



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 93: Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations (<i>continued</i>)	1

President: Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 93

Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of
China in the United Nations (*continued*)

1. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Last year on the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China, the Tunisian delegation submitted a number of recommendations which unfortunately were not followed. Consequently we find ourselves this year in a similar situation to that in which the United Nations has found itself for a score of years. The question still arises, in spite of the evidence of history: will China this year join the community of nations and will the principle of the universality of the United Nations triumph, in spite of transient political considerations.

2. We understand full well that, due to a number of varied factors and due to the inability of the United Nations to solve this problem in 1949 and in subsequent years, the present representation of China has acquired rights which are now challenged. Consequently, its expulsion poses for us a problem of major importance in view of its international implications. It is this matter—the expulsion of this delegation—that has been the problem before us for some 20 years.

3. During those 20 years the Government of the Republic of China, established on Formosa—an island recognized as Chinese by the Allies during the course of the war and for the needs of that war—has in fact become the Government of an independent island, where the indigenous population claim, somewhat weakly, a right to self-determination, this to the detriment both of the Republic of China and the People's Republic of China. It stems quite clearly from this fact that, if the Republic of China must unequivocally vacate China's seat for the People's Republic of China, this should not prejudge the future interests of Formosa, which, in conformity with the principles of the Charter concerning the right of peoples to self-determination, may wish to be represented in the General Assembly of the United Nations and in its subsidiary organs as an entity separated from China or linked to it by special ties. The major Powers concerned might recognize Formosa as a separate entity in the interests of a balance which would allow the establishment of a durable peace in the region. That possibility

should not be rejected out of hand. A rational study of the factors involved does not exclude such a solution. In international affairs and in matters of politics, reason is often forgotten in the passions of the moment.

4. In any case, it would be unfortunate if the problem of Formosa and its implications were to delay in any way the active participation of the People's Republic of China in the work of the United Nations at a moment when there exists a consensus, if not unanimous agreement, that this participation should be brought about as rapidly as possible.

5. In other words, it is urgent, in order to strengthen the United Nations, to restore to the People's Republic of China its full rights. This will bring into our system a source of energy necessary for the future operation of our Organization. In order to facilitate, in so far as possible, a long-overdue solution to this problem, and in order to avoid a repetition of what has happened for the past 20 years because of procedural manoeuvres, the Tunisian delegation is submitting the following three separate—I repeat “separate”—draft resolutions.

[*The speaker then read out draft resolution A/L.639.*]

6. The first draft resolution, we believe, should be considered first before any other substantive proposal. The People's Republic of China should not enter the United Nations on the basis of a resolution adopted by a simple majority or even a two-thirds majority. It should be welcomed by a unanimous, or almost unanimous, vote. The draft that we have just submitted would allow us to achieve this objective. The People's Republic of China must come to the United Nations this year, otherwise the disappointment throughout the world will be considerable, and deep will be the doubts as to the effectiveness of our Organization.

[*The speaker then read out draft resolutions A/L.640 and A/L.641.*]

7. These are the draft resolutions that the Tunisian delegation submits to the General Assembly, to be put to the vote as and when necessary.

8. In our view, the United Nations should demonstrate decisiveness and firmness on a problem vital to its future at a time when negotiations between certain Powers are liable to confront the Organization with *de facto* situations which we should now be preparing to face.

9. Mr. ARITA QUIÑONEZ (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of the Republic of Honduras wishes to avail itself of this opportunity to express its thanks publicly to the Assembly for its demonstration of

mourning and for observing a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of our beloved Ambassador, H.E. Dr. Ramón Villeda Morales, when it learned of his death [1958th meeting].

10. We wanted to participate in this debate in order to make it clear that our country has deliberately become a sponsor of the draft resolutions in documents A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2.

11. We are sponsoring the first-mentioned draft resolution because we know full well that any proposal in the General Assembly which would result in depriving the Republic of China of its representation in the United Nations is an important question within the meaning of Article 18 of the Charter. Accordingly, since this matter is an important question, decisions should be taken by the vote of a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting, and accordingly it should be voted as a matter of priority, because it is precisely a draft that affects the form of voting on a question of substance. In other words, we should vote first and in favourable terms on the draft resolution which describes as an important question any draft resolution which would result in depriving the Republic of China of its representation in the United Nations, as is the intent of the text submitted by Albania and other delegations [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2].

12. We are also sponsoring the other draft resolution [A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2] because we also know full well that there are two inescapable realities. The first is that the international community cannot continue to ignore the presence of the People's Republic of China in questions which affect the destiny of mankind and that, therefore, this world organization, in order to fulfil its purposes and principles, should count on the responsible and active participation of that country. The second is the political reality of the equally active existence of the Republic of China with its seat in Taiwan.

13. There are persons who venture to pass judgement on what will happen tomorrow between those two political entities. We hear talk about a future possible merger of those two countries, or the definite separation of insular China, which would constitute a completely different Republic from mainland China. We do not know what the future holds for these two countries, and as we do not want to act on the basis of hypothesis or assumption, we prefer to view the present political reality, and for that reason we are of the opinion that, until the political fate of the actors in this drama has been defined, both representations should enjoy the full measure of rights and duties which are allocated under the Charter to all States Members. We are aware, therefore, that the clamour of international public opinion insists that the Government of the People's Republic of China should be represented in all organs of the United Nations and that the representatives of that Government are entitled to hold one of the five permanent seats in the Security Council. But at the same time we are aware that the Government of the Republic of China, with its seat in Taipei, should continue to participate in all the organs of the United Nations and that it cannot be expelled from the Organization.

14. We should also like to explain why we cannot support the draft resolution submitted by Albania and other

delegations. That draft resolution talks about "the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations" and we ask, what rights are you going to restore if that Republic has never had any rights as a member of the United Nations? As a matter of fact, the People's Republic of China has never been a member of this world Organization and therefore we agree with the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Costa Rica, our sister Republic, when he states that "restoration can be made only of what one has possessed, and not of what one merely aspires to possess" [1966th meeting, para. 134]. In addition, the draft resolution to which I refer talks about expelling "forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the place which they unlawfully occupy at the United Nations". In respect of the expelling of Members, Article 6 of the Charter states explicitly:

"A Member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the Principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

15. We should then ask ourselves, has the Republic of China repeatedly violated the principles of the Charter while it has been a Member of the United Nations? The answer is obvious. I am sure we would all answer with a resounding "No"! The Republic of China has not violated the principles of the Charter as a Member of the United Nations and therefore we definitely oppose any expulsion of a founding Member of the Organization which has properly fulfilled the principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations.

16. We repeat that we believe that the Republic of China with its seat at Taipei should continue to participate in all the organs of the United Nations, because as a matter of fact and law there are two Chinas; there is the People's Republic of China which aspires to become a Member of the United Nations and there is the Republic of China which is a founding Member of the Organization. Accordingly, we cannot say that the latter Government holds its seat unlawfully in the United Nations.

17. Finally, my delegation is clear and firm on this point. We shall never alter our position. We shall vote in favour of the draft resolutions which we have co-sponsored because we firmly believe that they are drafted in accordance with the principles of justice and law and because we are convinced that the Republic of China, a founding Member of the United Nations, cannot be separated from the Organization from one day to the next unless the General Assembly is prepared to establish a precedent that may be dangerous and to commit an act of injustice that may prove irreparable.

18. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in the general debate on item 93. The representative of Saudi Arabia has requested to be allowed to speak in order to introduce draft resolution A/L.638. I now call on him.

19. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): This is one of the most momentous meetings of the General Assembly in the last 25 years. Either our decision within the next day or two will be predicated on fairness, equity and justice, or it

will show that we are committing the age-old mistake of trying to vote by political solidarity—something which has led us to fail to resolve many an issue in the United Nations.

20. I submit that votes on the basis of political solidarity caused the League of Nations to founder. It is up to us either to resolve the question, as I said, on the basis of justice and equity, or to be confronted by a new crisis in Asia—as if the Korean war were not enough, as if the conflagration in Viet-Nam had not brought enough sorrow and tragedy to many nations.

21. Yesterday afternoon in this very hall we attended the concert directed by the illustrious musician of world fame Pablo Casals, and we were all put in a mood of euphoria—not only because of the music and its excellent performance, but also because an artist of the stature of Pablo Casals appealed to every one of us to work for peace. I think it was one of the most moving concerts I have ever attended, not only in the United Nations, but in many of the capitals of the world. And on the very day after that concert, what do we find ourselves doing but going back to positions that seem to be fossilized in two substantive draft resolutions—each sponsored by a good number of States—with a gulf between them, although there is a large area of understanding between them as well, as is evident from the text of both those substantive draft resolutions.

22. Yesterday I left the concert in a good mood and I meditated for a long time before I came to the conclusion that it was my responsibility as a representative of a Member State—a small Member State—to see whether we could bridge the gap between two groups of nations divided on an issue which may bring about more conflict in Asia. Before taking up my pencil, I asked myself: how far is Albania from China—6,000 or 7,000 miles? How far is the United States of America from China—may be 10,000 or 12,000 miles? Then I looked at the sponsors and found that some of them were African States, some of them were from the new hemisphere at a long distance from China—and they want to sit here as arbiters of the fate of a people, as if they constituted a tribunal of justice.

23. I was really moved and, going back to my humble work on this question, including that of last year, I thought I had a duty—not only to the peoples on my own continent, for after all I represent an Asian State, but also to the right of self-determination of peoples and nations—to see if something could be done. Members may not yet have had a chance to study my draft resolution. As was mentioned by the President, it appears in draft resolution A/L.638.

24. I would like to assure representatives that in part this draft is a synthesis of both substantive draft resolutions before the Assembly and in part it presents the basis for a compromise, if not a final solution. After I explain this draft resolution I will ask Members a few questions. They do not have to come to the podium and reply. Let them search their consciences and remit my draft resolution to their respective Governments. Let each one of them, if possible, set aside petty national interest and look with objectivity into this whole problem before us and the suffering and tribulation that may follow if we fail to divest ourselves of our own interests in this matter.

25. First, before going into the synthesis which representatives will discover in my draft resolution, I should like to state that my whole text flows from the principle of self-determination which, as I have mentioned time and again in various organs of this Assembly, was enunciated before the Versailles Treaty by none other than the former President of the United States, Mr. Wilson. The late Mr. Wilson returned to his country a broken-hearted man. For in the late 1920s a friend of Clemenceau prided himself on the fact that, when Mr. Wilson had told the victors that they should respect the principle of self-determination, he had taken Wilson by his tie and had almost choked him, telling him: “Go back where you came from. Europe is our own. We will do what we think is best.” Lloyd George and Clemenceau gerrymandered Europe the way they wanted to. And I submit that they sowed the seeds of the Second World War. The victors learned nothing from Versailles and its aftermath, or in the era between the two world wars, for they committed the same mistake of partition, with compounded interest.

26. Here we are called upon, on the basis of solidarity, to vote for this draft resolution or the other draft resolution, unmindful that our vote may pave the way for serious conflict in South-East Asia, in China, and many countries surrounding that great country.

27. That is why I felt impelled to do something about the two substantive draft resolutions, on the basis not only of the principle of self-determination which we enshrined in the Charter, but also of the right which we elaborated from that principle and embodied in the international covenants on human rights. The corner-stone of my draft resolution is the right of a people to self-determination, and here I read from that draft:

“The General Assembly,

“Recalling that one of the principal purposes of the Charter of the United Nations is to develop friendly relations among nations based on the respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples,”

That paragraph is taken word for word from Article 1 of the Charter. The second preambular paragraph reads:

“Recalling also that after exhaustive debates and long deliberations in the Social, Humanitarian and Cultural Committee of the General Assembly, the principle of self-determination was elaborated into a well-defined, inalienable right without which no fundamental human right may be fully enjoyed”

28. It fell to me in the early 1950s to submit a draft resolution using those same words, and I was challenged by none other than Mrs. Roosevelt, who served as United States representative on the Third Committee. She said to me, “Many human rights could be enjoyed without the exercise by a people of its right to self-determination.” I answered, “Give me an example.” She said, “The colonial Powers do not prevent anyone from worshipping the way he wants. This is an example.” I said, “But if those colonial people were free, they would be able to worship differently without feeling the necessity of being cowed and sometimes suppressed by the authorities.”

29. At that time the United States was very active in NATO, and of course, Mrs. Roosevelt had someone from the State Department behind her. That draft resolution was passed by an affirmative vote of 37, and the United States and those who were with it obtained only 13 votes. Incidentally, the membership of the United Nations in those days was around 55 States.

30. The right of self-determination is an established right. And later we spent eight years elaborating that principle of self-determination into a full-fledged and inalienable right. I have mentioned that right in the paragraph which I just read out because it stands as the first article in both international covenants on human rights.

31. The fourth preambular paragraph states:

“Recognizing that a people as such is defined not solely on the basis of speaking the same language or sharing a common culture and common customs or traditions, but also and essentially on the basis of an economic and socio-political system which has evolved from the community of interests of the people’s diverse components”.

I shall give the Assembly a few examples. My colleague from Belgium will bear me out: in Belgium they speak the Flemish language and the French language. In Switzerland they speak four or five languages—French, German, Italian and another old Swiss language. In many countries there were different strains of nationalities before they were merged by a community of interests. Let us turn to customs and traditions. We are all jealous to maintain the folklore of a community inside a nation, its traditions and its culture. But I submit that although language and culture and customs and traditions usually are the cohesive factors that go into the making of a people, still it is the community of interests which is the decisive factor. Take the Soviet Union, for example. It has 15 different Republics, but the community of interests makes them into one State. Take the United States, which has many different people that originally came from either Spain or Northern Europe, many of them Anglo-Saxons and many Germans, but it is the community of interests that keeps them together as a nation. And from that community of interests of the people grows the nation.

32. The next paragraph states:

“Affirming that sovereignty ultimately resides in the people, irrespective of a political system or ideology its government deemed fit to adopt”.

33. I heard some representatives state that Chiang Kai-shek is a dictator. They forgot about the time when Chiang Kai-shek fought on the side of the Allies, after which there was a civil war and he had to go to Formosa. They only see what they would like to see. But if we are to find out which nations are ruled, so to speak, democratically or arbitrarily, I can take any 60 nations and find that half are dictatorships. But nobody puts the shoe on his own foot. They do not say that such and such a Head of State is a dictator. No—they say only Chiang Kai-shek is a dictator because they have an axe to grind and because they are voting on the basis of political solidarity. Shame! I am not here to extol or to decry Chiang Kai-shek, but where is the

sense of fairness in singling out one man? There is no sense of fairness when resolutions are predicated on expediency and petty national interests.

34. There are some, like our American friends here, who say that they are fighting communism in Viet-Nam. Good Lord, I have never seen better relations than those that exist between Ambassador Bush and Ambassador Malik, one of the leaders of communism. He is my friend too and I am a monarchist. Whom are you fooling here? The capitalists are not fighting the communists and the communists are no longer fighting the capitalists. They want coexistence. Come on! One big country must have a motivation for its own political ends, so it picks the hackneyed and stereotyped phrases of fighting tyranny and fighting communism, while they dine and wine with the communists and seek coexistence with them. That is good, because we do not want a confrontation. A confrontation would burn all the small Powers. If there were to be a confrontation among the big nuclear Powers we would no longer be here.

35. So for heaven’s sake, leave ideology aside and let every country choose its own form of government and its own political system, and do not cast aspersions on a chief of state, who, at one time, did all he could in fighting on the side of the Allies and whom, I suspect, some want to crucify.

36. The next paragraph states:

“Affirming further that no single State, however powerful,”—whether it be the People’s Republic of China, whether it be the Soviet Union, whether it be the United States, whether it be the United Kingdom or France, although the last two have lost a lot of their power—“Member or non-member of the United Nations, nor any coalition of Member States,”—any group motivated only by self-interest, whether countries grouped together from the Balkans or from Central Africa, or my brothers from North Africa, or countries from the Caribbean or from the northern tier of the United States (where is my friend Beaulne, the Canadian representative? He knows that we do not live by bread alone)—“has the right under the Charter to divest any people of its own right to self-determination”.

37. Now, here I have worked in a consideration of what “a people” is, although I have, with many of my colleagues, defined the term “a people” from this rostrum. This paragraph speaks for itself:

“Considering that the Republic of China, i.e. the people of the island of Taiwan, constitutes a separate political entity whose population totals about 14 million”.

Who can challenge that statement of fact? In order to bring it home to my brothers from Albania—who do not recognize the Republic of China and, rightly or wrongly, consider it as having usurped the seat of the People’s Republic of China—I must say: they are a people in an island, with a political system of their own. Whether they should have had a separate political system from that of the People’s Republic of China or not is beside the point. During 25 years they have evolved a political system

separate from that of the People's Republic of China. Can you refute this at all, my good friend from Albania? That is why, to make sure that I understand the representative of Albania and his fellow sponsors, I have used the wording "the people of the island of Taiwan", because they do not want to recognize the Republic of China.

38. Can anybody refute the fact that there is a population there which totals about 14 million people? Can anyone refute the fact that there is such a people, which would like to call itself "Taiwanese"? It is true that Taiwan at one time was ruled by China. So was Indo-China for that matter, and there were wars between China proper and Indo-China, and finally China, graciously, magnanimously, thought that it should not compel the Indo-Chinese to live under its suzerainty. Why would you like to consider these people of Taiwan part and parcel of the mainland? Just because they were ruled by China before? So was the Middle East ruled before by the Turks and by the Mandatory Power. Does that give our Turkish brothers any right over the Arab countries which at one time formed part of the Ottoman Empire? Do the British and the French say: "We were the Mandatory Powers and were it not for the Second World War, you would not have extricated yourself so easily, and you should still be given training in how to govern yourself"? This is childish, puerile.

39. Why do you want to treat the people of Taiwan differently? Just because at one time they were ruled by China? So many peoples have been ruled by other peoples. This does not provide the mantle of authority, because it was a sort of occupation by military force—in all likelihood against the will of the people.

40. The next preambular paragraph reads:

"Recognizing the Republic of China, i.e. the people of the island of Taiwan"—again I repeat that for the benefit of our colleagues from Albania—"is economically viable, as is evident from its exports which total approximately \$4,000 million annually, and as is also evident from its enjoying one of the highest *per capita* incomes in Asia".

Do you want them to forfeit that *per capita* income just because you tell them that they should merge with China on the ground that at one time they were occupied by China? What right have we to tell them that? Let us reason and not act by emotional solidarity. I understand that the total exports of the People's Republic of China are not equal to the exports of that small island of 14 million. There is nothing wrong with that. They have been setting their house in order. They had a lot to do within their country, the People's Republic of China. I do not say this with derision, but it is a statement of fact.

41. The next preambular paragraph reads:

"Considering that any decision which disposes of the right of a people to self-determination against its will would lead to suppression and conflict, while one of the prime purposes of the United Nations is, *inter alia*, to maintain international peace and to take effective collective measures for the preservation of peace and the removal of threats to peace".

I shall explain this to the General Assembly so that there may be nothing vague or ambiguous. Let us assume, for argument's sake, that the People's Republic of China assumes its rightful place in the United Nations with the expulsion, by majority vote of the Assembly, of the Republic of China. Now, I am not going to quiz my friend Ambassador Bush. This is not a place from which to quiz anybody. But do you think that if this happens, the United States is going to turn its back on the Republic of China and say: "Well, we did all we can; now we cannot help you"? Good Lord, I think that if the United States did that, it would lose all the loyalties it enjoys—whether artificial loyalties, vote loyalties, loyalties based on mutual interest, or whatever loyalties they may be, whether acquired through technical assistance, through the CIA, through money paid, or through whatever it may be—and everybody would turn his back on the United States. If I were the United States, I would be a fool to turn my back on people whom I had supported for 25 years. It would be foolish.

42. It would be just like the Soviet Union's turning its back on the Arabs. You would not do that, would you, turn your back on the Arabs? Let us be frank. They would not. They all have interests—and they are legitimate interests. Why should the United States have its Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean, while the Arab world is next door to the frontiers of the Soviet Union? But this is power politics, we know it. Let us be frank, brutally frank sometimes. We are here not to follow the same policies that were pursued in the Congress of Vienna when Talleyrand and Metternich said things they did not mean and meant things they did not say. And look at the mess the world got into in the nineteenth century—a mess that has lasted up to now. Because we say things we do not mean and mean things we do not say.

