former started off with a thesis that the people of West Irian had a choice. The Indonesian feeling, as we can infer from the reports of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, appears

to be that the act of free choice was the culmination of Indonesian independence and the final unity of Indonesia after years of colonial domination. Therefore, to them, any dissident voice from West Irian implied disunity, disloyalty and a retrograde step. This Indonesian concept reflects itself in the method of implementing the act of free choice and, if it is accepted, does not leave room for any discussion on the method of implementation.

3. My delegation did not, however, understand this to be necessarily the case. We understood that the act of free choice left an option for the West Irianese to decide whether to be included in the Indonesian Republic or not. If this was so, and if we are correct in this inference, then we must record our grave concern at the methods adopted. The Secretary-General, his Representative, Ambassador Ortiz Sanz, and his team certainly deserve our congratulations for their fine work. On examination, their report shows some reservations. The Secretary-General's Representative was not allowed to bring in as large a team as he thought necessary for his task. He had been asked to assist, advise and participate, but he was allowed only to assist and advise. He was not satisfied with the amount of freedom of speech and expression allowed to the West Irianese.

4. Indonesia has a fine anti-colonial record and we cannot accuse it of racial or religious prejudice in this matter. We see, instead, a firm desire on their part to bring into being a larger and united Indonesia. Nevertheless, it has been brought to the notice of many of us that among some of the educated elements in West Irian there is a strong desire for the complete independence, eventually, of the whole island.

5. My delegation would like Indonesia and Australia to re-examine that desire of the Papuan people with understanding and sympathy. The island and its peoples can form a viable unit which will reduce tension in that area and remove a potent source of conflict in future years.

6. No society could be said to be so primitive and no terrain so geographically difficult in the modern world that the vital exercise of democratic government should be indefinitely denied to its peoples. Adult and school education, road engineering and aerial communications comprise a few of the techniques that can be used to eliminate these obstacles towards fully representative government.

7. My delegation shares the fears of other delegations that the acceptance of the same arguments being used in this case against international standards of free elections and the substitution instead of Indonesian standards of democracy, however well-intentioned and honourable these may be, leaves room for countries like South Africa, Portugal and

* Resumed from the 1810th meeting.

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

the illegal régime of Rhodesia to bring forward similar arguments in support of their own type of standards which would certainly operate to the detriment of freedom for black Africans. Our sincerity and integrity in refusing to accept these arguments would be challenged if we were to agree to allow the present exercise to go unquestioned, without recording our misgivings. We must note in this context and in fairness to Indonesia that it has always taken a strong stand on these matters, particularly on Namibia.

8. We note with satisfaction the promise of Indonesia to increase the autonomy of the government of the island and to intensify its development. The concern and co-operation shown by the Netherlands Government, as indicated by the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands in his speech a few days ago [1810th meeting], will do much to erase the impression of neglect of past years and emphasize the forward-looking attitude of its present Government.

9. The logical results of all these development schemes should be that it ought to be possible within a decade or less to give the island and people of the whole of Papua another opportunity of expressing again—this time by international standards of freedom of speech and elections—the direction in which they feel that a just and stable future lies for them.

10. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana): Once again man has scaled the heights of human ingenuity. Today, as we speak, human beings lie sleeping on the moon's surface. The voyage of the three American astronauts to the moon is receiving the highest commendation of the modern world. Their skill and ingenuity reflect the advances in science and technology which the Government of the United States has promoted and achieved. We extend our congratulations to the astronauts and to the Government and people of the United States.

11. We have under consideration the report of the Secretary-General regarding the act of self-determination in West Irian [A/7723 and Corr.1], a letter from the permanent representatives of Indonesia and the Netherlands [A/7763] and a draft resolution [A/L.574]. Thanks to the wise ruling of the President last week, we have had more time to study these documents.

12. There can be no doubt that the documents deal with a matter of great concern to the United Nations and to all freedom-loving peoples and impose upon the General Assembly a grave responsibility which we must discharge in all good conscience. By this draft resolution the Assembly is invited to take note of the report of the Secretary-General and to acknowledge with appreciation the fulfilment by the Secretary-General and his representative of the tasks entrusted to them under the Agreement of 1962 between Indonesia and the Netherlands. It is the duty of the Assembly, therefore, to consider whether the tasks entrusted to the Secretary-General and his Representative under the Agreement of 1962 have actually been fulfilled.

13. What were those tasks? The first task was that the United Nations and the Secretary-General should administer, as a United Nations Temporary Executive Authority, the Territory of West Irian between 1 August 1962 and 1 May 1963, when it should transfer the administration of the Territory to Indonesia.

14. The second task of the United Nations was a three-fold function; that is to say “to advise, assist and participate” in arrangements to be made by Indonesia for an act of free choice—referred to in article XVII of the Agreement—taking into account the interests and welfare of the people of the Territory and to be implemented by the end of 1969. According to the Agreement this three-fold function was to be carried out in three stages: (a) for the five-year period before the act of free choice was to be undertaken a number of United Nations experts were to remain in the Territory, after the transfer of responsibility to Indonesia, to advise and assist in the preparations under article XVI; (b) the United Nations representative and his advisers were to carry out the Secretary-General's responsibilities of advising, assisting and participating in the preparation of the arrangements, according to article XVIII; and (c) to assist and participate in implementing these arrangements and the act of free choice.

15. Concerning (a), it is a matter of record, through Mr. Ortiz Sanz, the Secretary-General's Representative, that during the period 1 May 1963 to 23 August 1968 these functions were not carried out by reason of Indonesia's having withdrawn its co-operation with the United Nations during that time. Thus the functions which should have been performed over this relatively long period of time were not performed except in the relatively short period of a few months between 23 August 1968 and 4 August 1969, with a limited staff, over an area which everybody claims is a most difficult geographical terrain. Could it be said, therefore, that this part of the Agreement was fulfilled? No one examining the facts could in good conscience answer this question in the affirmative.

