

determine the future status of the territory of West New Guinea by negotiations within a year from the date of transfer of sovereignty.

This exhortation, however, overlooks two facts. In the first place, the Netherlands and Indonesian Governments have negotiated and, moreover, negotiated for more than the stipulated year. The negotiations were not broken off by the Netherlands Government but terminated after the Indonesian Government had stated, in the report of the United Nations Commission for Indonesia submitted to the Security Council on the negotiations, that it was prepared to resume negotiations with the Netherlands Government only if it were understood in advance that sovereignty over West New Guinea would be transferred to Indonesia. We consider that the proposals put forward in the 1951 negotiations demonstrated the willingness of the Netherlands Government to fulfil the provisions of the Charter of Transfer of Sovereignty. However, as I have said, it became evident during the course of the discussions that a fundamental difference existed in the approach of the two parties to the problem.

Since the end of 1951, the Indonesian Government has seen fit to adopt a still more doubtful position, claiming that sovereignty over West New Guinea had been transferred to Indonesia under the Round Table Agreements, despite the fact that Article 2 of the Charter of Transfer specifically says that "the status quo of the residency of New Guinea shall be maintained" and that this article was at least at one time officially interpreted by Indonesian Delegations as meaning that sovereignty remained with the Netherlands Government.

Another factor to which the Canadian Delegation in particular must give serious and sympathetic attention is the attitude of the Australian Government. Sir Percy Spender has described in moving terms the reasons why the Australian people have such a direct and compelling interest in any question which might involve the transfer of sovereignty of the territory of their nearest neighbour.

Mr. Chairman, for the Assembly to call upon the Governments to resume negotiations without delay, implying as it does to rebuke to the Netherlands Government which we consider wholly unjustified, is unacceptable to my delegation. For this reason, if for no other, we would be unable to support the Indonesian draft resolution.

It is nevertheless true that there are a number of points in the Indonesian draft to which my delegation would have no objection and could, indeed, support. What we cannot support is to call upon both Governments to resume negotiations on what amounts to the terms of one of the parties. For, although the resolution does not say so explicitly, it is clear from Dr. Sudjarwo's statements that his Government persists in maintaining the pre-conditions which led to the breakdown of the negotiations undertaken in accordance with the Charter of Transfer. Moreover, as the Indonesian Government well knew, by taking advantage of their right to dissolve the Netherlands-Indonesian Union, the