43. It is high time the United Nations followed a different course, based on justice, on equity, on fairness and compromise.

44. This is not an orthodox speech. The Assembly has heard a lot of orthodox speeches here. An orthodox speech will follow the stereotyped phrases, strung like a necklace. But the pearls would not be cultured; they would even be simulated.

45. Therefore, assuming that the procedural draft resolution of the United States—the one which is called the "important question" draft resolution [A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2]—fails, shall we have solved the problem? I submit we shall not have, because the United States will still support the Republic of China. We might also have another crisis if Mr. Nixon and Mr. Chou En-lai or Mr. Mao Tse-tung do not come to an agreement about major world problems. Therefore, what would we have done here? Shall we have won a victory by voting for the Albanian draft resolution [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2]? What kind of victory? An empty victory. We want practical results to ensue.

46. And assuming that the United States procedural draft resolution wins, we still would have accomplished nothing, because the People's Republic of China most likely would refuse to come except with the expulsion of the Republic of China from its seat in the United Nations.

47. So either way, the problem would not have been solved. By "either way" I mean whether the Albanian draft resolution ultimately wins or whether it is stymied by the procedural draft resolution of the United States, or whether, on the other hand, the substantive United States draft resolution [A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2] wins. Nothing would be accomplished of any value except registering a vote on the electronic board. Meanwhile, everyone would be saying, "We won! We won!" I can see them outside, saying, "We won today! We won!", as if it were a football match.

48. These are the facts. Now back to the last preambular paragraph: "*Mindful* that the two substantive draft resolutions"—here is the crux of the question. I make you laugh sometimes to lessen the tension, but please read carefully what I have written and send it to your Governments, instead of treating it in a cavalier manner:

"*Mindful* that the two substantive draft resolutions, which are contained in documents A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, clearly stipulate that the People's Republic of China should assume its rightful place in the United Nations and be seated as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council, and that it should also be represented in all the organizations related to the United Nations".

This is the area of agreement. At one time, and for over 20 years, the United States kept saying that the Republic of China was the only Government that should have control over China, and their erstwhile allies followed them like sheep. I used to find it rather strange in those days. I abstained, not knowing how to vote. There was so much intrigue and so much lobbying. But then we began to see the light, that this was not the way to solve the problem, and we found that something radical should be done. We were all overjoyed when Ambassador Phillips in November last year, from this very podium [1902nd meeting], said that Governments could no longer ignore the presence of the People's Republic of China. They broke the ice. Now this year the United States comes forth, in its substantive draft resolution, with identically the same objective as that of the Albanian substantive draft resolution. There is no difference; both Albania and the United States want to see the People's Republic of China assume its rightful seat in the United Nations and be one of the five permanent members of the Security Council, and also a member of the organizations related to the United Nations, meaning the other councils and the specialized agencies.

49. But the whole question revolves around expulsion. I think it is not a question of restoring the rights of the People's Republic of China but of its assuming its rightful place. This might be considered a matter of semantics.

50. Now we come to the word "expulsion". We decided that the people of the island of Taiwan, known to us as the Republic of China, constitute a political entity, and that for 25 years they have evolved and developed a system of their own—whether economic, social, or political—and that we should not say to them as if they were little boys coming into school, "Look now, this seat is for your elder brother. Get out of here." This is what you would be doing by expelling the representatives of 14 million people. You

would in effect be saying, "Get out of here. Your elder brother is here. You should be under him." What right have we to say this to a people of 14 million as represented by their Government in this United Nations? I submit that we have no right to do this. On the basis of the right of self-determination, we have no right to do this.

51. Therefore, we come to the solution. The first preambular paragraphs of my draft resolution set forth the principles that govern the right of self-determination, the definition of a people, and in this case the fact that the Republic of China, or the people of the island of Taiwan, is a separate political entity—whether we like it or not is beside the point—and has been represented in this Organization for 25 years.

52. Then we come to operative paragraph 1. Please bear with me, because this is what your Governments, I humbly submit, should carefully consider. It reads:

"*Decides*, as a just, equitable and practical compromise, that the People's Republic of China should assume its rightful place in the United Nations, as indicated above in the last preambular paragraph, and that, at the same time, the Republic of China, i.e. the people of the island of Taiwan"—that is in order to please our colleague from Albania and the sponsors of his draft resolution—"should retain its seat in the United Nations, and in all the organizations related to it, until the people of the Republic of China, i.e. the people of the island of Taiwan, are enabled by a referendum or a plebiscite under the auspices of the United Nations to declare themselves on the following options:

"(a) Continued independence as a sovereign State with a neutral status defined by a treaty recorded by the United Nations;"

Why did I say "with a neutral status"? Because the main objection of the People's Republic of China is that the United States has used the island of Taiwan as a base against it. While the Republic of China preserves its sovereignty, it should be declared neutral and that neutrality should be spelled out in a treaty deposited in the United Nations.

53. Is this something new? It took us many years before Austria was admitted on such a basis—not until 1955, if you remember. Some wanted to leave Austria floating in the air; Austria, the country that had greatness in its music and its culture, that at one time as a sort of commonwealth of nations. Some just wanted to keep it floating, but we worked and worked and worked for many years, in the United Nations and outside it, until it was found to be the better part of wisdom to maintain Austria's integrity. And no doubt the big Powers—none other than the Soviet Union and the United States, as well as the United Kingdom and France—played a laudable role in declaring Austria an independent neutral State; and Austria has meticulously observed its neutrality. Nobody can criticize Austria for having done anything to break that neutrality.

54. This is one option. The second option, under (b), is "Confederation with the People's Republic of China, the terms of which shall be negotiated by the two parties

concerned". Who are the two parties concerned? The People's Republic of China and Taiwan, or the Republic of China as we know it here. What is wrong with that? The two can confederate with regard to foreign affairs, with regard to trade, with regard to the exchange of culture, with regard to industry, with regard to many things. And the terms of the confederation will be worked out by both parties. This is another option.

55. The last option, under (c), is: "Federation with the People's Republic of China, subject to protocols negotiated by both parties". We have such an example in the United Nations: Cyprus, the protocols concerning which were worked out in Zurich. There was a Turkish element and there was a Greek element. At one time partition was proposed and we counselled against partition. We said, "No *enosis* for the Greeks and no partition for the Turks". And they are not a federation, they are even one State; and we always hope that both communities will respect each other's interests. So there we have the last option.

56. But all this would be useless if we did not work out the final operative paragraph, which reads:

"*Appeals to the magnanimity*"—the emphasis is on magnanimity—"of both the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China, i.e. the people of the island of Taiwan, to consider the options enumerated in paragraph 1 above as the basis for, if not a final solution to, a political dispute among Asian brothers."

57. You Balkan people, you people of the new hemisphere, you people of Africa, you people of western Asia, leave them alone to work it out as Asian brothers, appealing to their magnanimity. Magnanimity; this is something of the past. Without magnanimity, the people of the world will come to an end because of the lethal weapons lying around. Is magnanimity the monopoly of Asia? No, but it still exists in Asia. It flows from the civilization, the culture and tradition of people who suffered for 6,000 years. Asia is the mother of continents, where Richard the Lion-Heart was captured by Saladin. Saladin could have decapitated Richard the Lion-Heart, but, magnanimously, he pardoned him and asked him to take an oath that he would not fight against him. And twice he fought against him and twice Saladin pardoned him. But what did you do, you Europeans in Nürnberg? The people who surrendered to you you hanged. No magnanimity. Magnanimity is not dead in Asia. Let us appeal to the magnanimity of the Asians here, and in particular the magnanimity of the People's Republic of China and the magnanimity of the people of Taiwan to solve their problem as Asian brothers, without undue interference by every Tom, Dick and Harry or Ivan Nikolaievich and I don't know who else. Let them settle their own problems, and do not confuse yourselves by words that flow from the petty national interest of States or from the fact that many of us States here happen to be clients of big Powers and want to ingratiate ourselves with them. This is the fact. Stand on your feet, you small States, whether you be of Asia, Africa or Latin America, and show the world that you are no client of any big Power, but that your true constitution is not your national constitution but an international document, the Charter of the United Nations, which should transcend all petty national interests and do away with emotional, political solidarity.

58. The PRESIDENT: Before I give the floor to the representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote, I should like to inform the Assembly that there are three delegations—Albania, China and the United States—which have requested permission to speak for the second time. I shall call first on them.

59. Mr. MALILE (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The Albanian delegation, like many other delegations, has noted with satisfaction that the debate on the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations which has just ended took place, despite the efforts of the United States to divert it, in a manner consistent with the responsibility of the United Nations to ensure a just and rapid solution of this question. This is quite natural because the solution of this problem is desired by all the peoples of the world and is of importance to the United Nations itself. The very broad participation by delegations in this debate and the fact that this debate has been accorded the highest priority during the current session of the General Assembly have confirmed the legitimate concern of Member States to repair the grave injustice to the Chinese nation of 700 million people.

60. A majority of the delegations of the Member States in their statements pointed out the immense international role of the Government of the People's Republic of China, that great and powerful socialist State, to its influence and impact upon events in Asia and throughout the world, as well as to the absolute necessity for it to occupy as soon as possible its rightful place within this Organization. It was once again confirmed that the United Nations has a great need of the People's Republic of China, without which the Organization will not be able to contribute to the solution of the most important problems of our time.

61. These delegations supported the draft resolution which has been sponsored by 23 delegations, including Albania, which is contained in document A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 in the belief that it provides the only just solution of the question before us and the only one in conformity with the great reality of our times, the inalienable rights of the Chinese people and the provisions of the Charter. These delegations further stated that the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China is predicated upon the immediate expulsion of the Chiang Kai-shek clique from the United Nations and that these two aspects are indivisible. They have proved that the United Nations has the imperative duty to settle this question in conformity with reality and that what is involved is a question of principle affecting the lawful rights of a great people.

62. The debate on the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China is in itself a grave charge against the anti-Chinese policy of the United States. It has shown clearly that the latter has not changed its unjust position on the lawful rights of China within the United Nations. The United States has not only continued openly to oppose the will of the majority of the Member States by its unjust attitude, but, moreover, it has tried at the current session by every possible means to make of the United Nations its accomplice in its anti-Chinese policy and designs. That was confirmed once again in the statement made before this Assembly [1966th meeting] by the

United States representative, George Bush, who has tried, through contradictory and baseless arguments and procedural subterfuge, to mislead this Assembly as to the substance of the question before us, and to divert the debate towards absolutely false and non-existent problems.

63. Now that the United States of America understands that it cannot arrest the general trend in the Assembly towards restoring to the People's Republic of China its rightful place in the United Nations, it has changed its tactics while maintaining its earlier basic position. Hypocritically it states, on the one hand, that China must come here and, on the other, insists that the Chiang Kai-shek clique must continue to remain in the Assembly. The United States knows full well that its proposals on so-called dual representation will result in blocking the restoration of the rights of China within the United Nations. It knows well that this would be a grave injustice and that the People's Republic of China would never accept that arrangement. The United States knows well the firm and uncompromising position of China on this question, a position which has been supported by the majority of Member States. Why, then, does the United States persist in its unjust position and seek to impose its will upon the Assembly?

64. The answer to that question will be found in the whole imperialist and aggressive policy of the United States against the Chinese people and its socialist régime. That is the source of all the efforts of the United States to impose upon this Assembly—by all possible means, at each session of the Assembly for 22 consecutive years—a wholly unjust and absurd attitude. It is well known that the United States imperialists have occupied by force the Chinese island of Taiwan and, as early as 1950, announced officially that they were going to establish military control over that Chinese province, which they then transformed into an aggressive base against the People's Republic of China and other peace-loving States in Asia. The military occupation of Taiwan can change nothing as regards the sovereignty of the People's Republic of China over that island. The United States argument that the island of Taiwan—which it occupies—is a separate State, is an absurd one, and the peace-loving Member States cannot allow themselves to fall for that. They know well the reasons for those manoeuvres and can distinguish what is true from what is false.

65. It is clear to all that there exists one single Chinese State in the world today: the People's Republic of China, born in October 1949 as a result of the triumph of the revolution of the great Chinese people. The Chinese province of Taiwan is an integral part of the territory of the People's Republic of China. That fact has been confirmed by important international instruments bearing, *inter alia*, the signatures of Presidents of the United States of America. The Chinese people will not fail to liberate the island of Taiwan.

66. The United States manoeuvres involving so-called dual representation seek to legalize the long-standing United States plot of the so-called two Chinas. That manoeuvre is aimed at dismembering the territory of China and perpetuating the occupation of the island of Taiwan. It was rightly stressed here that the United States attempt to give the puppet Chiang Kai-shek clique the legal status of a Member

State is fraught with danger for Member States as well as for the United Nations itself. Any such arrangement would create a dangerous precedent for the legalization of interference in the affairs of other States and their arbitrary division. It should be added that the United States has a considerable interest in creating such precedents because it is precisely that Government which hatches plots, stages coups d'état and organizes aggression against independent States and peoples. Examples are not lacking in this connexion. A fait accompli would be created as a result of such activities and would be taken advantage of by the American imperialists, as in the case of the Chiang Kai-shek clique, to promote their own policies. This, I repeat, would have serious consequences for the United Nations itself, because it would degenerate into an Assembly in which asylum would be provided for the enemies and the betrayers of peoples. This is very important and must be stressed, because Member States must oppose the two Chinas plot not only because such a position is just and in conformity with the Charter but also because the rejection of such a plot is in the interest of their own independence and their sovereign rights.

67. It is true that the restoration of the legal rights of the People's Republic of China has been blocked for 22 years, but that has occurred not because someone raised the question of admission of a new State or the exclusion of another Member State, as the United States representative has claimed, but because of the unjust position of the United States, which at this session too, has pursued the same objective in an attempt to distort the truth. Here, it is not a matter of excluding a State Member of the United Nations but simply of expelling the remnants of a clique overthrown by the Chinese people.

68. The contention of the representatives of the United States that the expulsion of that clique from the United Nations would create a precedent allowing other Member States to be expelled in the future has a naive ring to it. It is an absurdity; it is blatant blackmail and an affront to the Member States. The United States representative has placed on the same level respected representatives of sovereign States and a clique of renegades who represent nothing, who have been long ago thrown on the rubbish heap of history by the great Chinese people. We are convinced that the Member States will reject with disdain this provocation directed against their dignity and their sovereign rights.

69. The representative of the United States of America, in defending his thesis aimed at keeping the Chiang Kai-shek clique in this Assembly, has made much of the so-called United States concept of the universality of the United Nations and has tried to show compassion for the 14 million inhabitants of the island of Taiwan, occupied by the United States of America. Shedding crocodile tears he explained that the expulsion of the Chiang Kai-shek clique would deprive that population of representation within the United Nations. But everyone knows that the island of Taiwan is an integral part of Chinese territory and that the Chinese people, 700 million strong including the population of Taiwan, have not been represented in the United Nations for some 22 years—and that only because of the hostile attitude of the United States of America towards the great socialist China. Of what universality do representatives of the United States speak when for almost a quarter of a

century they have succeeded in keeping outside the United Nations one quarter of mankind?

70. The United States "two Chinas" tactic was warmly supported by the Japanese Government. The speech of its representative to the Assembly [1968th meeting] was an open expression of the unrealistic and hostile attitude adopted by the Japanese Government towards the People's Republic of China, an attitude it still maintains. The Japanese militarists are worried by the fact that the General Assembly has begun to repair the injustice done to the great Chinese people. Being consistent in their anti-Chinese line, they have repeatedly said that such a decision would destroy the international balance in the Far East. But what balance are the Japanese militarists speaking of? Perhaps this is not the moment to analyse that question, but I think that the recent history of our times will provide the necessary answer.

71. Regarding the draft resolutions submitted by the United States of America [A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2], they are, as many representatives have correctly stressed, illegal and in flagrant contradiction with the realities of today, with justice and with the principles of the Charter. Their purpose is to block China's entry into the United Nations.

72. In the case of item 93, which we are now discussing, it is not at all a matter of admitting the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, but of restoring its lawful rights. To achieve this, those who have usurped the place of the great China must be expelled forthwith. The real question before us is that of ensuring the lawful representation of a Member State, of ensuring the arrival of the true representatives of the Chinese people, the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China, and of inviting them to occupy within the United Nations the place which belongs to them. The Chinese State has a single seat in this Organization, and that seat belongs to the People's Republic of China. To raise the question of the admission to the United Nations of China, a founder Member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council, is tantamount to a denial of the Charter and of the basis of this Organization. It shows contempt for the Member States and for the United Nations itself, for reasons known to all which we have not failed to point out here.

73. The explanations we have heard here concerning draft resolution A/L.632 are completely unfounded. This draft is basically an integral part of the anti-Chinese attempt of the United States of America to legalize its "two Chinas" plot and is designed to sabotage the approval of the draft resolution of the 23 States, including Albania. The content of such a draft is illegal. It seeks to open the way to the United States manoeuvre aimed at involving the United Nations in the domestic affairs of the Chinese people, which is the aim of draft resolution A/L.633. As has been clearly pointed out, that draft resolution is in flagrant contradiction with Article 18 of the Charter. It goes without saying that that Article cannot be applied to our draft resolution.

74. Our draft resolution—and efforts are being made to prevent the adoption of that text by the unfair interpreta-

tion of the procedural device of a two-thirds majority—involves an issue which in the final analysis boils down to a question of credentials and does not fall within the group of questions defined specifically in Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter. Therefore, in order to settle the question, only a simple majority of the votes of Members present and voting is required.

75. We are happy to note that the overwhelming majority of representatives of Member States who have spoken in this debate have firmly rejected the two United States draft resolutions, for they are unlawful and constitute a grave act of hostility by the United States of America against China. This attitude of principle of the greatest importance shows that the majority of Member States are determined to repair the injustice done to the Chinese people.

76. The only equitable solution to the question we are discussing is to be found in the draft resolution submitted by 23 Powers, which calls for the restoration of all the rights of the People's Republic of China, the recognition of its representatives as the only legitimate representatives of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, the recognition of the People's Republic of China as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council and the immediate expulsion of the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique from the seat that they have been holding illegally in the United Nations and in affiliated organizations.

77. That draft resolution is in full accord with the realities of our times and with the indisputable rights of the Chinese people, and in the interests of the Member States themselves and of international peace and security. It takes account of all aspects of the issue. It is a single text, indivisible, and any attempt to delete part of it or amend it is unacceptable.

78. The Chinese people and the Government of the People's Republic of China have made known very clearly, officially and firmly, their unswerving attitude on this question. Although this attitude is well known to Member States, my delegation considers it necessary once again to draw the attention of this Assembly to the official statement of the People's Republic of China dated 20 August 1971, which states, *inter alia*:

"Should a situation of 'two Chinas', 'one China, one Taiwan', or 'the status of Taiwan remaining to be determined' or any other similar situation occur in the United Nations, the Government of the People's Republic of China will have absolutely nothing to do with the United Nations. This just stand of the Chinese Government is unshakable." [See A/8470.]

79. This official and solemn statement categorically rejects the distortions, speculations, and misinformation—spread so zealously both in this Assembly and in the corridors by those who support the United States thesis of dual representation—on the position of the People's Republic of China concerning the problem under discussion.

80. The People's Republic of China is a great and powerful peace-loving Socialist State, an invincible citadel of socialism, powerful defender of the interests of all the peoples of

the world, an insurmountable obstacle to the plans of hegemony of the United States imperialists and the Soviet socio-imperialists. The restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations would be a victory for all the Member States and the Organization itself. It would also be a severe blow to its manipulation by the two great Powers.

81. It is now obvious to all that the United States of America has completely failed in its anti-Chinese policy. The efforts of the United States to legalize an unjust situation or to delay the restoration of the lawful rights of the Chinese people in the United Nations are useless. Neither demagoguery nor subterfuge nor even the cynical pressures which in the course of this session have assumed hitherto unknown proportions, and are insupportable and incompatible with the dignity of sovereign States—and all the delegations present here are witness to this—can help the United States of America out of the impasse in which it finds itself.