16. With regard to the remaining stages, (b) and (c), of the implementation of the functions of the Secretary-General, here again it is a matter of record that Mr. Ortiz Sanz made two proposals for the consideration of the Indonesian Government: first, that the act of free choice should be based on direct voting in the cities in coastal areas where the general area of development, education and experience of the people of West Irian would qualify them to express their opinions freely, and, second, that in the hinterland, where the level of development, communications and education would be difficult, a system “of collective consultations” might be used to complement the one man, one vote, procedure. The advice of the Secretary-General's Representative on this issue was rejected by the Indonesian Government.

17. Before we go into any consideration as to whether the responsibilities imposed on the Secretary-General and his Representative by the Agreement were actually fulfilled, it is incumbent on us to examine the meaning of the function of advising, assisting and participating which the Secretary-General was called upon to carry out under the terms of the Agreement of 1962.

18. Throughout the report of the Secretary-General's Representative the impression is clear that Mr. Ortiz Sanz was not satisfied with the method of *musjawarah*, which had been decided upon by the Indonesian Government as the procedure to be used to determine the act of free choice, although it must be stated that arrangements for this were a clear responsibility imposed on the Indonesian Government by the Agreement of 1962.

19. It cannot be argued that the Agreement envisaged the discharge of that responsibility by the Indonesian Government without due consideration being given to the advice of the Representative of the Secretary-General, at least to the extent that the Indonesian Government's decisions could not be modified. One cannot see any justification for accepting in the Agreement the responsibility of the Secretary-General to advise if what the Agreement envisaged was solely and merely the rejection of such advice from the Representative of the Secretary-General by Indonesia.

20. To argue therefore that the Indonesian Government had carried out its responsibility strictly in terms of the Agreement would convince no reasonable person, because to argue on that basis would be to argue that the Secretary-General might as well have disengaged himself from the process of the implementation of the Agreement right from the beginning. For the purpose of the 1962 Agreement was not that Indonesia would be free to do whatever it wanted to do, but that in exercising its responsibility it duly recognized under the Agreement that it would conform to such methods and procedures in carrying out this obligation to such an extent that it would be possible for the United Nations to recognize the act of free choice as having been truly an act of self-determination by the people of West Irian or, in the words of the Agreement "in accordance with international practice". Here again it is a matter of record that the method adopted to determine the people's will was not in accord with international practice. Hence the painful but clear verdict of Ambassador Ortiz Sanz that "an act of free choice has taken place in West Irian in accordance with Indonesian practices" [A/7723 and Corr.1, annex I, para. 253], but not in accordance with international practice.

21. We are not convinced by the argument that the principle of *musjawarah* was the only political method which could be understood by the people. For it is a matter of record, again, that the Netherlands Government had instituted the voting system in West New Guinea, at least in the relatively educated and accessible urban areas, as well as to a certain extent in parts, at least, of the less accessible highlands. It is difficult to believe, therefore, that these were people who could not understand the voting system. Indeed, we are told that under the Netherlands Administration a type of democratic system known as "the whispering vote" had been successfully used. Further, in Australian Papua and New Guinea, which is characterized by the same difficult geographical features and is inhabited by the same so-called undeveloped peoples, the principle of "one man, one vote" is being successfully used, and a somewhat enlightened policy is being applied there in leading the peoples towards eventual self-rule. If in Australian New Guinea, why not in Indonesian New Guinea? And do the Indonesian people use the *musjawarah* procedure for their own national elections or is it something manufactured by the rulers for the ruled?

22. Because of the questionable methods adopted in ascertaining the will of the people of West Irian, we hold that article XVIII (b) of the Agreement was breached and that the results of that act were not those of the act of free choice within the meaning of the Agreement.

23. The fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution cannot therefore be considered valid by any impartial person nor can we accept paragraph 1 of the draft resolution as accurate. The Secretary-General and his Representative have not fulfilled the tasks entrusted to them under the Agreement. The best we can admit is that they have genuinely tried to fulfil those tasks. Further, in view of the unnecessary and undesirable regional sensitivities and loyalties which have been deliberately aroused by some delegations in the consideration of this matter, prudence would dictate that whatever development funds are made available to West Irian development should be channelled through the institutions of the United Nations.

24. In the circumstances my delegation cannot subscribe to a draft resolution which seeks to gloss over essential violations and non-fulfilment of the Agreement of 1962, let alone acknowledge with appreciation the fulfilment by the Secretary-General and his Representative of the tasks entrusted to them under the Agreement, for in respect of both the organs chosen for the act of self-determination and the method of appointing members to those organs, as well as the procedures used by those organs, the elementary principles of democracy were violated.

25. We should like, however, to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General and to his Representative for the courage and sense of duty shown in endeavouring to fulfil the tasks in the face of serious difficulties not of their making. We would even say that they deserve the congratulations of the Assembly for their efforts, but we cannot and should not expose them to any shadow of disrepute or accusation from any quarter that they have been made party to what can be described only as a mockery of the democratic process and a breach of the principle of self-determination, a principle so clearly enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. To do that would be to deny the brilliant record of the United Nations in the application of the principle of self-determination, to deny the history of decolonization so nobly achieved by this Organization and to compromise its effectiveness in eliminating the remaining areas of colonialism so intractably entrenched in the heart of Africa. Even considering the method of *musjawarah*, which is said to be the characteristic local form of democracy in the area, one would surely have expected that the system could lend itself to a more democratic procedure than what was adopted. For according to the report of the Representative of the Secretary-General, the consultative assembly in each regency was to be constituted by three classes: first, those of the regional representatives who are supposed to be elected by the people themselves, again through the strange process of *musjawarah*; second, organizational or functional representatives representing social, political and cultural organizations, including religious organizations; and third, traditional representatives consisting of the tribal chiefs, to be chosen by the local council in consultation with "those concerned". Who are "those concerned" in relation to the third category? Who specifies the social, political or cultural organizations in the second category? Nor is it explained how the process of election could be determined through *musjawarah*. Moreover, it is known that members of the existing local councils who were to be automatically members of the regency consultative assemblies for the free choice were Government appointees. There is a strong

presumption therefore that these consultative assemblies were filled with either Government appointees or members who were “elected” through *musjawarah*, naturally, but members all the same appointed because they were known to be the favourites of the Indonesian Government.