82. Today the General Assembly is going to vote on draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2. The delegation of the People's Republic of Albania hopes that those States that are still hesitating will also vote in favour of the Albanian draft resolution, co-sponsored by 22 other States, and place themselves on the side of justice and that, acting in concert with the majority of Member States, they, too, will make their contribution at this important moment when the General Assembly is about to take its historic decision to restore the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

83. Mr. LIU (China):¹ At the present stage of the debate I deem it necessary to make a few observations on the statements made by some delegations in this Assembly.

84. It is hardly necessary for me to go into a detailed analysis of the fallacies, distortions and specious reasoning which the supporters of the Chinese Communist régime have been in the habit of repeating. All Members of the Assembly are familiar with them. Nor would I pay back in kind the slanders and vilifications with which some speakers have seen fit to besmear my Government. The progress and achievements of the Republic of China in the course of the last 25 years speak for themselves. They are beyond the representatives of Albania, Algeria or any other country to detract from or to tarnish.

85. The pro-Peiping delegations have much to say about the indivisibility of the Chinese nation. I am in complete agreement with them on this point. In the course of its long history, China has more than once been split into separate and mutually antagonistic parts. Yet even under conditions of a divided country the Chinese people have always been one and indivisible in their loyalty to their common heritage. When the opportunity presents itself, the Chinese people have never failed to reunify their country into a

¹ The reference to "China" is to be understood in the light of General Assembly resolution 2758 (XXVI) of 25 October 1971. By that resolution, the General Assembly *inter alia* decided

"... to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China and to recognize the representatives of its Government as the only legitimate representatives of China to the United Nations, and to expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the place which they unlawfully occupy at the United Nations and in all the organizations related to it".

single one. I have therefore not the slightest doubt that, although for 22 years the people on the mainland have been forced to submit to Communist tyranny, they will sooner or later overthrow their oppressors and join hands with their comrades in Free China. Until then the two parts of China must by force of circumstance remain separated from each other. But the fact that control over the mainland was wrested from the Government of the Republic of China by the Communists does not in any way alter the legitimate rights of the Government of the Republic of China in the United Nations. It is ridiculous to maintain that the rights which it has exercised since the founding of the United Nations must now be taken away *in toto* in order to accommodate Mao Tse-tung and company.

86. This is not to deny the reality of the existence of the Chinese Communist régime. Indeed, it is precisely because the existence of that régime is such a frightening reality that the so-called question of Chinese representation has become one of the most momentous issues confronting the world Organization. How the question is to be resolved will, in the words of General Romulo, the Foreign Minister of the Philippines, be "a decision of the greatest historical significance for the future" of the United Nations [1972nd meeting, para. 21]. Elementary prudence requires the General Assembly to approach the question in strict adherence to the purposes and principles of the Charter. Any decision that ignores reason and justice or is in any way inconsistent with the Charter will seriously diminish the credibility of the lofty ideals upon which the United Nations was founded. It will certainly shake public confidence in the United Nations and thus reduce its usefulness as an instrument for peace at a crucial moment in the world's history.

87. My Foreign Minister, in his statement before this Assembly last week, has already pointed out that the whole issue of the draft resolution submitted by Albania and others has been the expulsion of the Republic of China from the United Nations. Referring to Article 6 of the Charter providing for the expulsion of a Member which has persistently violated the principles in the Charter, my Foreign Minister said then:

"The Republic of China, which the General Assembly has been asked to expel, is a Charter Member of the United Nations. Far from 'persistently violating the Charter', it has scrupulously and consistently discharged... its Charter obligations. The idea of expelling the Republic of China is thus as absurd as it is unthinkable." [1967th meeting, para. 41.]

88. I may perhaps now add that the régime the General Assembly is asked to admit is one which has, by its overt acts and declared policies, been persistently violating the principles of the Charter even before its admission and should therefore be denied admission in the first place if the terms of Article 4 were faithfully observed. In this connexion, the Assembly may well take heed of the forceful words of the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mr. Mandi, when he opposed bringing

"... into our Organization a country which, scorning the ideals of the Charter, makes domestic subversion a rule of its foreign policy" [1973rd meeting, para. 164].

89. The Assembly will also recall that a similar position was taken by the representative of Malawi [1974th meeting] and by the representative of Madagascar [1964th meeting].

90. Since the draft resolution contained in document A/L.630 has for its purpose the expulsion of the Republic of China from the United Nations, Article 18 of the Charter obviously applies. That Article lists the expulsion of Members as one of the "important questions" requiring a two-thirds majority for adoption. Albania and the other sponsors of that draft resolution, however, regard the expulsion as a logical consequence of the so-called "restoration of the lawful rights of the Communist régime". The application of Article 18, according to them, is thus irrelevant. It seems to me that this is mere sophistry. As the representative of Australia, Sir Laurence McIntyre, observed [1973rd meeting], the word "expel" is written clearly in that draft resolution and the application of the two-thirds rule cannot be said to be irrelevant. Sir Laurence further reminded the Assembly of the statement by the Foreign Minister of Costa Rica [1966th meeting], who quoted from numerous statements made in the general debate, underlining that the representation of China is indubitably an important question.

91. That being so, the draft resolution contained in document A/L.632 declaring that "any proposal in the General Assembly which would result in depriving the Republic of China of representation in the United Nations is an important question under Article 18 of the Charter", merits the support of all loyal Members of the Organization. It would be contrary to all reason and logic, and indeed make a mockery of United Nations jurisprudence, if a matter that has agitated the United Nations for over two decades and has been adjudged by successive sessions of the General Assembly in the last 10 years to be an important question within the meaning of Article 18 should now be casually resolved by a margin of one or two votes.

92. Moreover, the adoption of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.630 would, as has been noted by a number of previous speakers, set a dangerous precedent which could well be used against any Member of the United Nations whose policies can come under attack by a combination of other Members for ideological reasons. The danger posed by such a precedent is all the more serious and real when one remembers that in 1965 Chen Yi, the then so-called Foreign Minister of the Peiping régime, did in fact call for the expulsion of "all imperialist puppet States" as a condition for Chinese Communist acceptance of United Nations membership. The representative of Liberia, Mr. Dosumu-Johnson, must have had this in mind when, after noting that no one would wish the State he represents to be expelled for any reason whatsoever from this Organization, he said:

"... we should therefore act in no way contrary to our conscience and good judgement and establish any precedent to our future detriment." [1970th meeting, para. 95.]

He went on to say:

"The trouble with the United Nations today is that justice and truth have been subordinated to ideological

expediency and to economic considerations, and Members without conspicuous or arrogant ideological beliefs are often too shy to speak out lest they lose their friends.

"I implore you to do unto others as you would them do unto you." [Ibid., paras. 96-97.]

93. The spokesmen of the Chinese Communist régime in the United Nations have labelled any proposal affirming the continued right of representation of the Republic of China as a gimmick to delay the seating of Peiping. They have even circulated, as an official document of the General Assembly [A/8470], a statement issued by the so-called Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Communist régime on the question of Chinese representation. Like other documents that régime has issued in recent months, this statement proclaims to the world that the régime's acceptance of membership in the United Nations will be contingent upon the expulsion of the Republic of China. Mao Tse-tung and company are already dictating terms to the United Nations even before the Communist régime is admitted. Could the General Assembly, in honour and conscience, accept these impossible terms which Peiping has the impertinence to lay down?

94. Albania, Algeria and others have stressed the fact that Taiwan is Chinese territory. On this I cannot agree with them more. Taiwan is indeed Chinese territory. After 50 years of Japanese rule it was restored to the Republic of China. It is a matter of common knowledge that, in the last 25 years under the Government of the Republic of China, Taiwan has made tremendous progress economically, culturally and politically. It has attained a high level of modernization. It has carried through a land reform programme with remarkable success. The masses of the people enjoy a standard of living which is one of the highest in Asia.

95. The representative of Cuba went out of his way the other day to say that Taiwan is now under United States military occupation [1974th meeting]. Such slanderous accusations hardly need refutation. The Mutual Defense Treaty concluded on 2 December 1954 between the Republic of China and the United States² is similar to other bilateral security treaties which the United States has concluded with other Asian countries since the Second World War. The Government of the Republic of China, like all free and independent Governments, is at liberty to enter into whatever defence arrangements with whatever country it sees fit. This, as we have made clear time and again, is an exercise of the inherent right of a sovereign nation. We have no apologies to make to anyone about the military and security arrangements we have made with our allies in defence of freedom in our part of the world.

96. Some critics of my Government, however, make much of the difference between what they call the Taiwanese and the mainlanders who have come to Taiwan since 1945. The representative of Nigeria, for example, alleged that the Government of the Republic of China "has illegally occupied the island and imposed a virtual dictatorship over the 12 million Taiwanese" [1967th meeting, para. 113].

² United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 248, No. 3496.

97. That is a flagrant distortion of facts. What the representative of Nigeria calls Taiwanese are ethnically, culturally and historically Chinese. They speak the Chinese language. They adhere to Chinese cultural values. Their way of life is Chinese. They are descendants of men who have come to the island from time to time in the past centuries as well as in recent years from the coastal areas of South China. They have tenaciously held on to their Chinese cultural heritage. They have never regarded themselves as anything but Chinese. If there has been any difference between them and the recent comers, the difference is now fast on its way out. Like the recent comers, they do not want to be subjected to the inhuman rule of the Chinese Communists.

98. They are overwhelmingly loyal supporters of the Government of the Republic of China. Under our democratic institutions the people, irrespective of their sex, religion or ancestry, have ample channels to express themselves, and their wishes and aspirations are given all the weight they deserve in matters affecting their welfare and the national interest.

99. If there are voices of disgruntled elements to be heard, they are more likely to be stimulated by external influences than to be the spontaneous expressions of discontent. Indeed, one may ask, what country is without its share of dissidents? As the representative of Nigeria well knows, the Republic of China is by no means unique in this. I can assure you that my Government and my people are united in our determination to resist the march of communism and to redouble our efforts in the building of a free and democratic society.

100. The decision that the General Assembly is about to make has a special significance for the countries in the Asian-Pacific area. It will have, in the words of the chairman of the Japanese delegation, "a deep and far-reaching impact on the political situation prevailing in the exceedingly sensitive area of Asia" [1968th meeting, para. 104]. The Asian-Pacific countries have thus a vital interest in the outcome of the present debate. For countries which are geographically far removed from the Asian-Pacific area there is a strong temptation to view the question of Chinese representation in terms of power politics, which, as the Foreign Minister of Brazil reminded us in his statement in the general debate, "can hardly set proper criteria for organizing an international society based on peace, justice and the equality of States" [1940th meeting, para. 12].

101. It is always something of a puzzlement to me that certain Asian countries which are targets of Peiping's most menacing threats continue to spout platitudes about the desirability of replacing the Republic of China by the Communist régime in the United Nations. There can be only one explanation for this. It is fear. To those countries which are practically unarmed, Peiping's military might represents a formidable symbol of power which can hardly be resisted. And this threat is coupled with a pervasive propaganda, which is all the more persuasive because men are afraid. To them let me say in all candour that the course of timidity, adopted from a desire for security, leads to mortal danger.

102. On the other hand, there are Asian countries, notably Japan, Thailand, the Philippines and the Khmer Republic, which are not afraid to say and do what they believe in. By upholding the right of a fellow Member they are also defending the sanctity of the United Nations Charter.

103. Permit me to take this opportunity to express, on behalf of my delegation, our profound appreciation to those representatives who have, with eloquence and lucidity, firmly upheld my Government's right of representation in the United Nations. They have viewed the question in the light of the purposes and principles of the Charter. They have pointed out that the United Nations would make a tragic and irreparable mistake if it should yield to the claim of the Chinese Communist régime to replace the Republic of China in the United Nations. The arguments that they have advanced are well-nigh irrefutable and should command the respect of all of us. My delegation confidently hopes that the Assembly will, in its good judgement, reject all attempts to unseat the Republic of China. In your decision, my fellow representatives, lies the fate of the Chinese people, the peace and security of Asia and the whole world and the future of the United Nations itself.

104. The PRESIDENT: I call on the last speaker, the representative of the United States of America.

105. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): Very shortly our debate on the representation of China will be over and we will be proceeding to vote on the proposals before us. We have already debated this question for a week—as well we might, because it is a question of great importance and the decisions that we are about to take will be historic, momentous decisions for the United Nations.

106. Let me now sum up the strongly held views of the United States Government and, if I may be so presumptuous, the strongly held views of our many co-sponsors. I shall do so without resorting to vitriol or abuse. I heard the words "a clique of renegades" and "a rubbish heap of history" ring through these hallowed halls. These shrill accusations, reeking with hostility, demean the United Nations. The slander of nations must never replace the harmonizing of nations here in the United Nations. We have presented our case, or at least endeavoured to, hopefully with force but never with vituperation, and the attacks on our Government and, by implication, on all of our co-sponsors are, to say the least, contemptible. I shall say no more about them, but before I go further, I pay my respects here and now publicly to the decency of the man who has just preceded me. I wonder how many of us, human beings all, I wonder how many of us, given the personal and the vicious attacks that he has long endured in these halls, could have responded as he did with dignity and decency, with his head held high and his self-respect fully intact.

107. We in the United States delegation have listened most attentively to all the statements made here, representing all shades of view. Within the immense variety of arguments we find one dominant theme throughout this debate, one dominant issue. That issue is not the seating of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. In fact, for the first time in history there is something close to unanimity

behind the proposition that it is time for the People's Republic to take its seat in the United Nations, including its seat as a permanent member of the Security Council. That is a major and historic development here. It is not at issue in the United Nations any more.

108. No, the issue before us can be stated very simply. This is the issue: shall we expel forthwith the Republic of China from the United Nations, or shall it continue to be represented here? That is the heart of the matter. It is the only question in the debate; it is the only question in the draft resolutions we are about to vote on; and it is the question on which I intend to concentrate this evening. There may be a thousand shadings in the answers to this question. This we understand and I do not deny that shadings can be important. But when we come to the heart of the matter itself there are only two possible answers. Either the Republic of China will continue to be represented in the United Nations or it will be expelled. And between those two stark alternatives the United States very deeply and earnestly believes that one is right and the other is simply wrong.

109. The Republic of China should not and must not be expelled or deprived of its United Nations representation. It should and it must continue to be represented in this Organization. In the terms of our draft resolution, the Assembly should affirm "the continued right of representation of the Republic of China". Let me sum up our reasons for this position as simply and clearly as I can.

110. First, the solution is a realistic solution. To retain the Republic of China in the United Nations, while seating the People's Republic in both the General Assembly and the Security Council, is the most realistic solution open to us. It reflects the plain facts regarding who governs in Taiwan as well as who governs the Chinese mainland.

111. For 20 years the United States has been accused of ignoring reality. Today I submit to you that it is the sponsors of the Albanian resolution [*A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2*] who are ignoring reality. It is amazing to what lengths some of the supporters—and I say "some" because there are some men who are troubled—of the Albanian resolution have gone to disguise these facts or distract attention from them.

112. The representatives of the Republic of China speak for the Government of a population—we have heard it over and over again here—numbering some 14 million.

113. Many Governments in this debate have indicated that including the actual Governments of the world in the United Nations is a wise step, a creative step that ought to be taken wherever it is feasible. That is what we think is meant by the much-used and much-abused word "universality".

114. Any action that would lead to the first expulsion of a Member State in the 26-year history of the United Nations would be a blow to the principle of universality.

115. So that is our first reason—realism and universality.

116. Second, we believe the evolution of this reality is for the parties concerned to determine. The United Nations has

no need to prejudice or predetermine or pass judgement on the conflicting claims—except to help ensure that the dispute is resolved only by peaceful means. The United Nations should not, and our resolution does not, attempt to write the future history of China, or to influence the evolution of that part of the world.

117. I submit that we should leave those matters to history, as determined by the people directly concerned, and stick to the real issue before us. The issue is this: how all the people of China should be represented in this Organization.

118. Third, the representation of both these Chinese Governments in the United Nations, in accordance with the terms of our draft resolution, is a perfectly practical plan. It contains nothing prejudicial to the position of either party—and indeed it has been most carefully written to avoid doing so. It does not prejudice any ultimate solution of this matter.

119. I have heard many speakers here speculate on what might or might not happen if this Assembly adopts the draft resolutions which we have presented. But I submit that our task is not to speculate but to find a valid, equitable and realistic solution. Let us in the United Nations have the courage of our own convictions and do what we believe is right and necessary—what is truly in the interests of the Organization and in the interests of world peace. If we act in that spirit, we will want to make sure that the decision we are about to take benefits all the people directly concerned, not just the majority.

120. It must be a decision that will not just satisfy some debatable technical requirement but will serve a major objective in keeping with the broad purposes and principles of the United Nations. That objective is to see to it that there is real, meaningful, effective representation in these halls for all of these people—including those 14 million on Taiwan. And how is such real representation to be brought about at this point in time except through the actual governments that effectively govern? How else can we resolve this great issue in a way that does not violate our collective conscience?

121. In my Government's extensive consultations with almost all Members of the United Nations, we have heard one view expressed more consistently than any other. It was that the Republic of China ought not to be denied representation here as the price for opening the door to the People's Republic of China.

122. Some expressed strong opposition to expulsion. Some expressed a profound aversion to such a prospect, others, at least a deep regret. Many of the supporters of the Albanian resolution have told us that they have a deep regret on this point. But however this view is stated, it became clear to us that a large majority of Members of this Organization insist, or at the very least strongly prefer, that the Republic of China should continue to be represented here along with the People's Republic of China. That is the real underlying conviction of the majority of members in this Assembly. Let us act and let us vote on that conviction.

123. And now my fourth point: the question of legality. I am frankly surprised that some of the supporters of the

Albanian resolution should have argued against our resolution on grounds of legality and conformity with the Charter and the rules of due process, and so on.

124. If there is a draft resolution before us which is arbitrary and which flies in the face of justice and due process—which are the real concern of the law—it is most certainly the Albanian draft resolution. No wonder it has been rejected so many times, year after year, by this Assembly. In total disregard of the Charter, it proposes to “expel”—that is the word, and that is the act it describes—the Republic of China from the United Nations and all its organs without regard for the people concerned.

125. It would do so by a majority vote of this Assembly, and without any reference whatsoever to the law of the Charter concerning expulsion. Where is due process in this proposal? Has anyone presented a shred of evidence that the Republic of China, in the words of Article 6, has “persistently violated the Principles contained in the present Charter . . .”? There is no such evidence. The Republic of China has no stain on its name here, no Charter violation of any kind. It is a Member in excellent standing.

126. Many Members here have cause to know of its constructive service both to the purposes of this Organization and to the developing countries themselves. I ask you to examine your consciences as you decide this very important question.

127. The supporters of the Albanian draft resolution would have us believe that they propose to expel some amorphous group of people who represent nobody at all—presumably a group of private individuals who somehow have secured badges from somebody out here. Nothing could be further from the truth.

128. What the proponents of the Albanian draft resolution propose—no matter how they colour it, no matter how much vituperation they heap upon the alternatives—is the expulsion of the representatives of 14 million people. It should be clear to all in this room that if the Albanian draft resolution should pass in its present form, those people will be deprived of their only representation here in the United Nations.

129. By stark contrast, the dual representation draft resolution [*A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2*] is straightforward, non-contentious, studiously impartial in its language, and fully within the law of the Charter.

130. Some may ask where and when the Charter has been used before in precisely the way our draft resolution proposes. The answer is, nowhere—because in 26 years the United Nations has never faced precisely this situation. We have demonstrated in many other actions here that the Charter is a flexible document. It was written by wise men to cope with the unforeseeable. Within the Charter’s limits two Members are present here that are governed by the Soviet Government in Moscow—one over-all government entity but three seats, three votes. Within the limits of the Charter, India even before full independence, became a full voting Member. Within its limits, Egypt and Syria joined, became one Member, divided again, and resumed their separate seats. Within its limits, two members, Tanganyika

and Zanzibar, joined and became one. Within its limits, Indonesia, having renounced its membership, after some years changed its mind and—amidst general rejoicing in the United Nations—resumed its seat without any formality of readmission.

131. In every such case—and I wager that more can be cited—the United Nations has faced a reality, not a theory, and has acted accordingly, finding new solutions for new problems.