26. As far as the second category of persons is concerned, the Indonesian Government’s attitude was

“that those few people—possibly existing—‘not in favour of retaining the ties’ with the Republic of Indonesia, are . . . not organized in legally existing political groups or parties in West Irian” [A/7723 and Corr.1, annex I, para. 126].

27. The end result of the selection of persons to participate in the act of free choice was therefore that only those who favoured retaining ties with Indonesia could be elected. Thus, the means were carefully selected to achieve the desired result. Was this really an act of free choice?

28. Further, it is reported by the representative of the Secretary-General that at the actual event of deciding the act of free choice the strange phenomenon was regularly gone through whereby the Minister of Home Affairs took the floor and virtually campaigned, as it were. I quote from the report:

“He”—the Minister of Home Affairs of Indonesia—“asked the members of the assembly to determine their future with courage and full responsibility bearing in mind that they had one ideology, *Pancha Shila*, one flag, one Government and one country extending from Sabang to Merauke. It was the Indonesian Government, he added, which was willing and able to care for the welfare of the people of West Irian; therefore, there was no alternative but to remain within the Republic of Indonesia. He called upon the assembly to make Merauke the beginning of victory.” [A/7723 and Corr.1, annex I, para. 195.]

29. After this harangue some members took the floor and acted in a manner which can only be described as stampeding, perhaps, the silent majority—to use a phrase which has now become popular and respectable. To anyone who knows the real meaning of self-determination and freedom of choice, the question is tempting: why was there no opportunity given for anyone to make a contrary harangue to the Consultative Assembly?

30. If I have gone into some detail to explain the procedural aspects of the implementation of the act of free choice, it is because, among other things, we in Africa have suffered politically in the past at the hands of colonialists who were determined to apply similar methods to our political evolution; and we are still suffering as a result of the desire of the racists and colonialists who are equally determined to apply similar methods in this day and age to determine the political will of our peoples. These colonialists have used the same arguments that have been used about the people of West Irian: that our peoples are not culturally or educationally developed, that they are ignorant of the democratic process, that the only style of Government they understand is the *diktat* of the local tribal chief, and that the educated politically articulate few are the villains of society and threats to political stability. What

is at stake is the self-determination of the people of West Irian, the integrity of this Organization, and the justification of the principles of the Charter.

31. Here our misgivings have not been diminished by the many references in the report of the Secretary-General’s Representative to the repeated claim made by the Indonesian Government that West Irian was already part of the Indonesian Republic and that this act of self-determination was, therefore, either not necessary or final. For instance, the Foreign Minister of Indonesia in his statement last week said: “The result of the act of free choice, as reported by the Secretary-General, is legal, conclusive and irrevocable.” [1810th meeting, para. 18.] We do not accept this unilateral assertion for the reasons I have already given, and we deplore its implication that all that the Assembly is being asked to do is to rubber-stamp the claims of a Member State. If that were our sole function, then it were better that we did not consider the question at all in this Organization.

32. We have studied the statements made by the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands and of Indonesia [1810th meeting], countries for which we have great affection, even admiration, and with which we have worked together in many common endeavours, particularly in the field of economic development. I must say we have been encouraged and impressed by the progressive policies of these countries in these fields. However, I have detected nothing apart from doubts in their own minds about the validity of this so-called act of free choice, and yet at the same time a determination to wave these doubts away.

33. I have also consulted many delegations on the question under consideration, and in my observation there is deep concern and reservation about the mockery of justice and democracy through which this Assembly is being taken. Some have said we made the mistake in 1962, therefore we should now look only to the future. Others say that there is an atmosphere of inevitability about the vote on this resolution, however unsatisfactory it is. Others are playing regional power-politics over this issue of the destiny of a people. Still others, while recognizing the wide disquiet, are prepared to invoke loyalties which have no relevance to the situation and which are in violation of the principle of self-determination.

34. We refuse to believe that we cannot correct in time what mistakes we have made in the past. We refuse to believe that we are mechanical robots in this Assembly. We refuse to believe that we should put considerations of race, religion and colour above the high principles of the Charter; nor should this be an issue of confrontation between friendly regional groups in this Assembly.

35. It seems to my delegation that we must now exercise our right of choice, a choice in consideration for the peoples of West Irian, and that choice can only be made on three bases.

36. First, that, granted the lack of development and the low educational levels of the people of West Irian, those people should enjoy in the future an accelerated economic development such as will bring them to the level where they can exercise a real act of free choice and that that

development should be largely under the auspices of the United Nations.

37. Secondly, that the United Nations must continue to be involved and have a continuing interest in the area, and exercise some supervisory role over its welfare and political development.

38. Thirdly, that there is a need for the preparation of a final act of free choice, which the people of West Irian themselves should determine, recognizing the conscience of the international community.

39. There are many precedents to guide those concerned, whether by way of a referendum or a plebiscite or other recognized and internationally accepted procedures—procedures such as were used, for example, in Togoland in 1956, and in Rwanda and in Burundi in 1961.

40. The fourth principle should be that until such final act of self-determination takes place this Organization can only take note of the Secretary-General's report as a temporary phase of the continuing process of preparation of the people of West Irian. In that process of continuing preparation it might well be unrealistic to deny some partnership with Indonesia or the Netherlands, and it would be ideal for the United Nations to consider regular progress reports, for instance once every two years. We would hope that the two great countries of Indonesia and the Netherlands, particularly Indonesia, could lend a hand in that high endeavour. If they could see themselves accepting such a role, history would be for ever indebted to them for they would then have extended the boundaries of true self-determination and not limited them as they now appear to be doing under the present draft resolution.

41. For those reasons my delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution as it is.

42. In the light of those reservations I should like, with your indulgence, Mr. President, to table the following amendments for the consideration of the Assembly. I regret the delay in submitting the amendments,² which has been caused by necessary consultations.

43. I would propose replacing the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution by:

"Having received the report of the Secretary-General and his Representative on the latter's work in Indonesia following the 1962 Agreement."

For the fifth preambular paragraph I would propose:

"Bearing in mind the interests and welfare of the people of West Irian as stated in the preamble of the Agreement."