132. We are in a similar situation now. We face a reality, not a theory. Our proper concern must be to do justice to the complex reality that exists today in the form of effectively governing entities, and the Charter gives us the room to innovate in order to satisfy that concern.

133. Finally, a word about the first proposition that will come before us in the voting: the draft resolution deciding that any proposal to exclude the Republic of China from the United Nations is an important question [*A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2*]. This “non-expulsion” draft resolution will have the effect of requiring that the Albanian draft resolution, which contains such an expulsion proposal—read it, your eyes will see it just as mine do—will fail unless it receives a two-thirds majority.

134. To decide such a question without a two-thirds majority would be unthinkable. The proposal to expel the Republic of China is, as I said at the outset of this statement, the heart of the matter before us. If it were to be adopted, it would be the first expulsion of a Member—by any procedure, legal or illegal—ever carried out in the history of the United Nations. If this is not an important question in these halls, what is?

135. To take such a decision by a bare majority would expose this Organization in future times to ill-considered attempts to railroad other Members out of the United Nations as soon as a majority of Members should decide—possibly on quite transitory and emotional grounds—that such and such a Member does not truly represent its people or that some other group might represent them better.

136. If Members in this way, by a simple majority vote in this hall, could impugn before the world each other’s legitimacy and each other’s right to be called a State—what a sore temptation that would be toward the promoting of instability and confusion in the United Nations and in the world itself. Such a development would inevitably raise new and grave questions in many countries as to whether the United Nations had become a cockpit for dissension rather than an instrument for peace.

137. The issue is clearly marked: inclusion or expulsion; impartiality or one-sided and arbitrary punishment. If this is not an important question, what is?

138. Let the United Nations take the affirmative road—not the road of exclusion. Let it take the constructive road, that which assures equal rights as between large and small—not the ancient, discredited and utterly sinister road that leads to the rule of the strong over the weak. And let this decision be made not in Taipei, let it be made not in Peking, but here in New York. Let it be made, not

according to the demands of either party, but according to the interests and the spirit of the United Nations.

139. And having made our decision in that spirit, then we can in good conscience say to both parties: the halls of the United Nations are big enough for you both; the doors of the United Nations are open to you both for the urgent and creative work of building a more peaceful world.

140. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly has now concluded its debate on agenda item 93.

141. I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia on a point of order.

142. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Members realize that I submitted this afternoon a draft resolution contained in document A/L.638 which, of course, merits the consideration of the General Assembly. Some Members may act like horses with blinkers, seeing nothing but their own draft resolution. I have an open mind and have studied very carefully the two substantive draft resolutions: the one submitted by Albania and others, as well as the one submitted by Australia and others.

143. Every member who submits a draft resolution of a substantive nature, as the one I have submitted, should be extended the courtesy, if he so desires, of having sufficient time for the consideration of the draft resolution in accordance with rule 80 of the rules of procedure pertaining to proposals and amendments. Rule 80 states:

“Proposals and amendments shall normally be introduced in writing and handed to the Secretary-General, who shall circulate copies to the delegations. As a general rule, no proposal shall be discussed or put to the vote at any meeting of the General Assembly unless copies of it have been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting.”

I do not demand that courtesy. It is the practice of the Assembly to extend such a courtesy. I shall not only protest but I shall ask for the floor to dispute anyone who would not like to extend that courtesy, which is practical, and for a good reason.

144. Secondly, I shall ask for priority for my draft resolution, inasmuch as it is not an amendment, but I believe that it is a synthesis of both substantive draft resolutions before us and, at the same time, presents a solution with various options, or, if not a final solution, the basis for a solution.

145. However, if anyone asks that my draft resolution—or for that matter any draft resolution that is submitted today—should be cast by the wayside, I shall, Mr. President, ask you forthwith to give me the floor to stand on my rights and dispute any such demand which is inimical to parliamentary conduct and the practice we have followed in the General Assembly.

146. Finally, after what I have said, and subject to what any member may ask relative to precipitating a debate this afternoon, I should like then to ask for the floor on another point of order: to adjourn the vote until some of the

members have had time to study my draft resolution and other draft resolutions. Failing that, and this is fair warning, we will engage in a procedural debate—and I think I know a little about procedure—which will ensure that we will not come to the vote arbitrarily without being given a chance to see that our draft resolution is considered as it should be, in the same way as any other draft resolution that comes before the Assembly. With this fair warning I reserve my right, should anyone challenge what I have said, to raise a successive point of order.

147. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Saudi Arabia has made a motion on the draft resolutions to the effect that the voting should take place tomorrow in order to give representatives time to consider the different proposals before the Assembly. I intend to put to the vote the question of postponing the vote until tomorrow.

148. Two representatives have asked for the floor to oppose the motion.

149. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): The representative of Saudi Arabia has asked for the postponement of the vote, basing his request on rule 80 of the rules of procedure and concluding therefrom that he should be given the courtesy of having enough time allowed for his draft resolution to be studied sufficiently in order that an adequate decision may be taken upon it. In opposing this postponement, we base ourselves on the same rule of procedure and we ask for the same courtesy for our draft resolution that the representative of Saudi Arabia has asked for his own.

150. The fact of the matter is as follows. The Saudi Arabian draft resolution [A/L.638], which was circulated during this meeting of the General Assembly, certainly qualifies for consideration under rule 80 of the rules of procedure. But our own draft resolution [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2] was submitted on 25 September 1971. Enough time has passed for our draft resolution to have been studied. It has been discussed. Speakers have spoken for and against it. Therefore, basing ourselves on rule 80 of the rules of procedure, we ask that a vote be taken, without postponement, on our draft resolution, which was submitted, as I have said, on 25 September.

151. The second point is this. The representative of Saudi Arabia referred to his draft amendments as submitted in document A/L.637 of 18 October 1971. That is enough time for us to have studied those amendments. In fact we have studied them. And anyone who looks carefully at the new draft resolution submitted during this afternoon's meeting by Ambassador Baroody of Saudi Arabia, and at his amendments submitted on 18 October, will see that actually they amount to one and the same thing, except that his amendments have been inflated so as to become a draft resolution. On the basis of that, we oppose the postponement. I shall not deal with the other proposals. I am dealing with one point of order only: postponement or non-postponement. No speaker has the right to raise at one and the same time three or four points of order.

152. Therefore, to summarize, we oppose the Saudi Arabian motion for postponement on the basis of rule 80 of the rules of procedure because our own draft resolution was submitted as far back as 25 September 1971.

153. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Yugoslavia on a point of order.

154. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): The Yugoslav delegation carefully listened this afternoon to the statement of the representative of Saudi Arabia and his introduction of his newly proposed draft resolution [A/L.638], in the same way as it listened to his previous statements made during the debate on item 93 of the agenda: "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations", and to his presentation of his amendments [A/L.637].

155. I must say that the views now expressed by the representative of Saudi Arabia, and formulated in his new draft resolution, are already well known to the Assembly, and that there is little new in his arguments. So, in the opinion of the Yugoslav delegation, since their substance is very clear, they do not require a new and extended debate. These arguments repeat once again his support of the position of the existence of two Chinese States, more specifically one China and one Taiwan. With this newly-proposed draft resolution, the General Assembly is confronted with a separate problem that has nothing to do with the simple question that is before us: Who represents the Chinese people, the legitimate Government of the People's Republic of China or the *émigré* régime on Taiwan? But arbitrarily and unlawfully to create two separate Chinese States even on a temporary basis—as is now proposed by the representative of Saudi Arabia—from one country and, with that, to legalize a situation which was created through an essentially coercive act against the People's Republic of China, this is simply not the question before us and, indeed, this is not within the competence of the General Assembly.

156. We have heard the appeal of the representative of Saudi Arabia to consider his new proposals carefully and to report to our Governments before taking the vote on the draft resolutions which have been submitted under item 93. We shall certainly do that, although, as I said, we do not see in his most recent proposal anything new in substance—anything which has not already been said and discussed during the debate.

157. Mr. Baroody indeed has a right, in accordance with rule 80 of the rules of procedure, to have his own draft resolution put to a vote one day following the day of its circulation. But rule 80 does not prevent the General Assembly from taking decisions on other proposals, draft resolutions and amendments which are circulated "not later than the day preceding the meeting". This is the case with all of the draft resolutions and amendments that are before us except the draft resolution proposed this afternoon by the representative of Saudi Arabia and the draft resolutions already presented by the representative of Tunisia [A/L.639, L.640, L.641]. Accordingly, we can proceed to vote and take decisions on the draft resolutions that were normally circulated before this meeting.

158. Having that in mind, my delegation opposes the proposal just made, on a point of order, by the representative of Saudi Arabia to postpone the voting; however, it is ready, in accordance with rule 80, to proceed to the vote, one day after the circulation of the texts, on only those draft resolutions that were proposed this afternoon.

159. For all these reasons, the Yugoslav delegation will vote against the proposal of the representative of Saudi Arabia for postponement of the voting, if that proposal is put to a vote. My delegation will also vote against the request for priority for the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Saudi Arabia in document A/L.638, if and when that request for priority is put to a vote.

160. The PRESIDENT: I shall not put to the vote the motion to postpone the vote until tomorrow.

161. I call on the representative of Pakistan on a point of order.

162. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): As we understand the proposal made by the representative of Yugoslavia, the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 do not oppose the motion of the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia to postpone the vote on his own draft resolution until tomorrow. We oppose the motion to postpone the vote on the draft resolutions in documents A/L.630, A/L.632 and A/L.633. We are prepared to defer voting on the Saudi Arabian draft resolution and also on the Tunisian draft resolutions until tomorrow.

163. I hope, Mr. President, that you will put the proposal clearly to the Assembly so that the voting may reflect the precise sense of the statement made by the representative of Yugoslavia.

164. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Japan on a point of order.

165. Mr. NAKAGAWA (Japan): Today, only a short time ago, four draft resolutions on the subject under discussion were submitted by the representative of Saudi Arabia and by the representative of Tunisia in this Assembly respectively. All of these draft resolutions were presented under the same agenda item, item 93. All of them are very interesting in substance and merit careful and thorough study before a vote is taken on them. The representative of Pakistan said that the question of whether the voting should be adjourned or not until tomorrow applies only to the draft resolution submitted today by the representative of Saudi Arabia, and that the so-called Albanian draft resolution should be voted upon today. My delegation does not associate itself with the view expressed by the representative of Pakistan, believing that, since all four draft resolutions submitted today are under the same item as the so-called Albanian draft resolution, if the latter is voted upon today and if, as a hypothesis, it is adopted, then this automatically means that the four new draft resolutions submitted today will have no chance of being voted upon tomorrow, since the substance of all five draft resolutions is, at least in part, duplicated and on the same subject. My delegation therefore believes that, since these new draft resolutions are very interesting and merit careful study, we must have enough time to study them; and since we have just received them a short while ago, we are unable to vote on them because we have no instructions from our home Governments. My delegation therefore wishes to associate itself with the proposal made by the representative of Saudi Arabia that the voting on all the draft resolutions submitted under item 93 should be postponed until tomorrow.

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

167. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I do sincerely hope that we are not engaging in a match of wills. Like the representative of Japan, I have to refute what the representative of Pakistan has said relative to the postponement of voting on my draft resolution [A/L.638] until tomorrow. Have you forgotten, my good friend from Pakistan, and my good friend from Syria, and my good friend from Yugoslavia, that my draft resolution pertains to the same question, namely, the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, which was submitted by Albania and others [A/8392]? Do you think that we are so asinine as to believe that there would be room for voting on my draft resolution or those of the representative of Tunisia if you finished voting on some of the draft resolutions submitted under this heading? This is unfair.

168. If, as the representative of Yugoslavia said, his mind is made up, maybe other minds are not made up. Is it the practice for Yugoslavia to make up the minds of others of the third world or anyone else? I have never heard anything like that. This Organization is predicated on give and take. What will happen if the vote is postponed until tomorrow until my draft resolution is given a chance, not necessarily by every Government which would be consulted, but by some Governments at least? Has this been the practice, to precipitate a vote like this? It has been 20 years, my good friend from Albania, that some delegations have been saying that the rights of the People's Republic of China should be restored—20 years, even before your country was elected as a Member State. I know when it was elected to membership in this Organization. And you cannot wait 24 hours to give a chance to the draft resolution of a Member State, a founder of the United Nations? We signed the Charter; and after 20 years you cannot wait for 24 hours? You want to precipitate a vote by the mechanism of a majority. This is possible. The majority is there, by the buttons. Where is the human element? There is no human element. You want to computerize our work here, to precipitate it within 24 hours? You do not want anybody to do anything, to consider, to deliberate privately?

169. My brother from Syria used the argument that the draft resolution of the United States had been submitted in September and that of Albania in a memorandum submitted last July [A/8392]. Well, if a delegation would like to hear a general debate on certain draft resolutions before it makes up its mind whether or not even to participate in the debate or to submit a draft resolution flowing from the debate, what of it?

170. We had to wait and see, to be convinced perhaps by one or the other before we thought it was time that we should synthesize both draft resolutions and humbly try to find a solution or a basis for a solution. Is this the prerogative of coalitions of States? A single State has no right to come forth with an objective draft resolution that flows from the debate between those two coalitions? I have never heard anything like that. If we want to work by coalitions and by solidarity, States independent of those coalitions have no business to present independent draft

resolutions; from now on, only coalitions have the right to submit draft resolutions. If you do not have co-sponsors with you, then you had better go and find some because you are a lone wolf. This is no good. This is what it amounts to, my friends.

171. Well, it will be an indictment of coalitions if you precipitate a vote this evening. I will submit to the rule of the majority because I have no other choice. But then I will ask for the floor for a procedural debate on priorities. So I appeal to my colleagues who challenge my request for a short postponement until Governments may be consulted or perhaps some deliberations can take place. "No," you say; you want to precipitate. Go ahead.

172. Sir, you are our President, and I submit that if such a vote is taken and if my appeal to those delegations which want to precipitate a vote today is not heeded, then I shall feel justified in opening a procedural debate on the voting.

173. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Philippines on a point of order.

174. Mr. JIMENEZ (Philippines): My delegation supports the proposal of the representative of Saudi Arabia for a postponement of the voting on all draft resolutions submitted under item 93 until tomorrow.

175. The delegations of Saudi Arabia and Tunisia formally submitted only today four new draft resolutions. These four new draft resolutions cannot be considered in isolation from those previously submitted under the same item 93. We have to discuss the item taking into account all—and I repeat "all"—the draft resolutions submitted under that item. These draft resolutions have new elements which may affect the way delegations will vote on the other draft resolutions. Action by the Assembly on the latter will render the four new draft resolutions academic.

176. My delegation has to seek instructions from our Government on these four new draft resolutions and is not, therefore, prepared to vote on these and other proposals today. My delegation is therefore against the proposal made by the representative of Pakistan.

177. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Liberia on a point of order.

178. Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia): I have come to this rostrum to support the request made by the representative of Saudi Arabia to postpone the voting until tomorrow.

179. I cannot understand the resistance of my friends from Pakistan and Yugoslavia. I did not know that one has to vote on a question in parts. If we happen to vote today on part of the draft resolutions that are before us on agenda item 93, what will we consider tomorrow? We know that once voting on a question has commenced nothing is to disturb the voting unless it relates to the voting procedure. That was one of the reasons why in my opening statement [1970th meeting] I said that we try to turn the United Nations upside down for our own ends. Nowhere does that appear in the rules; rule 80 is specific on the question.

180. We have only today received four more draft resolutions—three from Tunisia and one from Saudi Arabia

—and I have not even had the time to study them; I have not looked at them. I must look at them, discuss them with my Foreign Minister and, if necessary, have them teletyped to Monrovia today for instructions. I must do that. If the representatives of Pakistan and Yugoslavia are so big that they can do anything they want, if they do not have to consult anybody, I do—I have to consult somebody, because I do not want to lose my job.

181. These draft resolutions are part and parcel of all the proposals before the Assembly on this question and they must be taken together. This new procedure that some have tried to introduce here is just to befuddle the issue before us. Let us postpone the voting until tomorrow, give small people like me a chance to consult my Government and then tomorrow, with an answer from it, be ready to discuss and to vote on this question.

182. I therefore support the request made by the representative of Saudi Arabia, and I trust that honourable gentlemen, intelligent gentlemen, members of this Assembly will support that request.

183. The PRESIDENT: I have listened to all the opinions which have been put forward and it is my ruling that we shall now vote on the motion by Saudi Arabia to postpone voting on all draft resolutions until tomorrow.

184. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Barbados, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Cyprus, Ecuador, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Laos, Malaysia, Malta, Qatar, Senegal, Singapore, Turkey, Venezuela.

The motion was rejected by 56 votes to 53, with 19 abstentions.

185. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes on the various draft resolutions before the voting. First, however, I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia on a point of order.

186. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, this house is divided against itself and explanations of vote before the voting may subconsciously influence those who are sitting on the side lines to cast their votes in favour of those who may explain their votes vehemently. Therefore I would suggest either that you equate the explanations of vote of those who are for and those who are against, if they want to explain their votes before the voting, or that the priorities of the voting be established before the explanations of vote.

187. I think that before we explain our votes we should determine the priority of the various draft resolutions before us. If anybody has an objection to my suggestion I should like to hear it and be convinced that I am wrong.

188. The PRESIDENT: There are 13 speakers who would like to explain their vote before the vote is taken. I shall now call upon those who wish to explain their votes on all the draft resolutions before proceeding to the vote.

189. Those wishing to explain their vote after the vote will have an opportunity to do so after all the votes have been taken.

190. I would suggest that no explanation of vote should exceed 10 minutes.

191. I call upon the representative of Tunisia on a point of order.

192. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): I do not wish to complicate your task, Mr. President, but I would like to ask you for some clarification. We are going to explain our votes, but what are the votes we are going to explain? What are the draft resolutions on which our explanations are to be given? That is the clarification I am seeking.

193. The PRESIDENT: On all the draft resolutions before the General Assembly.

194. I shall now call upon the representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

195. Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (*translation from Russian*): Having concluded its debate on one of the most important items on its agenda, "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations", the General Assembly now approaches the stage of voting on this matter.

196. It should be stressed that this debate coincided with the negotiations between the emissary from Washington and the leaders of the People's Republic of China in Peking in connexion with the widely publicized forthcoming visit by Mr. Nixon to China. This naturally caused not a little surprise and conjecture, and also aroused in some people a passion for political speculation.

197. The fact remains that the United States representative did crudely interfere in the internal affairs of the

Chinese people and continues to do so. It should, however, be pointed out that the debate was a useful one. It was useful in the sense that it brought out even more clearly certain factors which, in our opinion, have helped and will help delegations not only correctly to establish their position on this matter, but also to gain a better over-all understanding of the essence of the policy of the imperialist Powers and of their methods of forcing through their political views.

198. The United States representative and those who basically speak out against the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations resorted to all kinds of tricks. They mobilized the entire arsenal of classic bourgeois diplomacy, invented political myths, engaged in sophistry, distorted facts and, last but not least, resorted to open blackmail of many States Members of the United Nations and of the Organization itself.

199. It would not be superfluous, and it would even be opportune, to point out here that similar methods are being employed to justify United States aggression in Indo-China and Israeli expansion in the Middle East, and also to cover up the reactionary aims of the colonialist-racist collusion in southern Africa and other acts directed against the peace and progress of humanity.

200. On the other hand, the debate has shown that the just cause, based on objective reality and justice, is steadily making progress and that those who defend this just cause are on unquestionable and firm ground.

201. The position of the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic on the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is clear and based on principle. From the very outset, the Mongolian People's Republic has favoured a speedy and positive solution to this question. Our position remains unchanged, despite the current state of relations between the two countries and regardless of the unfriendly and provocative statements concerning our country made by certain leaders of the People's Republic of China.