I would propose a new sixth preambular paragraph to read:

"Bearing in mind article XVIII of the Agreement which, inter alia, calls for an act of free choice in accordance with international practice."

I would propose a new seventh preambular paragraph to read:

"Affirming the continuing interest of the United Nations in furthering the purposes of the Agreement."

And at the end of the last preambular paragraph I would propose that we delete the words "the Asian Development Bank and".

44. For paragraph 1 I would propose substituting the following:

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

I would propose the following new paragraph 2:

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

And for the existing paragraph 2 I would propose substituting the following.

"Appreciates any assistance provided through institutions of the United Nations to supplement efforts by the Government of Indonesia to promote the social and economic development of West Irian."

45. Again I repeat that I regret the delay in submitting these amendments, but in view of necessary consultations with many delegations it was not possible to submit them earlier. I have been encouraged to propose these amendments with only one purpose in mind—to enable the General Assembly to do its duty rightly by Indonesia, by the Netherlands and, above all, by the people of West Irian.

46. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia on a point of order.

47. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I am constrained to raise a point of order because I believe our colleague from Ghana, whom I consider as a very dear brother, has lost sight of the fact that the report of the Secretary-General was the result of the General Assembly having taken note a few years ago of the Agreement between Indonesia and the Netherlands and that the report itself was submitted to us here as a matter of courtesy.

48. I want to say that the amendments would have to be submitted as a separate draft resolution and not as amendments to the draft resolution that we have before us. If our colleague from Ghana will kindly note the title of draft resolution A/L.574, he will see that it reads "Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian)".

49. I am not going to delve into the substance because then I would not be on a point of order, but I want to say that from my humble experience you cannot amend an agreement which was made between two parties, two

² Subsequently circulated as document A/L.576.

sovereign Member States of the United Nations, as a result of which we have today a report submitted by the Secretary-General on what his Representative, Ambassador Ortiz Sanz, found in the area.

50. I submit that this is constitutionally wrong, and I stand to be challenged on that by the Counsel if need be. The amendments of the representative of Ghana are, I submit, irrelevant and invalid in so far as draft resolution A/L.574 is concerned. However, representing a sovereign State he can, if he so wishes, introduce a new item by way of the General Committee or, the General Assembly can decide by a vote—it is, after all, master of its own procedure—whether or not a draft resolution containing the substance of his amendments would be accepted for debate. There are two procedures that can be followed. One procedure would be, if the representative of Ghana insists on the substance of his amendments, for him to propose a new item entitled “The self-determination”—or however he wants to word it—“of West Irian” and allow it to go through the proper channels. The second procedure would be—although we have not followed such a procedure, but every Committee of the General Assembly and the Assembly itself is master of its own procedure—for him to submit a draft resolution, and then a debate would be held on whether that draft resolution could be considered in conjunction with the item before us or whether it should be delayed until next year.

51. If we act otherwise we shall be confronted—in the face of the unconstitutional nature of the amendments of our brother from Ghana—by an interminable debate which, I submit, would be irrelevant to the subject before us.

52. Therefore, Mr. President, you need not make a ruling, but before you allow further speakers on this subject I hope that what I have said will be taken into consideration. For if it is not, I warn you—and I have been here long enough to know—that we shall spend perhaps 10 days going round in circles and getting nowhere.

53. I reserve the right to speak on the substance of the matter if the procedure which I have suggested is not followed.

54. Mr. T. N. MOHAMMED (Malaysia): The question of West Irian, formerly West New Guinea, was associated with the United Nations for some eight years. It began in January 1955 as, initially, a dispute over a colonial territory. The deliberations year after year on that question at that time in the General Assembly did not bring a solution to the dispute any nearer. By 1962, however, through the persistent and unceasing efforts of some countries which did not wish to see the dispute escalate into an armed conflict, and with the close collaboration of the United Nations Secretary-General, an agreement was finally forged between Indonesia and the Netherlands, entitled “Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian)”. Today the General Assembly meets to consider not the old question of the dispute over the territory of West Irian, but the aforementioned Agreement which came into force in September 1962 and, in particular, the Secretary-General’s report regarding the act of self-determination in West Irian as called for by that

Agreement. If I may use a metaphor, we are called upon to write the last pages of the closing chapter in the history of the United Nations association with West Irian.

55. The West Irian question in its historical perspective has always been close to Malaysia, and by that I do not mean only in physical terms. In 1960 when the question had already been on the United Nations agenda for five years without a solution appearing within the grasp of the parties concerned, the Prime Minister of my country, then the Federation of Malaya, seeing that the dispute over West Irian between the Netherlands and the Indonesian Governments had further added to the existing tensions in South-East Asia, and with the consent of leaders of the Indonesian Government, offered himself as a mediator in the dispute. During his official visits to the United States and Canada in November 1960, he discussed his proposal with the leaders of those two countries and subsequently with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the late Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld. All those with whom he discussed the subject gave their blessings. He later discussed the proposal with the Netherlands Prime Minister and held preliminary discussions with the Netherlands Foreign Minister—who, incidentally, is still that country’s Foreign Minister and is, I believe, among us today—and the State Secretary for the Netherlands in New Guinea. The result of that preliminary round of talks was embodied in a joint communiqué which revealed that the Netherlands Government was willing to subject its policy in Netherlands New Guinea to the scrutiny and judgement of the United Nations. That represented a step forward towards the realization of a peaceful solution of the West Irian dispute through the United Nations. Unfortunately, however, before the Prime Minister could report to the Indonesian Government the details of his discussions with the Netherlands Government, certain elements in Indonesia, claiming that he had acted without referring the matter to Indonesia, conducted a sustained press campaign and made unbridled attacks on the efforts of the Prime Minister. That was despite the express provisions to the contrary contained in a letter dated 28 September 1960 from the then Acting Indonesian President to the Prime Minister. In the circumstances the Prime Minister could not pursue his efforts further.