202. The basic premise of the Government and people of the Mongolian People's Republic is that the People's Republic of China is by right a founder Member of the United Nations and one of the permanent members of the Security Council. To grant the People's Republic of China its lawful place in the United Nations and all its organs would be to restore offended justice and to recognize the need for specific action and strict adherence to the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter. Following the admission of the Mongolian People's Republic to membership in the United Nations on 27 October 1961 [*resolution 1630 (XVI)*], the Mongolian delegation declared at the sixteenth session of the General Assembly in its first speech on the question under discussion:

"... the delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that the question of restoring the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations must be decided in the spirit of the United Nations Charter, i.e., with due regard to the just demands of the People's Republic of China, including its demand for

expulsion from our Organization of the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique, who represent no one." [*1077th meeting, para. 167.*]

203. Twenty-two years ago the Chinese people concluded a popular democratic revolution, doing away forever with the Kuomintang régime, and creating in its place the People's Republic of China. From the very beginning it was clear to anyone with common sense that only this State, the People's Republic of China, and not the Chiang Kai-shek clique, which had been cast out of history by the revolutionary movement of that great people, was competent to represent the Chinese people. However, for more than 20 years the Chinese people has been denied its lawful place in the United Nations.

204. It is not difficult to find the reason for this scandalous injustice. The reason for the discrimination which has been and still is practised against the People's Republic of China by leading United States circles lies in the policy of the cold war, a policy of enmity towards all that is progressive and new. Nor has the substance of this policy changed today, even if we take into account the latest steps taken by Washington to normalize relations with the People's Republic of China. The United States Government has not taken such steps because it is sympathetic towards the People's Republic of China and the Chinese people. The fact of the matter is that it is attempting to conform to new conditions in order to carry out its own selfish policies—to drive a wedge between the peoples of Asia, between all forces that strive for peace, national independence and social progress.

205. Proof of the continuation of the former policy of the United States against the People's Republic of China is given, for example, by the manoeuvres of Washington in connexion with the question under discussion. On one hand, the United States Government declares itself in favour of the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, while on the other hand it uses all kinds of devices, including dollar blackmail of the United Nations, to maintain the Chiang Kai-shek régime in the United Nations and thus bring about a situation which would be tantamount to recognition of the existence of two Chinas.

206. In this context, with all due respect for the sovereign right of a Government, I cannot but express regret at the positions of those delegations which support the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations but at the same time intend to vote for the resolution on the so-called important question, i.e., for the draft resolution in document A/L.632.

207. In accordance with this position of our Government, our delegation will vote for draft resolution A/L.630, which shows the correct and most direct way to a solution of the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

208. My delegation will vote against the draft resolution in document A/L.633, if it is put to a vote at all. The purpose of this draft resolution is to force the General Assembly to interfere in the internal affairs of the Chinese people and to sanction the dismemberment of China.

209. Our delegation will also vote against the draft resolution in document A/L.632, which seeks to hinder the positive solution of the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. We shall also vote against the granting of priority to this draft resolution, since it is designed to force through the question of substance by a procedural device.

210. In the same spirit, our delegation will reject any amendments and proposals which will bar the way to a positive solution to the question under discussion.

211. Mr. NAKAGAWA (Japan): The Japanese delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/L.632 and A/L.633, both of which we sponsor. We are absolutely opposed to and shall vote against draft resolution A/L.630, the so-called Albanian draft resolution.

212. During the course of our debate on this question of the representation of China in the United Nations, Mr. Aichi, chairman of my delegation, explained in this forum [1968th meeting] the basic reasons why we are opposed to the so-called Albanian draft resolution. Permit me to reiterate and amplify some of the more important points.

213. First of all, the Albanian draft resolution refuses to face and consider the realities of the actual situation prevailing with regard to China. For many years, two Governments have existed in China, one being that of the Republic of China and the other the Government of the People's Republic of China. Each Government has established and maintained diplomatic relations with some 60 other Governments and has evolved a political and economic system of its own with effective control of its population. The so-called Albanian draft resolution is based on a biased premise that only the Government of the People's Republic of China exists and that, therefore, the Government of the Republic of China is not entitled to be represented in our world Organization. It would forthwith expel from the United Nations the Government of the Republic of China, which has scrupulously and conscientiously observed the provisions of the Charter for the last 25 years. My delegation is categorically opposed to such an arbitrary step. Furthermore, if the General Assembly were to decide on taking a step of such momentous importance by a simple majority, it would be tantamount to a violation of Article 18 of the Charter, which specifically stipulates that the expulsion of Members is an important question which requires a two-thirds majority.

214. That is the reason why Japan, together with 21 other Member States, presented to this Assembly draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2, which says that any proposal which would result in depriving the Republic of China of representation in the United Nations is truly an important question and comes under the scope of Article 18 of the Charter. I appeal to the wisdom and fair-mindedness of my fellow representatives not to proceed lightly towards expelling a Member which claims an untarnished record of continuous loyalty and devotion to the United Nations. I believe that no one can deny the correctness of treating as an important question a step of such gravity.

215. I beg your indulgence in allowing me to refer to another aspect of the so-called Albanian draft resolution.

We have frequently heard the argument that this draft resolution embodies the only solution to the problem we are facing because it is the only formula which will allow the participation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. My delegation is second to none in hoping that the Government of the People's Republic of China will participate in the activities of the United Nations. It is not only desirable but necessary that it should be represented in this world body. But, because we want the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, must we expel the Republic of China from it? It is true that the latter controls a much smaller territory and population than the former. But the Republic of China is not a Government in exile. It is in effective control of the island of Formosa with 14 million inhabitants. We hear the argument that because the People's Republic of China declares that it would not consent to come into the United Nations unless the Republic of China is expelled, we must expel the latter. But is it right and just to expel the smaller Government because the larger Government wishes it? The Government in question is not a Government in exile nor a Government newly established out of a civil war. On the contrary, it is an original Government of China, one of the founders of the United Nations, and one which for 25 years has faithfully and loyally fulfilled its obligations under the Charter. Should we expel it without any fault at all on its part, simply because a larger and more powerful Government, in fact a colossus, demands that sacrifice in order to have its own way? My delegation believes that the small has an equal right with, if not a greater right than, the big for protection and just treatment under the Charter. In fact, my delegation believes that this is the fundamental principle on which the United Nations stands. The Preamble of the Charter of the United Nations solemnly declares: "We the peoples of the United Nations determined . . . to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small". For these ends, the Charter calls upon all countries to practise tolerance and to live together in peace with one another as good neighbours.

216. There is also a third argument which states that since there is only one seat for China in the United Nations, when one government is newly admitted the other government must go. My delegation believes that this rigid approach using legal technicalities is not conducive to the equitable settlement of the highly complicated problem before us. The General Assembly is not a juridical organ and we must find a solution which befits the realities of the present situation.

217. Our draft resolution contained in document A/L.633, if adopted, would guarantee in an impartial manner the full fledged participation of the People's Republic of China in this world organization. I honestly believe that by the adoption of our draft resolutions the conflicting claims of the Government of the Republic of China and the Government of the People's Republic of China would neither be prejudiced nor frozen and that the settlement of their respective claims would remain open to future peaceful negotiations between the two parties concerned.

218. We believe that the primordial consideration is to deal with the issue before us in a manner consistent with

the purposes and principles of the Charter and reflecting the actual circumstances of each particular case, in order to arrive at an equitable and fair solution of this very complex issue. Indeed, the primary objective of the Charter is the maintenance of peace and security in the world, and the expulsion of the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China could only result in exacerbating tension in Asia and this would run counter to the ideal embodied in the United Nations Charter. Our two draft resolutions do not embrace the idea of creating two Chinas but only take into account the factual existence of the two governments. It is only a transitional measure, and not intended to close the possibility of a more durable solution through peaceful talks between the two parties concerned. We believe that the United Nations is a living and dynamic Organization and is capable of a realistic approach to major world problems affecting the peace and security of all nations.

219. Before concluding my remarks in explanation of vote, I must dwell upon the procedure for voting with regard to a technical point. I should like to request that priority be granted to draft resolution A/L.632, of which we are a sponsor. I am confident that the Members of the United Nations will agree that a procedural draft resolution has to be voted on prior to any substantive draft resolution. It would be illogical as well as contrary to the practice of our Organization if a substantive draft resolution were put to the vote first simply because it was submitted first. If the Assembly were to vote on the so-called Albanian draft resolution without deciding the procedure of voting, we would inevitably face a situation where we would not know whether the draft resolution in question had been adopted or rejected. The right approach is to determine, before voting on the substantive draft resolution, whether the decision should be made by a simple majority or by a two-thirds majority. We have already pointed out the two well-known precedents established during the sixteenth and twenty-second sessions of the General Assembly, which clearly pronounced that priority should be accorded to a procedural draft resolution over a substantive one. The Assembly on those occasions wisely avoided falling into a procedural impasse by refusing priority voting to the substantive draft resolution. I would urge that the General Assembly first put to the vote draft resolution A/L.632 before proceeding to vote on draft resolution A/L.630.

220. In conclusion, I wish to stress again that the so-called Albanian draft resolution, which would exclude the Government of the Republic of China from all the organs of the United Nations against its will, is contrary to the spirit of universality and harmony and entirely inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. It is negative as well as unrealistic. I would repeat my appeal to the conscience and wisdom of my fellow delegates not to support the so-called Albanian draft resolution.

221. Mr. GALINDO POHL (El Salvador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Rare is the occasion when the United Nations has confronted such a complicated problem as that of China. It was 22 years ago that the consideration of the important question of the representation of China was initiated and at this twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly the problem it is nearing a solution.

222. We have heard many very able statements which reflect the differing and often irreconcilable views of two parties that want to solve the question of China either through the approach of two States, with the variant of two governments, or through representation by only one government.

223. In analysing the debate as a whole, it will be noted that, more than a confusion of tongues, there has been a confusion of arguments, because each side has deduced very logical and consistent conclusions from the principles it adopts, but the other part in turn works with its own principles and comes to opposite conclusions. Very seldom has this interplay of international principles led to such uncertain results. All of the principles are based on some principle or rule recognized by the international community and yet it has not been possible to establish, on unequivocal legal precepts, the foundation of any of the opposing positions. This is owing to the fact that the question of China is not primarily a legal matter but rather a deeply and definitely political problem. The principles and rules that the international community considers as accepted operate when we have a clear political situation to deal with, but in and of themselves they are unable to solve problems that are primarily political in nature because then they compete among themselves; sometimes they interjoin and sometimes they are mutually exclusive. The fact that it is impossible, on the basis of recognized rules and principles of international law to draw a clear and undisputed conclusion does not, however, permit of the flagrant violation of such principles. Decisions that are political in nature, for the justification of which there are no legal rules that can govern them within a framework of the logic of deduction, must be taken on the basis of a certain feeling of equity and considered judgement, and if they succeed they may create new rules. This is the way the dialectic process operates between politics and law and this is how the creative spirit of each age and each community is expressed.

224. Twenty-six years ago the Republic of China signed the United Nations Charter and its Government has represented that country on a continuing and uninterrupted basis, but the People's Republic of China has replaced the Republic of China in the largest and most densely populated portion of Chinese territory and thus it has title to succession and therefore it may be understood to have taken over the rights of the Republic of China. However, the People's Republic of China has not replaced the Republic of China throughout all of Chinese territory or in governing all of the Chinese population because an island of 14 million inhabitants remains outside its administration.

225. There is continuity in respect of the Republic of China, but the area in which the nationalist Government exercises effective control has diminished considerably, although it has not disappeared. For its part, the People's Republic of China has succeeded the Republic of China in the government of the largest portion of the Chinese nation, but until now it has not exercised effective control over the whole of Chinese territory. Therefore in the circumstances, as a consequence of succession, the rule that one single Government represents one single State does not apply. All of this that I have said is based on the hypothesis and basic premise of the territorial unity of China.

226. There are obvious facts, therefore, which prevent the pure and simple application of continuity and succession to solve this problem. The dispute between the two parties that fought for supremacy in China remained inconclusive although it favoured the People's Republic of China which governs 700 million inhabitants while the opponent has been reduced to 14 million. If this dispute had come to a clear conclusion, as usually happens in civil struggles, the succession of governments would have been carried out in full legality and the People's Republic of China would have to be recognized as the sole and entire representative of the Chinese peoples. There is however a small fraction of the Chinese population and of Chinese territory that is under a different administration.

227. The claim of the Republic of China to the effect that it represents all the Chinese people is a fiction and it cannot even be considered as a legal fiction because legal fictions have some basis in fact. But it is also a reality that the Republic of China exercises effective control on the island of Taiwan.

228. Moreover, the claim of the People's Republic of China as the unified and integral successor on Chinese territory is also slightly out of kilter with reality owing to the separate existence of Taiwan.

229. The United Nations should act on the principle of universality in order to bring into its midst a Government that represents 700 million inhabitants. Universality, however, cannot be measured by millions of inhabitants or by square kilometres and the exclusion and deliberate and considered rejection of any people, no matter how small, is a blot on that universality. The logic of principles imposes certain obligations and, if we are to opt for universality, we cannot achieve it through expulsions. Universality must be served without prejudice and without trying to sway the balance in favour of either of the parties because this would be intervention in the domestic affairs of other States. When a process of civil dispute crystallizes you are intervening on one side or the other if you try to dislodge one or the other from the international positions that it has taken. The reality is that for the time being two Governments share between themselves—in unequal portions, it is true, but they share—the administration of the Chinese territory and nation. This is the present fact and it is not by any means a prejudgement of the future.

Mr. Aguilar (Venezuela), Vice-President, took the Chair.

230. Twofold representation is not the ideal—in fact from it. It is not much more than a hasty expedient, but it is the alternative which respects the *status quo*. We are not inventing this reality, nor are we trying to support it, but we are taking it into account in order to solve a problem confronting the United Nations.

231. The knotty issue that has arisen concerning the representation of China is as involved and difficult as was the famous Gordian knot of Greek legend, and a knot of these dimensions cannot be unravelled but it simply has to be cut. To this end we should look at the case primarily from the political standpoint and with the understanding that the available principles do not lead unequivocally to a conclusion because here and there they encounter facts of reality which are beyond them.

232. El Salvador has no illusions that the vote which is cast here in the United Nations will solve the Chinese problem. Indeed, if the proposal of Albania and the other States [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2] triumphs the case will have been disposed of as far as the United Nations is concerned but it will continue in Asia. If the proposal made by Australia and other States [A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2] carries the day there is every reason to believe that the People's Republic of China will not accept the resolution and that therefore the problem will remain pending, at least for a year.

233. What we should actually try to settle here is not the problem of China, but rather the problem of the United Nations vis-à-vis China. The problem of China will in the last analysis have to be solved by the Chinese people themselves—and let us hope this will be done through negotiation and within the guidelines prescribed by the United Nations Charter. The people of Taiwan will have to emerge from the impasse they find themselves in and say what they want to do with their island.

234. El Salvador will cast its vote in the light of the circumstances obtaining this year and the proposals and amendments submitted for decision, but we should like to reserve our position on the facts that may develop as this case evolves. Of course, my Government will accept the decision of this Assembly because we respect majority rule, which we have accepted as a Member of this Organization. Our vote will be cast on the proposals that best fit within the principles of non-intervention and universality and these are the principles that will guide our voting on the proposals and amendments. This vote is not an effort to participate in Chinese affairs because Chinese affairs are the concern of the Chinese people alone, but rather it is based on our capacity as a Member of the United Nations and we hope it will be a means of contributing to the solution of the problem of the United Nations vis-à-vis China and not to the solution of the problem of China, which is a matter which concerns only the Chinese people themselves.

235. Mr. ZAKARIA (Malaysia): In his address to the General Assembly on 1 October [1948th meeting], my Prime Minister clearly stated my Government's support for the seating of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. My delegation, therefore, did not deem it necessary to participate in the general debate on this item. I would like, however, to take this opportunity to explain the vote of my delegation on the various draft resolutions before the General Assembly in the light of my Government's policy on this question.

236. In the view of my delegation, the question facing the General Assembly is neither one of the admission of a new Member State nor of the expulsion of an existing Member. China is a founder Member and is still a Member of our Organization. There is no proposal for the admission of China or for the expulsion of China. The question is one of representation, that is to say, who should occupy China's seat in the United Nations. The question of the expulsion of a Member State simply does not arise. For this reason, my delegation does not agree that draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 is applicable to this issue. My delegation will therefore have to vote against it.

237. The second basic factor is that there is only one China and there is only one seat for China in the United Nations. In this connexion, my delegation has no doubt whatsoever that the Government of the People's Republic of China is *de jure* and *de facto* the Government of China and that it alone has the legitimate right to represent China and to occupy China's seat in our Organization. For this reason, my delegation will vote against the draft resolution which provides for dual representation for China in the United Nations [A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2].

238. It follows from the foregoing remarks that my delegation is in accord with the view set out in the draft resolution sponsored by Albania and 22 other delegations [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2], by which the General Assembly would restore all the rights of the People's Republic of China and recognize the representatives of its Government as the only legitimate representatives of China to the United Nations. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of that draft resolution. I should make it clear, however, that we view the question of Taiwan as a separate issue which will have to be resolved by the parties concerned. We are anxious that this question should be resolved by peaceful means and we hope that in the solution due account would be taken of the wishes of the people of Taiwan, to be ascertained by the process of self-determination.

239. Mr. JAYAKUMAR (Singapore): The delegation of Singapore wishes to explain its position on the draft resolutions before us. The overriding consideration of the Singapore Government in foreign policy has been to advance Singapore's national interests and to avoid actions likely to damage its interests or get it into difficulties. In implementing such a policy, we have tried as far as possible to accommodate the interests and aspirations of other nations. We have never deliberately gone out of our way to damage the interests of other nations.

240. These two considerations have always governed our stand in regard to the China question both inside and outside the United Nations. The Singapore Government has always maintained that the seat now occupied by the Government in Taiwan rightfully belongs to the Government of the People's Republic of China. We are also of the view that there is only one China and that Taiwan is a part of China. This is also the view of the People's Republic of China and of the Government in Taiwan. It is not, therefore, for foreign Governments to decide whether there are one or two Chinas. It follows, therefore, that the Taiwan question is an internal matter to be settled by the Chinese peoples, including those of Taiwan. It is up to the Chinese people to decide the status of Taiwan in the United Nations.

241. This being an internal matter, the Singapore Government is of the view that United Nations Members should not be put in a position where they are forced to make a judgement on what is an internal conflict. The Albanian draft resolution also calls for the expulsion of the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China. The United States Government advocates the presence of the Government of the Republic of China in the United Nations. The question whether the Government in Taiwan should remain a Member of the United Nations with a seat

in the General Assembly is a matter for the Chinese peoples to decide.

242. In the light of these considerations, the delegation of Singapore will vote in favour of the draft resolution sponsored by Albania and others [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2] as a whole.

243. Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria): Last year the Austrian delegation cast its vote in the General Assembly for the proposition that the People's Republic of China should occupy the seat of China in the United Nations. Since then, the Republic of Austria and the People's Republic of China established diplomatic relations on 28 May 1971. In the joint communiqué issued on that occasion, the Austrian Government has recognized the Government of the People's Republic of China as the sole legal Government of China. Consequently, we cannot associate ourselves with any proposition tending to support the claim of any other government to the right of representing China. As is now generally recognized, without the full participation of the People's Republic of China in the activities of the United Nations, we cannot expect to make significant headway with regard to the many problems with which this Organization is confronted and which relate to its basic goal, namely the maintenance of international peace and security.

244. It is in the light of these considerations that the Austrian delegation will cast an affirmative vote on draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2. As regards Taiwan, I refer to the statement of my delegation on 20 November 1970 [1913th meeting]. A Government exists there which is in fact in control of that island, but does not represent China. The Austrian Government hope that the solution to this problem can be found as a result of peaceful evolution.

245. As regards the draft resolution contained in document A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 and the procedural votes, Austria will abstain in the vote on both counts. We cannot see our way to supporting proposals or propositions which are likely to delay the entry of the delegation of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations.

246. Mr. PEREZ DE CUELLAR (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Peru is in favour of the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and consequently believes that it should fill the seat which is rightfully China's in the General Assembly and in the Security Council as a permanent member.

247. It is urgent that the People's Republic of China should take the seat that is rightfully China's in the Organization. This is the criterion which guided our vote at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly against the so-called important question resolution and which will lead us this year to vote against draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2.

248. The majority obtained at the previous session [1913th meeting] by the draft resolution submitted by Albania, Algeria and other delegations indicates that the draft resolution dealing with the so-called important question issue boils down to a procedural circumlocution which thwarts a decision by the international community, a decision which cannot be delayed.