56. I have related in some detail that episode in the history of West Irian not in order to relate Malaysia’s role, but rather in order to emphasize the weight and importance that Malaysia has all along given to the West Irian question. To us the question has been of such vital interest—as it still is today—that the Prime Minister of our small nation, then only some three years old, was so concerned with the problem that he was prompted to offer himself as mediator between Indonesia and the Netherlands. He was motivated in that attempt solely because of his desire to see a lessening of tension in that part of the world in which we all live. Even though the attempt failed, for the reasons that I have stated, Malaysia rejoiced at the fact that this germ of an idea which the Prime Minister had initiated in good faith had taken root somewhere else. I need not relate to the representatives in this Assembly the metamorphosis of that idea into what was known as the Bunker Proposal—named after the United States Ambassador who is now in Viet-Nam—which by 15 August 1962 had transformed itself further into the Treaty signed between the Governments of

Indonesia and the Netherlands which I referred to earlier. That Agreement was duly registered as No. 6311 in the United Nations Treaty Series of 1962, and is now commonly referred to as the New York Agreement.

57. The long-standing dispute over the Territory of West Irian was thereby resolved when the Agreement came into force with the adoption by the General Assembly on 21 September 1962 of resolution 1752 (XVII), by which the Assembly took note of the Agreement, acknowledged the role conferred upon the Secretary-General of the United Nations by the Agreement and authorized him to carry out the tasks entrusted to him therein. No country rejoiced more at that event in 1962 than the then Federation of Malaya, one of Indonesia's closest neighbours, with whom it enjoyed the closest social, cultural and religious ties. That source of tension in South-East Asia, with a high potentiality of armed conflict, would be removed for ever from our midst.

58. In considering this question we in this Assembly have before us the report of the Secretary-General on the act of self-determination in West Irian [A/7723 and Corr.1], submitted in compliance with article XXI of the New York Agreement, to which is annexed in full the report of the Secretary-General's Representative as well as the report of the Government of Indonesia. I should like specifically to draw the attention of representatives to the fact that while the Representative of the Secretary-General in his report made certain reservations regarding the implementation of paragraph 1 of article XXII of the Agreement, relating to the rights, including the rights of free speech and freedom of movement and of assembly, of the inhabitants of West Irian, nevertheless he concludes, on the basis of the facts presented in his report and the documents referred to:

“... it can be stated that, with the limitations imposed by the geographical characteristics of the territory and the general political situation in the area, an act of free choice has taken place in West Irian, in accordance with Indonesian practice, in which the representatives of the population have expressed their wish to remain with Indonesia.” [A/7723 and Corr.1, annex I, para. 253.]

This is also reflected in paragraph 3 of the Secretary-General's report.

59. I should like also to draw the attention of the representatives to paragraph 4 of the Secretary-General's report in which he states:

“For its part, the Indonesian Government, in the report which it submitted to me, recalls the special circumstances prevailing in West New Guinea (West Irian), deriving mainly from the ruggedness of the territory, the prevailing difficulties in communication and the low level of development of the population, with the exception of a relatively small group of West Irianese living in some of the coastal towns. The Indonesian Government recorded the act of free choice as a success which would strengthen the unity of Indonesia and its people, for it considered the result of that act as the culmination of the independence of Indonesia.” [A/7723 and Corr.1, para. 4.]

60. That represents the Indonesian view in this exercise. That view is borne out by the facts of history in the long

struggle that the Indonesian nation faced for nearly three decades until the final fulfilment of its international obligation in 1969 in affording the people of West Irian the act of free choice as required under the New York Agreement, thus bringing to culmination the territorial integrity of the nation in full freedom and independence.

61. My delegation subscribes to the view that the New York Agreement was clearly a bilateral one between Indonesia and the Netherlands. It did not come about as a result of the United Nations General Assembly deliberations on the dispute between the two countries over West Irian nor under any other mandate of the United Nations. The role of the Secretary-General, including the need to create the United Nations Temporary Executive Authority and later on to appoint his representative “to advise, assist and participate” in the act of free choice to be afforded to the people of West Irian, was called for by the Agreement, in other words, by the two parties to the Agreement. That view is amply supported by the fact that in 1962 the United Nations General Assembly in the resolution which I referred to earlier, confined itself to taking note of the Agreement and to congratulating the parties on their success in finding a peaceful solution to the long-standing dispute.

62. The General Assembly was constrained to give approval to the further role of the Secretary-General in the need to create the United Nations Temporary Executive Authority and the appointment of his Special Representative, as called for by the Agreement between the two Members of the United Nations, only because those functions were outside the normal constitutional functions of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. That also explains the express provision in the Agreement whereby the two countries concerned would bear all expenditures incurred by the Secretary-General in performing those functions called for in the Agreement. No expense was to be borne by the United Nations itself.

63. It follows, therefore, that if any objection at all should be raised or any reservation made in the proper compliance by one contracting party with any of the provisions of the Agreement, it should rightly come from the other contracting party, in this case the Kingdom of the Netherlands, vis à vis any aspect of the act of free choice afforded to the people of West Irian by the Indonesian Government in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Agreement. In that connexion may I be permitted to quote the exact words used by the Netherlands Foreign Minister when he spoke last week and introduced draft resolution A/L.574. He said, *inter alia*:

“I should be less than frank if I were to disguise the fact that both in the Netherlands Parliament and in our press renewed doubts have been expressed as regards the method whereby the will of the people was ascertained and, more particularly, the circumstances under which they had to exercise their right of self-determination. These sentiments were conveyed to the Secretary-General and to the Indonesian Government at the time. Now Mr. Ortiz Sanz's final report confirms that, to a certain extent, those doubts were not unjustified.

“In spite of that fact the Netherlands Government is prepared to recognize and to abide by the outcome of the

act of self-determination as stipulated in paragraph 2 of article XXI of the 1962 Agreement. If certain elements of doubt remain, I wish to reiterate what I said in the First Chamber of the States-General on 25 June 1969, namely, that the Netherlands Government does not consider the method adopted by the Indonesian Government to be, in itself, contrary to the provisions of the Agreement, which left sufficient latitude for the Indonesian interpretation. Accordingly, I think no useful purpose would be served by commenting further on the manner in which the act of free choice took place or on the outcome." [1810th meeting, paras. 28 and 29.]