249. In turn, draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, known as the dual representation proposal, offers us a solution which contains serious defects and inconsistencies of a legal nature, the principal one being that it finds no support whatsoever in the United Nations Charter, and that in addition it is politically sterile, as is shown in absolutely unequivocal terms by the statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, which appears in document A/8470.

250. It is in the light of these considerations and with a desire by a great many countries, including Peru, to have a dialogue started with the People's Republic of China, and formally established at a multilateral level, that Peru has decided to vote in favour of the draft resolution presented by Albania and 22 other countries [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2] because we believe that it will resolve the pending problem in a full, clear and acceptable manner.

251. We shall vote in favour of that draft resolution although we entertain certain technical reservations about it. We believe that the concept of expulsion is not used with the necessary precision in the second part of the operative paragraph. Machinery for expulsion is spelled out in Article 18 of the Charter, which we believe does not apply to this question of representation, particularly when recognition of the representatives of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations would inevitably lead to non-recognition of the representation which now occupies China's seat.

252. To sum up, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 and will vote against any initiative which we consider will make more difficult a speedy solution of the problem of the representation of China in the United Nations, particularly draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2. We hope that the adoption of the former draft resolution will make it unnecessary to put to the vote draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2.

253. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): No debate on the question of the representation of China has been as impassioned, as emotional and as fraught with uncertainty as the debate that has just concluded. Nevertheless, we have heard the same arguments based on the same premises as those that were presented in the preceding years. The hope was even expressed at one point that we would discover new realities which would allow the Assembly to adopt an unequivocal decision on the exclusion of the People's Republic of China and on the expulsion of a Member State.

254. For 22 years we have tried to reconcile certain immediate wishes with the unshakable principles of the Charter, passing from one solution to another, and were finally forced to recognize that what we could offer to the international community at large was only a provisional arrangement. Such a conclusion might have been acceptable if the various political formulas that were proposed at least had the advantage of providing us, without any possible ambiguity, with the outline of the path that our Organization should follow independently of any consideration of any particular interests, which were, after all, ephemeral.

255. It has been claimed, and there are still claims today, that our Organization has unjustly excluded the People's

Republic of China and has thus denied to it the rights which some people call lawful, as if there could be such things as unlawful rights. Our Organization is an exclusive one—there is no doubt about that. That it has established its standards and enunciated its principles and Article 4 of the Charter, which some delegations have been too bashful to quote in the recent debate, is sufficiently explicit. However, this exclusiveness affects more than one State; it extends in fact to all States which aspire to be loyal Members of our Organization, thus providing the principle of universality with its only justification.

256. My delegation asks itself what was the possible reason why the régime of mainland China could not have stated 22 years ago that it accepted all the obligations of the Charter? Why has it not, ever since the beginning, announced its full and complete support of the objectives and principles of the Charter? Was it too much to ask it to abandon, definitely and without any mental reservations, any subversive interference in the internal affairs of States? Were we to, and must we still, understand that for it respect for the Charter comes after the uncertain triumph of an ideology arrayed with all the virtues, but which has no attraction at all for us?

257. I would not like to raise all these questions in a purely polemic spirit, but it should be recalled that in an access of generous unanimity we did reaffirm hardly a year ago in a declaration [*resolution 2625 (XXV)*] the principles underlying friendly and normal relations between States, and it pains us to realize that this reaffirmation may be compromised, for the Assembly might decide that certain realities compel us to forget the imperative force of those principles.

258. Those realities, whatever their value—and if, moreover, they are to be universally acknowledged—can only be a reflection of the concerns and the interests of each one of our countries. We do not claim to be the only possessors of the truth, but at least we know that we shall never accept an arrangement whereby our efforts to build a society based on order, peace and justice are frustrated by the insidious export of an ideology so new that it denies human and spiritual values.

259. If the régime on mainland China were to renounce its ideological expansionist views, with all their inherent dangers, then perhaps we could consider expressing ourselves with less concern about its rights and with more assurance as to its obligations, not as that régime sees them, but as the Charter prescribes.

260. If it is proven, and then accepted, that practically and theoretically the Organization could not have excluded the People's Republic of China but that the latter, by its preliminary conditions and recent actions, has rendered difficult, if not impossible, the judgement of our Organization as to its capacity and will faithfully to abide by the obligations of the Charter, there remains the crucial problem of the expulsion of the Republic of China.

261. We have been told that the voluntary exclusion of a State cannot be ended or its termination announced except through the immediate expulsion of a Member State. We have vainly sought support for such a view in the Charter,

the rules of procedure and even among the precedents. It is not surprising, therefore, that we have refused categorically to accept such arguments.

262. The argument has been advanced, in an attempt to convince us, that the People's Republic of China, according to a certain interpretation of international law, was the successor of the Republic of China, a signatory of the Charter. This was a tempting argument, but a specious one, because to our knowledge the Republic of China exists today, and to claim the contrary would be a violation of historical truth and would certainly be to disregard the feelings of 59 sovereign States which have decided to demonstrate their confidence in it by granting it full recognition. We are not among those who believe that the criterion of the actual existence of a State should be its power, the size of the population under its control, the number of its divisions or its alliances, because if this were so, we would yield to the facile, but unworthy, temptation to recognize as States only those to which we must defer because of their status or power.

263. Perhaps in an access of passion and eloquence, it has been claimed that the representatives of the Republic of China represent nothing; at the same time, reference is made to the 700 million on the continent, the 14 million living on Formosa, and the 18 million overseas Chinese. It is for those millions alone to determine by whom they wish to be represented. It is not for us to make precarious guesses which, in any case, only reflect our own feelings and not theirs.

264. For us, the representatives of the Malagasy Republic, the Republic of China represents the Chinese will to promote peace, practise tolerance, respect human values, fundamental freedoms and national options, co-operate and live in harmony with other nations of the world. Indeed, if we want adherence to our Organization to be universal and unreserved, we must believe the evidence of the last 25 years that the traditional qualities of the Chinese people have been properly embodied in the representatives of the Republic of China and have been harnessed in the service of our whole community in the pursuit of the Charter's purposes and the preservation of its principles.

265. Assuming that, in spite of all these considerations, the Assembly still wants to expel the Republic of China, we would think that it should act strictly in accordance with the Charter.

266. We have been asked to express our views on expulsion. Article 6 of the Charter has been carefully combined with certain provisions of the rules of procedure and, after a series of fantastic and staggering pirouettes, Articles 18 and 23 have been ignored.

267. We have already said, and we repeat it, that nothing, nothing at all in the conduct of the Republic of China justifies the adoption of so extreme and irreversible a measure as expulsion; otherwise we could rightly conclude that the application of certain Articles of the Charter depends solely upon the will of certain States or groups of States.

268. We are not ready to accept this sort of arbitrariness which, by degrees and extension, will eventually lead us to

a denial of everything we have subscribed to, without giving any thought to the fact that we might subsequently, depending on circumstances, mould it, distort it, change its very character by whim and in what we believe to be our interests.

269. For the reasons that I have stated simply, honestly, and sincerely, my delegation will oppose any initiative which will result in the Republic of China losing the representation to which it is entitled in this Assembly and in various institutions related to it, and will act accordingly on other motions and resolutions.

270. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Rwanda) (*interpretation from French*): The debate on the question of the representation of China, which has lasted for more than 20 years, seems today to be coming to its conclusion because in a few minutes we are going to proceed to a vote which my delegation hopes will be decisive.

271. While throughout this period there was fierce opposition to the presence of the People's Republic of China within this Organization, today, almost unanimous agreement is apparently emerging that the People's Republic of China should regain its place in the community of nations.

272. All the draft resolutions before us today seem to agree on this point. I would only like to analyse two of them. The draft resolutions contained in documents A/L.630 and A/L.633, on which we will be asked to give our decision, seem to be almost identical on the essential point, namely, the presence of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

273. The draft resolution in document A/L.630 calls upon the General Assembly to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China—all of its rights as a great Power. Now, is this not precisely what we are asked to agree to in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/L.633 which recognizes that the People's Republic of China should be seated as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council?

274. True, draft resolution A/L.630 says that the Assembly must "expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the place which they unlawfully occupy at the United Nations and in all the organizations affiliated to it". Might the drafters of this text not have been guilty of an aberration of language here? It would seem to me that that is what it is. It seems to me that all of those who sit here represent not individuals but States Members of the Organization—unless anyone can show us that Chiang Kai-shek, who is mentioned in the draft resolution, was ever a Member State of our Organization.

275. If this cannot be proven, such a request addressed to the General Assembly has no legal standing and is therefore completely irrelevant to our debate, particularly so since the Committee on Credentials, which is democratically elected at the beginning of each session of the General Assembly, has never reported to us the existence of such an anomaly.

276. If the issue of expulsion of the representatives of the Republic of China, a country with which my Government maintains normal diplomatic relations and fruitful co-opera-

tion, had never been raised, my delegation would today be entitled to oppose firmly any draft resolution that would contain such a request.

277. However, that is not the case. Draft resolution A/L.630 does not call into question at all the status of the representatives of the State which we know under the name of "Republic of China" and which is seated in the United Nations. Therefore, my delegation does not find that a sufficient reason to justify its opposition to that text.

278. Draft resolution A/L.633 also recognizes, as I said earlier, the lawful right of the People's Republic of China to sit among us. Better still, it is mindful of the interests of the Republic of China and therefore is in line with the policy of my Government.

279. Consequently, the vote that Rwanda intends to cast on the two draft resolutions will be determined by the considerations I have just set forth.

280. There are doubtless some who are convinced that the poorer countries offer a privileged ground for all sorts of manoeuvres, intrigues, threats, intimidations and pressures.

281. To all such, Rwanda would reply that, for its part, it is sovereign and acts after mature reflection, particularly when the issue involved is so important for the maintenance of international peace and security. Its vote will make it quite clear that it proudly defends its dignity and independence vis-à-vis all factions.

282. Mr. DE SOUZA (Dahomey) (*interpretation from French*): The time has come for us to express our views on one of the most important questions that the United Nations has had to decide ever since its creation. There is no doubt that the result of this important vote will to a very large extent influence the future of our Organization. We shall therefore, if we wish to achieve anything lasting, if we wish to save the very foundations of this Organization and thus assure its survival, have to be ruled, not by passion or political partisanship, but by the reality that no one can any longer ignore.

283. As in past years, the delegation of Dahomey will not lose sight of the realities when it casts its vote on the various draft resolutions now before us. It will therefore not be able to associate itself with draft resolution A/L.630. In this connexion, it wishes to stress the point that it is in no way opposed to the admission to our Organization of the People's Republic of China, for, as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Dahomey stated from this same rostrum on 5 October last,

"... is it not true that it is neither decent nor realistic to confine in isolation and to go on ignoring any longer the existence of about 800 million human beings?" [1953rd meeting, para. 227.]

284. Having said this, however, we do not wish, as a result, to remove from this Organization a Member State that has made an exemplary contribution to the attainment of the objectives of the United Nations since its creation. It is thus quite clear that, in the opinion of my delegation, any proposal to deprive the Republic of China of its status as a

Member of our Organization should be considered as an important question; for that reason my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2.

285. We shall likewise cast our vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, which, in our view, combines political realism with a sense of equity.

286. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation did not think it would intervene in the debates our Assembly has devoted to what we have agreed to call the problem of the representation of China in the United Nations.

287. The way the discussions have proceeded, and the unforeseen—not to say spectacular—events that have taken place in recent months at the international political level, have caused us to observe a certain degree of circumspection, and my delegation has therefore preferred to await the end of the debate before stating the official position of our Government.

288. The Government of Senegal recognized the People's Republic of China more than 10 years ago, immediately after our accession to independence. In the same way, ever since that time we have maintained diplomatic relations with the Republic of China, which Government was one of the first to establish a diplomatic mission in Dakar.

289. My Government considers that the People's Republic of China is the sole representative of the Chinese people; but it is not, however, convinced that its authority should automatically be exercised over the entire territory of the island of Formosa. The people of Senegal, which for almost three centuries knew the constraints of colonization, would certainly find it paradoxical if its Government were to consider itself justified in giving its unreserved endorsement to the proposition that Formosa should be considered an integral part of the territory of China without the indigenous population of that island being given an opportunity to exercise its right to self-determination.

290. Moreover, neither does my Government believe that the problem of Chinese representation in our Organization involves the question of the expulsion of a United Nations Member; for if that were the case, there would be no need for any resolution involving the matter of a two-thirds majority, and paragraph 2 of Article 18 of our Charter and the rules of procedure of the Assembly would have made it incumbent upon us to apply this procedure.

291. The United Nations at present has 131 Members. The credentials of one of those Members, in this case China, are claimed by two delegations. If our Assembly upholds the claim of one of them, its membership will not be altered thereby, while the adoption of the thesis in draft resolution A/L.633, in the United States draft, would implicitly lead to the addition of a new Member, the admission of which would not have had the prior recommendation of the Security Council in accordance with the provisions of our Charter.

292. My delegation, which sincerely wishes to see the people of the island of Formosa represented in the United Nations, considers none the less that that representation

should certainly not be effected by flouting our legislation in a manner which would constitute a dangerous precedent for our Organization.

293. It is, therefore, in consideration of all those factors that my delegation has decided to abstain in the voting on all the procedural motions, including the one that was presented this afternoon. It has decided further to vote against draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, the so-called United States proposal, and will give its support to draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2, the so-called Albanian text, to the exclusion of any other proposal, although it does not support that text without reservation; and in particular, I refer to certain terminology in the last paragraph, on which we shall ask for a separate vote. My delegation is convinced that this decision will not entirely satisfy any of the parties concerned, but it will at least have the merit of reflecting action faithful to the ethics underlying the policies of our Government.

294. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on the draft resolutions which are before the Assembly for its consideration under agenda items 93 and 96.

295. It is well known that my Government has already initiated negotiations with the People's Republic of China to normalize diplomatic and trade relations with that country. As long as these negotiations are under way we shall have to reflect very carefully on the attitude we should take in casting our vote because of the particular situation in which we find ourselves.

296. In deciding how Argentina would vote, we have also given very particular consideration to the fact that in any problem linked to the representation of a Member State it is vital to preserve the principle of territorial integrity, which has been so stubbornly upheld by Argentina in this and other forums, and which has been proclaimed in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations, paragraph 6 of resolution 1514 (XV) and resolution 2625 (XXV) of the General Assembly, among other principles of similar international standing.

297. With respect to draft resolution A/L.630, we regret that it contains no mention of this principle to which we referred earlier. Neither can we subscribe to the last phrase of the operative part because what is at stake here is not the expulsion of anyone, but rather the problem of the representation of a Member State. There has been no violation of the principles contained in the Charter, nor has the Security Council been seized of the question in accordance with the provisions of Article 6 of the Charter. This is so because, as I have already pointed out, we are not discussing the expulsion of a Member State, but rather who represents that State.

298. Despite these objections, the draft resolution undeniably has the virtue of relying on the principle of territorial integrity and, in addition, recognizes the deep need, which we all share, for the People's Republic of China to participate fully in debates in this Organization and for it to occupy its seat as a permanent member of the Security Council.

299. After careful consideration of the defects and merits of this document we have decided to abstain from voting on it.

300. With respect to draft resolution A/L.632, it should be pointed out that, by virtue of the principle of territorial integrity, Argentina can accept the existence of only one single Chinese State and, therefore, will have to vote in favour of this draft resolution because, at present, it has diplomatic relations with the Republic of China.

301. We have also taken into consideration that the problem of the representation of China has been defined traditionally in the United Nations as an important question, a criterion which my country has always upheld.

302. However, in stating this position, we should also like to point out that we shall vote in favour of any initiative which would consider as an important question draft resolution A/L.633, the so-called dual-representation draft resolution, because we believe that the entire problem, and not just one of its facets, should be described in these terms.

303. Lastly, in our analysis of that draft resolution we have taken particular account of the question whether it is in accordance with the principle of territorial integrity. In keeping with this principle, my Government holds that any question which may be raised in respect of representation is, in the first instance, a domestic affair of China, on which both parties have spoken categorically for unified representation. For those reasons we shall abstain from voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2.

Mr. Malik (Indonesia) resumed the Chair.

304. Mr. PRATT (Sierra Leone): There is a local saying in Sierra Leone which, when translated, is to this effect: "When I support you on my shoulders, don't tell me that my head stinks."

305. In the draft resolutions contained in documents A/L.632 and A/L.633 it is very clear that we are being asked to support Taiwan on our shoulders. But, of course, my delegation's attitude in voting on this question—and particularly on those two draft resolutions—must be guided by whether, in trying to support China, we are told that our head stinks. If we had not already made up our minds, it has been made very clear by Mr. Liu, the representative of China, that China is one and indivisible; and we have taken that to heart. He has stressed again and again that China is one and indivisible. He has stressed that Taiwan is Chinese territory and that those people who are called Taiwanese are ethnically, culturally and historically Chinese who came from the coastal areas of South China and who never regarded themselves as anything but Chinese.

306. Bearing in mind those statements, my delegation feels that the General Assembly cannot in all sincerity adopt a resolution which is contrary to a standpoint which it has already taken. The United Nations General Assembly, on what we now know as Human Rights Day, 8 December 1949, adopted the following resolution. After stating in the preamble that

“... the peoples of the United Nations have expressed in the Charter... their determination to practise tolerance, and to live together...”,

General Assembly resolution 291 (IV), which is still in force, continues:

“Calls upon all States:

“1. To respect the political independence of China and to be guided by the principles of the United Nations in their relations with China;

“2. To respect the right of the people of China, now and in the future, to choose freely their political institutions and to maintain a government independent of foreign control;

“3. To respect existing treaties relating to China;

“4. To refrain from (a) seeking to acquire spheres of influence or to create foreign-controlled régimes within the territory of China; (b) seeking to obtain special rights or privileges within the territory of China.”

307. It is impossible for my delegation to support the draft resolutions contained in documents A/L.632 and A/L.633, because they contravene this earlier General Assembly resolution. They would try to get us not to respect the political independence of China; they would try to get us to interfere in the right of the people of China, now and in the future, to choose freely their political institutions; and, by devious means, they would try to get the United Nations, as an institution, organization or power bloc, to seek to exercise spheres of influence by creating a so-called province of Formosa or Taiwan. For those reasons my delegation is unable to support, or even to recommend, those two draft resolutions.

308. With further reference to the draft resolution contained in document A/L.632, it needs no priority because, whether it is voted on at the beginning or at the end, it merely seeks to decide a matter which is not before the Assembly, namely, the expulsion of a Member State.

309. For those reasons my delegation will vote against both those draft resolution.

310. Mr. AGUILAR (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation has asked to speak in order briefly to explain the vote that it intends to cast on draft resolution A/L.632.

311. Venezuela will vote in favour of that draft because it considers that everything which concerns the representation of China in the United Nations is an important question and should, therefore, be decided by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting.

312. This has been Venezuela's position on the seven occasions on which the General Assembly has had to take a decision on this question and we have not found any valid reason for changing our attitude on this occasion.

313. No one denies the importance of this question. All the speakers who touched on this item during the general

debate at the current session and all the speakers who have spoken on agenda item 93 have emphasized, expressly or implicitly, the importance—the extraordinary importance—of this complicated problem. All the media of communication have devoted and are devoting to the news and speculations on this item the attention that is reserved for great events. All of us in this room know that our respective positions on different complicated aspects of this problem have been taken at the highest political level by our Governments, after very carefully weighing all their implications.

314. The truth is that no one doubts this question is an important one; and what is more, that it is perhaps the most important of all the questions that the Assembly will have to consider at this session.

315. The main argument that is advanced against describing this as an important question is that it is a manoeuvre, a stratagem, a procedural device, to mention only some of the terms most frequently used, and, to sum up, that this is a procedure designed to frustrate the will of the majority of the Member States and block, once again, a decision on the substance of the matter which that majority favours.

316. With respect to that argument we wish to comment, first of all, that the proposals which for 20 years have been submitted to various organs of the United Nations and which are designed to give the seat of China to the representatives of the People's Republic of China and to expel the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China, until the previous session did not have the support of a simple majority of the Members present and voting; and, on that particular occasion, the difference between the votes in favour and those against the proposal was barely two votes. Secondly, we believe that it is not proper that a matter of this or similar importance should be resolved by a simple majority in an Organization which, like our own, is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members and one of whose purposes is to serve as a centre for harmonizing the efforts of nations to achieve the lofty purposes which are spelled out in the Preamble and Article 1 of the Charter.

317. Is it appropriate that a matter so complicated from the political and legal standpoints should be settled by a simple majority, contrary to the views and the judgement of the remaining Member States? As far as my Government is concerned there is no doubt about the reply to that question. A matter of this importance should ideally be settled through an arrangement or political negotiation which would result in a solution acceptable to all or at least to the vast majority of the Member States. But if that is not possible, the solution which is adopted should have at least the so-called two-thirds majority.

318. We should like to state that, in the light of those considerations, we shall judge the merits of any other motion designed to describe as an important question other proposals on the substantive aspects of the question bearing in mind, of course, that those proposals must be considered as a whole, as a single unit, and not in isolation if we wish to respect their spirit and purpose.

319. To conclude, we should like to add that, as a logical consequence of the position which I have expounded, my delegation will vote in favour of the motion to give priority to draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2.

320. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): The 23 sponsors of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 will not be in a position to accept any amendments to it and will oppose any proposals to put any of its parts separately to the vote. The reason for that is that the draft resolution is an indivisible one and calls for the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and, in so doing, spells out explicitly the inescapable consequences of the restoration in order that confusion and controversy may be avoided.

321. As for draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, which proposes dual representation for China, the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 will vote against it, because its constitutionality under the Charter is open to question. The draft resolution in document A/L.633 seeks to legalize and give institutional permanence to a situation of two conflicting authorities in a single Member State. It runs counter to the Charter principle of territorial integrity, by seeking to make an imposed *de facto* separation a *de jure* separation. In so doing it seeks to ascribe to the United Nations an authority which is not vested in it by the Charter: the authority of creating a State.

322. Turning now to the draft resolution of Saudi Arabia [A/L.638], the sponsors of the 23-Power draft resolution are constrained to observe, with great respect to our brother and dear colleague Mr. Baroudy, that it is based in effect on the "one China, one Taiwan" concept. The Saudi Arabian draft resolution will not lead to the presence of the People's Republic of China in our midst, as the Government of that State has already stated categorically that it will have absolutely nothing to do with the United Nations if any formula of "two Chinas", "one China, one Taiwan" or "the status of Taiwan remaining to be determined" is adopted. Our supreme purpose is to bring the People's Republic of China into the United Nations. It is, to use the words of the representative of France, not to "refuse to extend to the whole international community a dialogue which was successfully begun on a bilateral level" [1970th meeting, para. 43]. The only means to that end is the draft resolution contained in document A/L.630. There is no other way. Neither draft resolution A/L.633 nor draft resolution A/L.638 is an alternative route.

323. We do not, now, have to subject draft resolution A/L.638 to an analysis, because in this debate we have already dealt exhaustively with all the issues that arise from the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. The sponsors of draft resolution A/L.630 and other like-minded delegations are therefore ready to vote on draft resolution A/L.638 without further delay. They do not require time to study that draft resolution, as their instructions are sufficiently comprehensive to cover the present contingency. The sponsors of draft resolution A/L.630 are opposed to draft resolution A/L.638 and will vote against it. That position we consider to be predicated on equity, fairness and justice, because the People's Republic of China,

representing nearly 800 million people, has been excluded from the United Nations for more than 20 years and it is time that this exclusion was ended.

324. Only a few moments ago three draft resolutions were submitted in the name of the delegation of Tunisia. Those contained in documents A/L.639 and A/L.640 must be read together, because while the former invites the People's Republic of China to arrange to be represented in the United Nations, the latter invites the Chiang Kai-shek delegation to sit under the name of Formosa in the General Assembly and in different organs of the United Nations, with the exception of the Security Council. In other words, it is the same "one China, one Taiwan" formula which can only ensure that the People's Republic of China remains outside the United Nations. We shall therefore vote against both those draft resolutions submitted by Tunisia.

325. The third draft resolution in the name of Tunisia [A/L.641] is based on the assumption that none of the substantive draft resolutions before the Assembly is likely to be adopted. We shall vote against that draft resolution as well, because the People's Republic of China has for more than 20 years made known its position of principle in regard to the restoration of its lawful rights and has nothing to add to or subtract from it. Inquiries by the Secretary-General or through an *ad hoc* mission would not be a fruitful exercise.

326. It has been rightly said that the decision on this item could be momentous and historic. We entirely agree. We are certain, however, that the decision will have those qualities only if it brings the representatives of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations. Any other decision would have no other effect than that of perpetuating the status quo, a state of affairs that is recognized by all to be barren and to have impoverished the United Nations.

327. Mr. KUFUOR (Ghana): Ghana has for a very long time recognized the People's Republic of China and its right to seats in both the Security Council and the General Assembly. It has also been saying for a long time that the best way to ensure that this Organization continues to represent the best hopes of mankind is to be guided, as far as its membership is concerned, by the concept of universality. That concept above all compels my delegation to recognize that the Republic of China also has a right to a seat in the General Assembly. My delegation realizes that the Organization's conduct cannot be hidebound. Harmony and compromise must at least be put on the same level as the rules of procedure, as far as the objectives and conduct of the Assembly are concerned.

328. The two parties to the issue before us both say they are one nation. My delegation says that they should find some peaceful way of coming to some agreement between themselves. As far as our role in this Organization allows us to have a say in the question, we feel guided by the fact—which nobody in this Assembly can deny—that there are two entities involved in the issue, both of which have been treated, or are being treated, as States by this Organization.

329. We realize of course that there have been grave mistakes committed on this question but we are not here to

apportion blame, as even this Assembly would not be quite free from such blame. For after all, it is this same Organization, this Assembly, which for the past 22 years or so has kept the People's Republic of China out of its councils and allowed only the Republic of China a seat, as if it was the only entity there was in China.

330. In the circumstances we cannot therefore do full penance if in our efforts to correct the situation we shift from the one extreme to the other. In fact it may be argued that the Assembly is estopped from taking any measure that will mean the expulsion of Taiwan from its organs. That is not to say that one does not care about the need to receive the People's Republic into the Organization immediately. On the contrary, my delegation feels that the Assembly has not done enough to find ways and means to invite the People's Republic of China in without sacking Taiwan. And on this point it should not be beyond the imagination of the Assembly to consider, for instance, appointing a delegation made up in part of all the big Powers we can muster to go to Peking to talk their brother big Power into coming in, even though belatedly, to play its role.

331. But we say this, careful not to prejudice the eventual settlement of the issue between the two countries or entities concerned in the problem.

332. Therefore, Ghana will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 and in favour of its being treated as a matter of priority. It will also vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 but reserves its position on that part that seeks to expel Taiwan, or the Republic of China. Finally it will vote for draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2.

333. Mr. MANDI (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*interpretation from French*): Now, after 20 years of debate and of shady manoeuvres, a problem which has been described as important by some and as minor by others will perhaps find its solution. Without prejudging the outcome of the vote which will soon take place, I should like to emphasize once again and forcefully that in the opinion of my Government the problem raised by the representation of China is an important problem because the impact which our decision will have on international affairs is incalculable.

334. Indeed, order, international peace and security, and our own future will unquestionably be affected by the about-faces of our policy and the effect may well keep us on the road to progress or plunge us once again into the worst situation the world has ever known. Indeed, it seems to us to be extremely dangerous to decide by a simple vote the fate of 14 million inhabitants without therewith taking into account the immediate effects which our decision might have in the international situation.

335. Political affinities and diabolical manoeuvres assail us from all sides. I appeal to this Assembly, therefore, to take hold of itself and take a decision with international peace and security as its sole objective. That is the reason why we support, and continue to support, the idea that expulsion is not a measure provided for under the Charter.

336. I had thought that we were working within the framework of the Charter and its provisions. Are we engaged here in the process of amending the Charter? Why then speak of expulsion when the Charter nowhere mentions such an idea? We are about to create a dangerous precedent for our Organization.

337. You, Sir, and we all are the guardians of the Charter of our Organization. My delegation, consistent with its foreign policy, is convinced that the United Nations is a rostrum for peace. We will therefore vote against any draft resolution which would exclude the Republic of China from the Organization and that is why we shall vote against the Albanian draft resolution [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2]. In regard to draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2, submitted by the United States, my delegation will support it because we believe that the question of depriving the Republic of China of its seat in the United Nations is an important question. As regards draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, my delegation will abstain for its own reasons which I have had occasion to state before this Assembly.

338. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): The only problem we have to debate is that of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. The question, which is posed in clear terms and which we must answer in no less clear terms, is whether the will of our Organization, expressed by our Assembly, is that the People's Republic of China shall come to occupy its seat among us and its seat in the Security Council as a permanent member.

339. In fact, this will was already demonstrated during the last session and it seems to be unanimously subscribed to this year. One thing has become evident. The People's Republic of China was born on 1 October 1949 and since then it has never participated in the work of the United Nations. That has scarcely prevented it from developing, from growing in strength and from affirming itself on the international plane to a point where it has become an indispensable element in the settlement of world problems.

340. So it is more the United Nations and the cause of peace that have suffered from the absence of the People's Republic of China from our deliberations. It is they which will benefit from an immediate correction of this situation through the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China.

341. If we agree on this point there are not innumerable ways of going about it. The problem is simple and it is stated in very simple terms. To recognize the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is to recognize that the People's Republic of China represents the great country which is China and the great people which is the Chinese people. To wish to correct the injustice and the anomaly that have prevailed thus far is to wish to restore to the People's Republic of China the full extent of its rights in our Organization without attempting to interfere in the affairs coming under its sovereignty or to interfere in the integrity of its Territory. That is the genuine priority problem, and it is a priority problem because it is important—important politically, I mean—and because its solution cannot endure any additional postpone-

ments; and this priority must express itself through the immediate adoption of the draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2, of which Algeria is a sponsor. There is no matter of greater priority.

342. We repeat that it is not a matter, nor can it be a matter, of expelling a Member State. We challenge the proposition that the régime which today claims the title of Republic of China can in any way be confused with what was the Republic of China before 1 October 1949, the date on which that régime yielded its place to the People's Republic of China. We challenge the proposition that Taiwan has ever been a Member of the United Nations and we reaffirm the proposition that it is an integral part of China. It is therefore unacceptable to have our debates delayed through a discussion dealing with a subject that is manifestly concocted out of whole cloth.

343. For 20 years our debates on the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations have been blocked by manoeuvres of this kind. Are we this year again going to engage in such a game which is certainly unworthy of the importance and political ramifications of our debate? We denounce all the attempts to introduce elements of confusion into our discussion.

344. We cannot at the same time be for the restoration to the People's Republic of China of its seat and its prerogatives in the United Nations, and for the maintenance of Taiwan as a Member of the Organization. This attitude can find no valid justification either in law, history or logic. Moreover, knowing the completely unequivocal position of Peking on this question, such an attitude would be purely and simply at variance with its proper purpose of having the People's Republic of China occupy the seat of China in the United Nations.

345. One cannot at the same time be in favour of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and engage in procedural manoeuvres designed precisely to delay, if not to block, this restoration. Can those who invite us to engage in such intellectual contortions which would have us base our attitudes upon such contradictory elements convince us that they are sincere in their desire to support one or the other term of their proposals? For our part we doubt it, and that is why the Algerian delegation is against giving priority as requested to the discussion of document A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2. In the interest of having clear debates leading to frank conclusions, we appeal to the Assembly also to reject that priority.

346. Mr. MALILE (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of the United States of America has requested priority for its draft resolution A/L.632. The Albanian delegation categorically rejects this request of the United States as a flagrant violation of the Charter and of the rules of procedure. This draft resolution is not a procedural draft; it is even deprived of any substance or purpose. Moreover, it attempts to speculate about names which henceforth belong to past history, whereas the United Nations is called upon to deal with peoples, States and their Governments.

347. Having been presented as the antithesis of draft resolution A/L.630 and against it, draft resolution A/L.632

prejudges the solution of the problem in favour of the well-known anti-Chinese theses supported by the United States and thus bears on the substance of the matter, as it seeks to pave the way for draft resolution A/L.633 in order to legalize here at the United Nations the time-worn "two Chinas" plot. Accordingly, draft resolution A/L.632 is inapplicable to our own draft resolution.

348. The American draft, which is a so-called procedural one, is illegal and contrary to the Charter and to the rules of procedure. In particular, it represents a gross violation of Article 18 of the Charter. In draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2, submitted by 23 countries, it is not a question of the exclusion of a Member State or of the admission of a new State. It comes down then to a simple question of the verification of credentials, a decision which does not require more than a simple majority of Members present and voting. It is then clear that it is not the so-called procedural character of the United States text which has led the United States to present this two-thirds majority draft, but rather political motives, namely the desire to obstruct the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

349. We have drawn the attention of Member States to this fact because the adoption of draft resolution A/L.632 goes against the interests of Member States and of the United Nations. The attempt of the United States of America to ensure priority for its own text is even more flagrant. Draft resolution A/L.630 enjoys natural priority in accordance with rule 93 of the rules of procedure. It was presented first and has priority over the draft resolutions submitted by the United States.

350. It is the duty of Member States to realize that the manoeuvres of the United States of America to ensure priority for draft resolution A/L.632 is another diversionary tactic which runs counter to rule 93 of the rules of procedure and is also designed to advance another manoeuvre, the purpose of which is to involve the United Nations in the internal affairs of the Chinese people.

351. This illegal act is directed against draft resolution A/L.630, which constitutes the only just solution of the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and is fully in accord with the will of the people of China, the unswerving position of the Government of China, and the principles of the Charter.

352. We deem it our duty to draw the attention of Member States to the fact that the decision which the Assembly will now take on the so-called two-thirds majority draft resolution is not a simple matter of voting procedure. The consequences are very serious. To vote against the priority motion and against draft resolution A/L.632 is to defend the Charter and the interests of the United Nations, the strengthening of its authority and effectiveness. This would reinforce the struggle waged by Member States against colonialism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*. It would be a vote for international peace and security. It would also be in defence of a just cause and would meet the aspirations of all the peoples of the world. The sponsors of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 will vote against the United States motion for priority and

against the United States draft resolution calling for a two-thirds majority.

353. We express our conviction that the General Assembly will face up to its responsibilities and resolutely reject that proposal.

354. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): Mr. President, the United States delegation requests that you put to the vote the question whether the General Assembly should vote first on the "important-question" draft resolution [A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2]. We certainly hope that the Assembly will do this and will vote a strong "yes". The United States motion for priority which my delegation had the honour to move as long ago as 18 October [1966th meeting] is entirely in order. We have tried to explain in the clearest terms why we believe that this critical question of procedure should be decided at the outset. But, to repeat let me say again that we think representatives are entitled to know before they cast their votes on the Albanian draft resolution just exactly what majority is required for adoption.

355. Our motion for priority is squarely in order under rule 93 of the rules of procedure. Rule 93 expressly contemplates that the General Assembly may decide to vote on proposals in some order other than that in which they have been introduced. The question is up to the members of the General Assembly to decide. It is for all of us to decide. I therefore request, Mr. President, that you put to the vote the United States motion to accord priority in the voting to the important-question draft resolution, the non-expulsion resolution.

356. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand): I wish to support the request of the representatives of the United States of America and Japan that priority should be granted to the draft resolution contained in document A/L.632, the so-called "non-expulsion" or "important-question" draft resolution. That draft resolution is a procedural resolution. It relates to the way in which a decision is to be taken on the substantive draft resolution before us in document A/L.630.

357. Logically, this procedural decision should be taken first. It is the common practice of this Assembly to do so. If we do not vote first on the important-question draft resolution, we shall not know the effect of the voting on the substantive draft resolution until after the event. In practice, the General Assembly has recognized this situation in the past by giving priority to procedural draft resolutions including those on this very question of China's representation. We should know before we take a vote on the Albanian draft resolution whether the decision should be made by a simple majority or by a two-thirds majority of this Assembly. The Assembly will thus have the opportunity to take that decision and will know where it stands by voting first on the important-question draft resolution and on the outcome of that vote we shall all know the effect on the ultimate vote that may be taken on the draft resolution proposed by Albania and other States.

358. If I heard him correctly just now, the representative of Albania said that the United States motion, which I am supporting, is opening up the way for the draft resolution

which appears in document A/L.633 to be given priority—the so-called dual representation resolution. This is not what we or the United States or Japan are asking for. What we are asking for is that priority in the voting should be given to the so-called important-question draft resolution.

359. My delegation accepts that the Albanian draft resolution should be voted on before the dual-representation draft resolution. My delegation will of course vote in favour of the procedural motion by the representatives of the United States and Japan, that is, to give priority in the voting to the draft resolution in document A/L.632 and we urge others to do the same for the sake of a fair and reasonable consideration of a matter of such significance for the United Nations.

360. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I submit that my draft resolution contained in document A/L.638 should have priority for the following reasons: First, my draft resolution is a synthesis of the two substantive draft resolutions, namely that submitted by Albania and that submitted by Australia, and their respective sponsors. Secondly, my draft resolution presents a compromise with three well-defined options. Thirdly, it appeals to Asians to settle their affairs among themselves, without undue interference from countries that do not understand the problem of China, that are not interested in the welfare of the Chinese people, and that are only showing that they are clients that have interests—petty interests sometimes—in common with one big State or another. I think the Charter of the United Nations should transcend the petty national interests of States.

361. However, if my draft resolution is not given priority, I do as of now ask the General Assembly to refer it to the next session, since all the other draft resolutions, with the exception of those submitted by the representative of Tunisia, will end in deadlock and will not solve the question of China which has bedevilled us for 20 years or so.

362. To substantiate my argument, I will present to you the following possibility. Either the United States important question resolution wins or it loses. If it wins, the People's Republic of China will not be seated, as many of you would like to see it, at this session. And who can guarantee that there will be no complications during the next session? I ask you to ponder what I say and think lucidly and apply political sagacity instead of voting by solidarity.

363. If the so-called Albanian draft resolution wins—in other words if the procedural draft resolution of the United States fails—the People's Republic of China may or may not be seated, for various reasons. Many avenues could be opened to the Powers in the Security Council, and I am not going into detail. It is not such an easy question that it can be solved by majorities when the house is divided. However, I must say that then we would be pushing the United States into a situation whereby it will not relinquish its interest in South-East Asia and, more precisely, in Taiwan itself. So what would the United Nations have gained? We are here in order to harmonize relations between States. So if the United States resolution wins, there will be a deadlock, and if it fails, there will be a deadlock. Have you weighed these things? From the point of view of international relations

and establishing harmony and peace amongst States, we will have failed.

364. This was why I thought my draft resolution should have priority, simply because it provides options for the Republic of China—that is, the people of the island of Taiwan—and at the same time it appeals to both the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China—that is, the people of the island of Taiwan—to get together through the intervention of well-meaning parties. States Members of the United Nations should bring them together to work out a final solution. If this house was not so evenly divided one would say the rule of majority should prevail. But it is a majority of one or two Members that will prevail and leave bitterness in its trail and drive certain nations, especially the big Powers, to take positions that will not pave the way for peace. Is this what the United Nations wants?

365. It is not because I feel superior. I am an humble servant amongst you here. But I have thought out matters and thought that a compromise of the nature I propose in my draft resolution is probably the best answer because of the impasse in which we find ourselves.

366. Having said this, I would want to assure you that I still maintain my amendments [A/L.637] to the Australian draft resolution. An hour after those amendments were submitted, rumours began to float that they were inspired either by the United States or by Albania. Rumours began to float two hours later that I was going to withdraw my amendments. My amendments stand, and I shall ask that they should be voted on by roll call; and I shall ask, even if we stay until 8 o'clock in the morning or until noon, that every paragraph of the draft resolution be voted on by roll call, paragraph by paragraph.

367. You called for that. If you do not extend courtesy, I am not called upon to extend courtesy to others.

368. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): It pains me to have to find myself at issue with my very good friend, Ambassador Baroody. I greatly respect his arguments and his sincerity, and I certainly shall not try to match the fervour of his oratory. But I must lend my support to the proposal made by the representatives of Japan, the United States and New Zealand that priority be given to draft resolution A/L.632.