64. Nothing could be clearer than those words spoken by the Netherlands Foreign Minister to indicate the attitude of his Government in this matter.

65. My delegation also believes that the central issue underlying this question before us is the welfare and interests of the people of West Irian. In fact, in the preamble to the New York Agreement itself, which was quoted by the representative of Ghana, the interests and welfare of the people of West Irian were stated to be paramount in the two countries' desire to settle their dispute regarding the Territory. My delegation, therefore, notes with satisfaction the concluding remarks in the report of the Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations when he states:

"It is clear that, when voting to remain with Indonesia, the inhabitants of the territory were also voting for economic development and social progress, which they hoped would result from their decision." [A/7723 and Corr.1, annex I, para. 252.]

The report went on further to state that the Secretary-General's representative was encouraged to note:

"...at the time of the act of free choice and subsequently, high officials of the Indonesian Government have publicly expressed their firm intention to grant to West Irian a substantial degree of autonomy and to make serious efforts to promote the development of the territory." [Ibid.]

66. My delegation is also happy to note the letter signed by the permanent representatives of Indonesia and of the Kingdom of the Netherlands [A/7763]. The communiqué forwarded in that letter speaks about "the desire of the Government of Indonesia to accelerate the development of West Irian" and about the Netherlands Government's decision "to make an initial contribution of 17.5 million guilders" representing "the foreign exchange requirements of development projects in West Irian" to a special fund to be administered by the Asian Development Bank to which other countries are also invited to contribute. The Indonesian Government on its part undertakes to provide the local costs. There is no better proof of the earnest intentions on the part of the two Governments concerned towards the people of West Irian. The least that this Assembly can do is to give them the necessary encouragement and blessing in this laudable exercise of international goodwill and co-operation.

67. I do not wish to conclude my remarks without paying a tribute to the part played by the Secretary-General and

his staff as required by the Agreement, and especially to the Secretary-General's Representative, Ambassador Ortiz Sanz, for the admirable part that he has played in his functions to advise, assist and participate in the act of free choice of the people of West Irian. The manner in which he performed his functions, as indicated in this lucid and excellent report, should be a shining example for the future in which the United Nations can play a role to bring about an amicable solution to disputes between Member States.

68. In the light of what I have stated my delegation has therefore given its fullest support to draft resolution A/L.574, which would have the Assembly take note of the report of the Secretary-General and acknowledge with appreciation the fulfilment by the Secretary-General and his Representative of the tasks entrusted to them under the Agreement, and appreciate any assistance provided through the Asian Development Bank, through institutions of the United Nations or through other means to the Government of Indonesia in its efforts to promote the economic and social development of West Irian. I therefore recommend this draft resolution to the support of this Assembly.

69. U BA SAW (Burma): The delegation of Burma has studied with care and interest the report of the Secretary-General on the item entitled "Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian)". We are, indeed, indebted to the Secretary-General and to his Representative in West Irian, Ambassador Ortiz Sanz, for the detailed report concerning the act of free choice with which the people of West Irian have expressed their wish to remain with Indonesia. In the view of my delegation this successful implementation of all aspects of the Agreement entered into by the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands on 15 August 1962 in New York represents not merely the closing of a chapter in the history of the struggle for independence begun in 1945 by an Asian nation, but also exemplifies the possibilities which international co-operation and the judicious application of the principle of peaceful negotiations sponsored and promoted by the United Nations open up in the sphere of international relations.

70. The importance of the successful implementation of the Indonesian-Netherlands Agreement of 1962, moreover, and of great significance not merely for Asian and African States but also for the United Nations membership in general, is the fact that the principle of the territorial integrity of nations has been maintained. That the maintenance of this principle is of particular importance for nations which have newly acceded to independence from a past colonial status goes without saying.

71. Admittedly, there have been difficulties attendant on the implementation of the Indonesian-Netherlands Agreement, and they have been cited in the report of the Secretary-General and in the report of the Government of Indonesia. But those difficulties, which serve to underline the problems which have faced West Irian in the past and still face it today, serve also to indicate the lines along which a solution may be sought. The co-sponsors of draft resolution A/L.574, which include both Indonesia and the Netherlands, have presented to the Assembly a forward-looking draft resolution directed towards West Irian's

future development. The delegation of Burma considers it most appropriate that there is co-operation between Indonesia and the Netherlands regarding the development of West Irian, that past relationships should be carried over as the seeds of a future and fruitful association. This sharing of responsibility, evidence in itself of political goodwill and generosity, as well as far-sighted statesmanship, will perhaps, we hope, set a trend in international co-operation in many other areas of the world.

72. It now remains for us in the international community to offer our good wishes by way of whole-hearted support of draft resolution A/L.574 now before the General Assembly.

73. Mr. YAZID (Algeria) (*translated from French*): We are engaged in discussing an agenda item entitled "Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian)"; we have before us a number of working documents, among which is the report of the Secretary-General regarding the act of self-determination in West Irian [A/7723 and Corr.1].

74. We have heard some statements characterized by a number of distortions—whether intentional or unintentional—which might tend to make us overlook the historical background to the question. I will briefly remind you of this background.

75. Indonesia gained its independence through armed struggle against the Japanese and Netherlands occupations; but in acceding to independence it did not regain the whole of its national territory. West Irian was always a part of Indonesia, which never renounced its sovereignty over that territory. The question has been discussed repeatedly in the United Nations. Our discussions, and the recommendations we were able to make through the co-operation of a number of countries which were friends of the then administering Power—the Netherlands—and of Indonesia, created the necessary conditions for agreement between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Indonesia.

76. That agreement, of which the General Assembly took note [resolution 1752 (XVII)], provided that the peoples of West Irian should be consulted in accordance with the Indonesian practice of *musjawarah*; it also conferred a certain role on the Secretary-General, and the General Assembly authorized the Secretary-General to carry out the tasks entrusted to him in the Agreement [*ibid.*].

77. There is a desire to forget these essential facts, and we might well wonder to what dark manipulations we are now witness. We must state that we would never have expected that a country like Indonesia—which, I remind the Assembly, has the support of the Asian governments in this problem—would be compared, directly or indirectly, with South Africa or Portugal. It seems to have been forgotten that the principle of real and active struggle for the self-determination of peoples was born not at San Francisco but at Bandung and that there was a meeting of African and Asian countries at Bandung,³ in a country—Indonesia—

which has always been in the forefront of the struggle for the liberation and self-determination of peoples.

78. We who attended that conference remember that the representatives of the South African people were present at Bandung as observers and that this was made possible by the action of a number of Governments, including that of Indonesia. Although African representation was limited in numbers, we saw countries such as the Sudan and what was then known as the Gold Coast, now Ghana, present in the Afro-Asian family at Bandung, despite the fact that they had not at that time attained their independence. The liberation movements of Tunisia, Morocco and Algeria were represented, and Indonesia was one of the countries which played a decisive role in defending the right to self-determination and independence of the African peoples. It assumed that role steadfastly before, during and after Bandung, and particularly in our Organization.

79. I recognize, among the many Indonesian representatives here present, brothers who, at great sacrifice, have made a personal contribution to the struggle for national liberation in Indonesia. The Minister for Foreign Affairs bore arms in the struggle and had experience of Japanese and Dutch prisons. The Permanent Representative lost his fingers in the war of liberation. These men took up arms and fought for self-determination and for the liberation of Indonesia, of the whole of Indonesia, including West Irian.

80. Indonesia, in its agreement with the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West Irian, asked our Secretary-General to play a certain role. The Secretary-General was authorized to play that role; he appointed a representative, and the report which is now before us deserves our consideration and our confidence.

81. The Secretary-General of the United Nations has to his credit an important and continuing contribution to the work for the liberation of peoples and the exercise of their right to self-determination. It was not by chance that we Algerians nominated U Thant—at that time the representative of Burma, a country with a long experience of liberation through arms—to assume the responsibility of presiding over the special committee for Algeria in the Afro-Asian Group. His judgement has always been of fundamental importance to us and we frequently entrusted him, during discussions, with the task of presenting our case and defending our interests.

82. In our view, the observations in his report provide further confirmation of the correctness of our position on the question. As will be seen, the problem before us is not one which lends itself to comparisons with situations in colonized territories of Africa or elsewhere. The situation is completely different. It reflects the viewpoint of Asian and African countries which have always set an example of unity and which we would not wish to see divided on an issue such as that of the Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West Irian. Such a division—which some would like to see—might, indeed, have repercussions first of all for the national liberation movements of Africa, Asia and Latin America, which require the solidarity and unity of anti-colonialist forces. And Indonesia occupies a very important place among those anti-colonialist forces.

³ Asian-African Conference, held at Bandung from 18 to 24 April 1955.

83. How can Indonesia be compared with South Africa or Portugal—Indonesia, which was among the first countries to provide diplomatic and material support, in arms and money, to countries such as Tunisia, Morocco and Algeria during their struggle; which was among the first countries to offer material support to the South African people and which, at Djakarta, Bandung and Bogor, found defenders in the already independent countries of Asia and Africa and, in particular, a defender named U Thant?

84. If we read the report submitted to us by the Secretary-General, we find a number of quotations. One of them, in the introductory part of the report of the Secretary-General regarding the act of self-determination in West Irian, reads thus:

“... it can be stated that, with the limitations imposed by the geographical characteristics of the territory and the general political situation in the area, an act of free choice has taken place in West Irian, in accordance with Indonesian practice, in which the representatives of the population have expressed their wish to remain with Indonesia.” [A/7723 and Corr.1, para. 3.]

85. This quotation is confirmed by the following two paragraphs from the report by the Representative of the Secretary-General:

“It is clear that, when voting to remain with Indonesia, the inhabitants of the territory were also voting for economic development and social progress, which they hoped would result from their decision. It is encouraging to note that at the time of the act of free choice and subsequently, high officials of the Indonesian Government have publicly expressed their firm intention to grant to West Irian a substantial degree of autonomy and to make serious efforts to promote the development of the territory.

“Finally, on the basis of the facts presented in this report and the documents referred to, it can be stated that, with the limitations imposed by the geographical characteristics of the territory and the general political situation in the area, an act of free choice has taken place in West Irian in accordance with Indonesian practice, in which the representatives of the population have expressed their wish to remain with Indonesia.” [Ibid., annex I, paras. 252 and 253.]

86. We would also quote the following passages from the closing remarks of the Representative of the Secretary-General:

“The Government of Indonesia, in order to fulfil the requirement contained in article XVIII (d) of the Agreement regarding ‘the eligibility of all adults, male and female, not foreign nationals, to participate in the act of self-determination’, officially accepted the three prerequisites for the formation of the consultative assemblies that I had suggested at the meeting at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Djakarta on 10 February 1969 and in my letter of 25 February, namely, that the consultative assemblies should have as large a membership as possible, that all sectors of the population should be represented and that their members should be clearly elected by the people.

“The answer given by the consultative assemblies, by *musjawarah*, to the questions put to them (see subparagraph (c) above) was a unanimous consensus that West Irian should remain with Indonesia.” [Ibid., annex I, para. 248 (d) and (e).]

87. I shall quote two further paragraphs from the report of the Representative of the Secretary-General:

“It will be seen from the proceedings summarized above that each and every one of the eight consultative assemblies decided unanimously through *musjawarah* to retain the territory’s ties with Indonesia.

“As far as we were able to observe, the meetings of the consultative assemblies were conducted in an orderly manner. Members of the assemblies were able to express their views and often signified vehemently their wish to remain with Indonesia. The meetings were open and in some places the general public gathered inside and outside the buildings where the meetings were being held and enthusiastically supported the decisions reached. At other places, groups of citizens, such as elementary and high school students, boy scouts, teachers, and members of women’s organizations and other bodies, participated in popular demonstrations in favour of the result of the act of free choice.” [Ibid., annex I, paras. 245 and 246.]

88. My delegation considers that the Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian), of which the General Assembly took note in 1962, has been applied in accordance with the conditions laid down. My delegation also considers that the reports of the Secretary-General and his Representative are satisfactory and show us that the Agreement has been observed. My country acceded to independence by the practice of self-determination, following an agreement between France and Algeria. We have always agreed with the majority view of our Assembly that West Irian is, and should be, part of Indonesia, and we have noted an Agreement which stated that the methods of consulting the peoples of West Irian had been accepted by Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

89. Such an agreement had the advantage of permitting a speedy and peaceful settlement of the problem and avoiding other methods of settlement. If Indonesia had not recovered that portion of its territory by the peaceful method of applying the Agreement of which the Assembly took note in 1962, we are convinced that the Indonesian people, with the support of the peoples of West Irian, would have recovered it by other means. But since we had the opportunity of seeing the establishment of conditions for ensuring that West Irian should remain with Indonesia—moreover, by peaceful means—our Assembly duly noted the Agreement, which was applied in accordance with the accepted terms and with a role being conferred on the Secretary-General. This role was discharged to the full and resulted in appraisals by the Secretary-General and his Representative which my delegation considers entirely satisfactory.

90. We should be loath to see this report become the subject of discussions on self-determination and its methods of application. That question might be debated, but

elsewhere. We do, however, have a number of comments to make. Whereas it is considered normal that the practice of popular consultation should take account of the social conditions of specific regions, and whereas this principle is accepted almost unanimously by the Members of the United Nations, an attempt is now being made to call in question a consultation in West Irian which was, after all, based solely on Indonesian practice—in accordance with the undertaking which our Indonesian brothers gave and which they honoured. That practice, which is known as *musjawarah*, takes account of the special social conditions of the region.

91. If we were to embark on a discussion of the question of self-determination, the debate would be much broader and would be liable to lead us very far, because we should begin by asking: where are these champions of self-determination to be found when it comes to Korea, Viet-Nam or Palestine? Where are they to be found when it comes to the liberation movements in Africa. when it comes to supporting the armed struggle?

92. If we were to examine the various practices of consultation of our peoples, where would that lead us? An Indonesian practice exists which takes account of the specific characteristics of the region, and we must be satisfied with it. As far as the Algerian delegation is concerned, our position may be summed up as follows. We have complete confidence in our Indonesian friends, who have recovered a part of their national territory. We have complete confidence in the appraisals made by our Secretary-General and his Representative. We are opposed to any attempt to induce us to question the act of self-determination in West Irian because, in our view, as far as Indonesia was concerned, it was a matter of recovering a part of its national territory, with the support of the local populations, who participated in political campaigns—and even military action at one time—in order that they might be reunited with Indonesia.

93. Indonesia is an anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist country which has made its contribution to the struggle of all peoples. This contribution is recognized by Asian countries, which are fully conversant with the problems of the region and with the problems which arise in this part of Indonesia.

94. As a country which emerged at the end of a long struggle for national liberation, we align ourselves with our Indonesian brothers, who cannot be likened to colonialists or imperialists, who made their contribution in blood at the time of the struggle against the Japanese and the struggle against the Dutch, who were among the first in Asia to give us their unconditional support, and among those who raised the banner of Bandung, the banner of true self-determination and of the struggle of the peoples of Africa and Asia.

95. I could wish that the members of our Assembly had known themselves the problems confronting Indonesia, that they had participated at Bandung and had followed the activities of our Organization before Bandung, and since. Here we have an Afro-Asian group which has always been guided by countries which, like Indonesia, were responsible for its creation and which have made their contribution to the struggle of the peoples of South Africa and Africa.

96. There is no question of going so far as to treat Indonesia like South Africa or Portugal. If its history is unknown to us, we need only refer to the votes of the Indonesian delegation on problems of national independence and self-determination to be able to pass judgement.

97. Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan): The Japanese delegation welcomes the fact that after many years the final stage in the peaceful solution of the long-standing problem between Indonesia and the Netherlands with regard to West New Guinea was completed last summer. The problem which was once a potential source of disturbance of the peace and security of the area has been settled. We now have before us the report of the Secretary-General regarding the act of self-determination in West Irian. In this report we find that the Special Representative of the Secretary-General has indicated that an act of free choice has taken place in West Irian in which the representatives of the population have expressed their wish to remain with Indonesia. Thus we may say that a new era has opened for West Irian.

98. My delegation wishes to pay a high tribute to the Special Representative, Ambassador Ortiz Sanz, for the devoted manner in which he carried out the delicate tasks entrusted to him by the Secretary-General, in accordance with the Agreement of 1962.

99. My delegation also welcomes the fact that the Government of Indonesia has pledged itself to give special attention to the future economic and social progress of West Irian, taking into account the specific conditions of its population. The Special Representative, in his report submitted to the Secretary-General, pointed out that high officials of the Indonesian Government had expressed their firm intention to grant West Irian a substantial degree of autonomy and to make serious efforts to promote the development of the Territory. We have also noted with satisfaction that the Government of the Netherlands has indicated its intention, in close co-operation with the Government of Indonesia, to continue rendering financial assistance for the development of West Irian and for the well-being of its people.

100. Referring now to the draft resolution [A/L.574], I should like to state that my delegation, in the light of what I have said, will vote in favour of it. In the latter part of the sixth preambular paragraph and the second operative paragraph of the draft resolution, reference is made to assistance through the Asian Development Bank. It is the understanding of my Government that the Minister of Finance of Indonesia and the Minister of Development Co-operation of the Netherlands recently discussed with the President of the Asian Development Bank the establishment of a new fund for West Irian to be administered by that institution but that the matter is now under study by the Bank authorities.

101. To conclude my remarks, I would say that we sincerely wish for every success in the Indonesian Government's efforts for the economic and social development of West Irian.

102. The PRESIDENT: I have a few more speakers on my list for this item, but I should like to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the following situation. In his

point of order the representative of Saudi Arabia did not ask for a ruling; rather, he made an appeal to the representative of Ghana and at the same time he made some suggestions for consideration. I gave the floor to the other speakers inscribed on my list, in order to provide time to

think about the matter and to reflect on the suggestions made by the representative of Saudi Arabia.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.