369. There are two reasons, as I see it, for this. First of all, this is a procedural draft resolution and a perfectly legal procedural draft resolution, neither obstructive, nor diversionary—a draft resolution calling for the application of Article 18 of the Charter, which describes expulsion as an important question.

370. Now, I think for more than 10 years past, a draft resolution having this same purpose has been accorded priority year after year without question, without dispute; and there seems to me to be no logical reason why it should not be given the same priority this year.

371. The second reason is that after all, as has already been said by the representatives of the United States and New Zealand, until we have reached a decision on this draft

resolution we shall be voting on a number of substantive draft resolutions without knowing precisely what we are voting about. Therefore, I urge all representatives to support priority for the draft resolution contained in document A/L.632.

372. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has just heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the vote. It will now take decisions on the following requests for priority.

373. As members are aware, at the 1966th plenary meeting, on 18 October 1971, the United States moved that the General Assembly vote first on the draft resolution contained in document A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2.

374. This afternoon the representative of Tunisia asked for priority in voting to be given to the first of three draft resolutions which has been circulated in document A/L.639.

375. In addition, the representative of Saudi Arabia has requested priority in voting for the draft resolution contained in document A/L.638.

376. The Assembly, therefore, has three requests for priority in voting.

377. Rule 93 of the rules of procedure provides that:

“If two or more proposals relate to the same question the General Assembly shall, unless it decides otherwise, vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been submitted. The General Assembly may, after each vote on a proposal, decide whether to vote on the next proposal.”

378. I therefore put to the vote first the United States motion that priority in the voting should be given to draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2. The operative paragraph of that draft resolution reads:

“Decides that any proposal in the General Assembly which would result in depriving the Republic of China of representation in the United Nations is an important question under Article 18 of the Charter.”

379. A roll-call vote has been requested on the United States motion for priority.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vene-

zuela, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil.

Against: Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada.

Abstaining: Cyprus, Ecuador, Iran, Kenya, Laos, Malaysia, Malta, Qatar, Senegal, Singapore, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Austria, Botswana.

The United States motion was adopted by 61 votes to 53, with 15 abstentions.

380. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly has therefore decided to grant priority in the voting to draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2.

381. I shall now put to the vote the motion by the representative of Tunisia that priority in the voting should be granted to draft resolution A/L.639. If this motion is adopted, draft resolution A/L.639 will have priority over the draft resolutions A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2, A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.638.

382. I call on the representative of Tunisia on a point of order.

383. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, there is something a bit confusing here. I did not ask for priority at this particular stage, because we discussed the question of priority for the procedural issue. Thus, we should vote on the procedural proposal. After that, we will consider the order of priority. I do not believe it is possible at this stage to consider the matter of priority of matters of substance. Otherwise, our voting will be very confused. I myself shall have different positions to adopt depending upon the result of the vote on the question of procedure. Consequently, I would object to the vote that you are proposing.

384. The PRESIDENT: Does the representative of Saudi Arabia agree?

385. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I am in full agreement with my colleague from Tunisia to the extent that the procedural draft resolution should be voted on before we deal with priorities in connexion with the substantive draft resolutions, lest confusion arise—all the more because neither the Tunisian draft resolution nor mine has been given a chance for consideration. Since the question of priorities may psychologically determine the vote of those who are sitting on the fence, I believe there should be no objection at this stage to putting the draft resolution on the two-thirds majority to the vote. Then, Sir, I submit that

you may ask us whether we wish to ask for priority. I have already made my position clear with regard to my draft resolution, as to its fate in case it is not given priority after the vote on the draft resolution on the two-thirds majority, in other words, the important-question draft resolution. Then, I think we will be able to conduct our work in a more business-like manner.

386. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Tunisia on a point of order.

387. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, before you proceed to the vote, I should like to make certain comments and ask our colleague the Ambassador of the United States to replace in draft resolution A/L.632, the words "the Republic of China" by the words "the representation of Formosa". We find ourselves in a very confusing situation with this draft resolution. Negotiations are under way at this moment between Washington and Peking. We know absolutely nothing about these negotiations. We, the smaller countries, would be very happy to know something about them. My delegation has voted in favour of two motions, one on the adjournment of the debate, and the other on the priority to be granted to the two-thirds-majority draft resolution. If no clarification is forthcoming at this juncture, my delegation will be forced to abstain on this draft resolution.

388. The PRESIDENT. I shall therefore put to the vote draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil.

Against: Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon.

Abstaining: Cyprus, Iran, Italy, Laos, Malta, Morocco, Netherlands, Qatar, Senegal, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Austria, Belgium, Botswana.

The draft resolution was rejected by 59 votes to 55, with 15 abstentions.

389. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn their attention to draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2, and to the amendments submitted thereto by Saudi Arabia [A/L.637]. In this connexion a request for a separate vote has been made by Senegal on the last part of the operative paragraph of that draft resolution, beginning with the words "and to expel forthwith". I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

390. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): I rise to a point of order under rule 80, to move to delete the expulsion clause contained in the Albanian draft resolution in document A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2. I refer to the concluding words of the operative paragraph of that draft resolution, which read:

"... and to expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the place which they unlawfully occupy at the United Nations and in all the organizations related to it."

391. Our Secretary of State and I have repeatedly sought to make clear the conviction of the United States that the General Assembly should not expel the Republic of China. But that is what the expulsion clause would do, and I therefore move its deletion. If the General Assembly agrees to delete the expulsion clause, the Albanian draft resolution will have the effect of welcoming the People's Republic of China to this Assembly and the Security Council, while at the same time not affecting the representation of the Republic of China in this hall.

392. To repeat, I move the deletion of the expulsion clause from the Albanian draft resolution. I hope that all friends will join in supporting the deletion of the expulsion clause, and we ask all to join in voting against that clause.

393. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Iraq on a point of order.

394. Mr. EL-SHIBIB (Iraq): I am sure it is not only my delegation and those delegations that have always defended the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations which rejoiced a few minutes ago when this Assembly took a decisive and historic vote in rejecting and refusing a ruse and a manoeuvre which has been used repeatedly to bar the People's Republic of China from occupying its lawful place in the United Nations. The draft resolution which the General Assembly has just rejected by a handsome majority should have seen the end of all attempts to bar the door to the People's Republic of China. But, apparently, there is no end to manoeuvres.

395. The question we have before us is China's place. The majority of us recognize that China is represented by the People's Republic of China. If the United States delegation wishes not to have the representative of Chiang Kai-shek

expelled, it is very welcome to take him and seat him in the place of the American delegation.

396. There is only one Government of China, the Government of the 800 million Chinese, the Government which has withstood the onslaughts, the isolation, the embargo for over 20 years; and now that it has proved its mettle, it has increased support, and the whole world is watching this Assembly to see it open the door without bars and without subterfuges and welcome it to its rightful place.

397. I do not believe we should waste much breath on rejecting any such manoeuvre, and I move that we reject overwhelmingly the amendment proposed by the representative of the United States.

398. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): As the representative of Iraq has just said, the General Assembly has taken a momentous decision, a historic decision. We have witnessed, in the course of the discussion, an attempt to use unconstitutional means and filibusters to divert the attention of the States Members of this Assembly. We have witnessed another attempt by the representative of the United States.

399. The PRESIDENT of the General Assembly has already announced the commencement of the voting. I want to find out from you, Mr. President, by what right the representative of the United States proposes an amendment when the voting has begun? To refresh the memory of the representative of the United States I should like to read rule 90 of the rules of procedure:

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

400. I therefore submit that the United States representative was completely out of order.

401. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

402. Mr. BUSH (United States): I appeal to the President that the voting had not commenced. I would cite rule 80 and ask the President to rule again. The vote had clearly not commenced on the Albanian draft resolution at that point, and we would quote rule 80 in opposition to the rule which we have just heard quoted. Voting had not started and this motion was, in our mind, clearly in order, we should like a ruling on that from the President.

403. The PRESIDENT: The vote is continuing; the amendment is not receivable.

404. I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia on a point of order.

405. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, there has been confusion. It is open to every representative—rule or no rule—to ask for a vote by division.

406. If the representative of the United States did not express himself clearly that does not prevent him from

asking for a vote by division; the voting had not started. You cannot rule out of order anyone asking for a vote by division.

407. Furthermore, if there is not a vote by division, then I request a roll-call—and this is my point of order—on every word in my amendments and on each paragraph in the draft resolution to which they pertain.

408. The PRESIDENT: I wish to make it clear that Senegal has already requested a vote by division.

409. I call on the representative of Syria on a point of order.

410. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): No amount of filibustering or attempts to confuse the issues will succeed tonight. Let that be clear. Whether it is the Ambassador of the United States or of Saudi Arabia who comes to the rostrum to impose his wish to speak, that is not the right way to proceed.

411. Mr. President, you have announced that the voting has already commenced. That of itself brings us under rule 90, as you have stated. For what did the representative of the United States ask? He asked for the deletion of a paragraph, which amounts to an amendment of the draft resolution. The only matter which can be discussed after the voting has started is the actual conduct of the voting. The representative of the United States was not speaking on the actual conduct of the voting.

412. I therefore wish you to confirm your ruling, Mr. President, that the voting has already commenced and that every motion not dealing with the actual conduct of the voting is out of order.

413. That question has been settled and we should, therefore, proceed with the voting now.

414. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Liberia on a point of order.

415. Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia): Mr. President, it is not customary for me to take issue with the President of the General Assembly, but when an error has been committed I think it is the prerogative of every Member of this Organization to call the President's attention to it.

416. You will recall that the representative of Senegal asked that we take a vote by division. You did not mention that request in connexion with draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2. Before the voting began, the representative of the United States asked for a vote by division; prior to that the representative of Saudi Arabia had asked for a vote on the draft resolution, paragraph by paragraph. But these motions have not been announced. And, Mr. President, I think that if an error has been committed we should not be too big to correct it. I do not like to challenge the decisions of the President, but in this instance I think he is in error and that error should be corrected.

417. The PRESIDENT: What error?

418. Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia): I repeat the error is that the representative of Senegal asked for a vote

by division; the representative of Saudi Arabia asked that we vote on the draft resolution paragraph by paragraph, which would have obviated the necessity of the United States representative's asking for that division.

419. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Tunisia on a point of order.

420. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like to facilitate your task. When I submitted three draft resolutions in the course of the debate today it was in anticipation of the vote on the draft resolution calling for a two-thirds majority, which might have been adopted. As it was not, the Tunisian delegation withdraws its three draft resolutions and will vote for the Albanian draft resolution. We had submitted these drafts in a constructive spirit. We did not wish this meeting to end without adopting a resolution which would invite the People's Republic of China to join our ranks. It is done. We are in favour of the universality of our Organization. We would have liked a more flexible formulation, but things being what they are we must accept the fact that we have turned a page of history.

421. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Senegal on a point of order.

422. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): Recently several speakers referred to my previous statement and said that I had requested a separate vote on the Albanian draft resolution. That was not what I had requested. I made it quite clear that my delegation would vote in favour of that draft resolution to the exclusion of any other. Nevertheless, my delegation indicated its reservations regarding one part of the last paragraph which contains controversial terms that are needlessly derogatory in respect of a member of our Assembly. We believe that the wording of that part could have been conceived in more measured terms without the general meaning of the text being altered or its objective jeopardized.

423. In this connexion, I do not agree with the interpretation which has just been given of that part of the paragraph by the representative of the United States. For me, it would suffice to change a few words which I consider to be insulting, to say the least; but if the text provides that we agree to the entry of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations then, since there is only one seat for China, one of the two Chinas will have to leave.

424. What I want to avoid is the use of discourteous terms in formulating, in issuing, a statement reflecting that situation. Hence it was for that reason that my delegation asked for a separate vote on the last part of the Albanian draft resolution. At any rate, my delegation will vote for the draft resolution as a whole.

425. An eminent political personality recently stated from this rostrum that the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations was necessary but that the maintenance of the membership of the Republic of China was unquestionably useful. We, too, believe that we have to choose between what is necessary and what is useful, and we have chosen that which is necessary.

426. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): We are dealing here with very serious business and, although we accept your ruling, Mr. President, we would now suggest that we are entitled to a separate vote under rule 91, and we move that there should be a separate vote on the expulsion clause, under rule 91.

427. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Egypt on a point of order.

428. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): I am sure that all representatives here would like to know what they are being asked to vote upon, because we have just heard the representative of Senegal saying that he wants to have a separate vote, which is exactly what was demanded by the representative of the United States of America. However, the purpose of each of those representatives is exactly the opposite of that of the other.

429. The representative of Senegal finds it unnecessary—and I tend to agree with him—to have language that could be objected to by any of those representatives with whom we have had the honour of being colleagues for such a long time. I agree with him; but if we vote bearing in mind the explanation given by the representative of the United States of America in his previous statement that the deletion means we will admit two Chinas, or that we will, as Mr. Reston said the other day in *The New York Times*, keep both the first wife and the second one, this will be very perplexing indeed.

430. I think all representatives are entitled to know whether in voting on a part which is itself irrelevant and does not really prevent us from accepting the Albanian draft resolution, they will be voting for only one China and only one delegation representing the one State of China? Before we begin on the separate voting I, for one, need some explanation. If we vote “yes”, for deletion, does that mean that we have two Chinas or not? And I think that the representative of Senegal should really ask for clarification before he asks for a separate vote on this part of the draft resolution. I think the representative of the United States also should tell us what he means by this deletion.

431. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania on a point of order.

432. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): In your wisdom, Mr. President, you have already removed one obstruction. Now we are faced with another obstruction. If it were merely our brother from Senegal that was involved, it would not be very difficult for my delegation to launch a solemn appeal to him not to insist on a separate vote; but, obviously, for reasons known to all here, I cannot possibly launch a similar appeal to the representative of the United States. I shall therefore formally oppose any move to divide our draft resolution. This draft resolution in its entirety is worded so as to achieve one single objective. That is the objective to which the majority of the members of this Assembly have clearly given their approval—the restoration of the lawful rights of the People’s Republic of China.

433. The paragraph calling for the expulsion of a delegation which purports to represent China is a valid paragraph and cannot be separated from the whole text of the resolution.

434. I appeal to all members of this Assembly, particularly to those who wish to act in conformity with the principles of the Charter of our Organization, to those members who wish to act constitutionally and in accordance with the rules of procedure of our Organization, to reject decisively the proposal of the United States delegation for a separate vote.

435. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of Sierra Leone on a point of order.

436. Mr. PRATT (Sierra Leone): I rise on a point of order. Others before me have been raising points of order which were not points of order. I rise on a point of order under rule 73.

437. Under rule 73, if any representative is not satisfied with your ruling, Mr. President, he has a remedy: to appeal it. Mr. Bush was dissatisfied with your ruling and he came to the rostrum and he used the correct word. He said—and I hope he will find that I am right when he reads the record tomorrow—that he was appealing; he used the word “appeal”. I thought he would proceed in accordance with rule 73, but he did not; he made a different appeal. He has come back two or three times to this rostrum and he has at last said that he has submitted to your ruling, Mr. President. What did he object to? He questioned whether the voting had begun. He has submitted to your ruling that the voting had begun. Nevertheless, although he submitted to your ruling that the voting had begun, which brought him under rule 90—concerning how one should conduct oneself when the voting has begun—he went on interrupting the voting.

438. Then we have also got further interruptions which have invoked rule 91. Under rule 91 again the proposal was made by the representative of Senegal. We have had more than two speakers in favour of division. We have had more than two speakers against division and what are we coming to? Are we a market place where certain delegations want to filibuster? Certain delegations which have lost a certain motion which they hoped they would have won in accordance with certain papers now just want to keep us here until tomorrow morning. No, we cannot afford that. I rise on this point of order that under rule 91 you put this matter to the vote and if you want my authority it is rule 79 (d).

439. Mr. REYES (Philippines): To my delegation the position is perfectly clear. Sir, you had announced that you would put to the vote draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 and at the same time you announced that one delegation, the delegation of Senegal, had formally asked for a separate roll-call vote on the last clause of that draft resolution containing the words “and to expel” and so on. Therefore, the situation to my delegation is perfectly clear.

440. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): I have the impression that there are persons in this Assembly who deliberately insist on misrepresenting my ideas. I also have the feeling—and this is the excuse that I am giving them—that this ought to be a question of interpretation or of language for heretofore those who have come to explain my views other than I have expressed them myself, spoke in English and I assume, therefore, that it is the interpretation which must have led them into some misunderstanding.

That is why I should like to be very specific. I did not ask that the Albanian draft resolution should be voted in parts. I simply wanted to stress a reservation that my delegation entertained on certain phrases contained in the last paragraph. But, since that statement has given rise to so many erroneous interpretations which misrepresent my thoughts, I withdraw that proposal on the clear understanding that I should like to reaffirm that it is to say the least discourteous, at a time when we are inviting a Member of our Assembly to leave our midst, to accompany him to the door insulting him all the way.

441. The PRESIDENT: In this connexion a request for a separate vote has been made by the United States. The procedure will therefore be as follows: in accordance with rule 92 of the rules of procedure I shall first put to the vote the amendments of Saudi Arabia, one by one. Is that correct?

442. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): And by roll call vote.

443. The PRESIDENT: If they are not adopted I shall put before the Assembly the motion for a separate vote and then I shall put to the vote draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 as a whole, amended or not.

444. May I now request members to turn their attention to the amendments contained in document A/L.637. I shall put them to the vote one by one.

445. I call on the representative of Sierra Leone on a point of order.

446. Mr. PRATT (Sierra Leone): Mr. President, you asked whether there was any objection. If there was no objection you were going to put them to the vote one by one. Rule 91 of the rules of procedure says, "A representative may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment shall be voted on separately", which is what the representative of Saudi Arabia has done. "If objection is made to the request for division, the motion for division shall be voted upon."

447. I come to the podium formally to object to the division of the amendments, to a vote on the amendments of Saudi Arabia paragraph by paragraph. I move this formal objection because it is very clear, without going into the substance of the Saudi Arabian amendments, that such votes would merely delay what is already almost the general trend. There is no point in our voting paragraph by paragraph on amendments which, in substance, have already been rejected. So I would formally move, under rule 91 that the proposal for a paragraph-by-paragraph vote on the Saudi Arabian amendments be rejected.

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

449. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): This Swedish gentleman, Sir, who just went out, said I should be expelled. I am glad he went out. Shame on him and on Sweden! Did he not say that? Deny it. I stand on my right, whether it is Sweden or the United States or the Soviet Union. Shame on you! Go out. Stay out. You have no right to say I should be expelled. Now it is Taiwan and now it is Baroody who

should be expelled. Shut up! Is this what the United Nations is? He sits here and says that I should be expelled.

450. Very calmly I said "fair warning". When I appealed to my colleagues I said "fair warning". If you do not give us the time and the courtesy to enable my draft resolution to be considered by those who wish to consider it, I will ask for my amendments to be put to the vote by roll call and also for the Albanian draft resolution to be put to the vote by roll call, paragraph by paragraph. I said "fair warning" twice and I said "I am willing to stay all night if you so desire, but for Heaven's sake extend me some courtesy". The courtesy was not extended to my delegation representing a sovereign State Member of the United Nations. Emotions are running high. We do not wish to use lashing words, but "fair warning" again. If anybody uses a lashing word, my tongue lashes better than his. It is not fair. Many of my friends appealed to me. Why should I heed their appeal when they did not heed my appeal? Why? Am I bound by courtesy if they are not, if they did not extend personal courtesy, if they did not extend courtesy to the country that I represent, by affording the time for my draft resolution to be looked into? By what yardstick of justice or fairness or equity should I say, "Yes, *noblesse oblige*". Did they act with nobility? Did they act with consideration? It has nothing to do with the outcome of the voting, but I told them "fair warning". They did not take heed. Of course, it is up to me to answer their appeal or not, and I would say to my colleague from Sierra Leone—and there are no hard feelings—that I think that he was out of order to go into the debate again. I simply did not go into the debate. All those who asked for the point of order were going into the substance and vilifying one another because they were against them. This is not an orderly fashion in which to conduct our business, and everybody says, "You are trying to influence others". I never said that after the debate was closed, and the records stand. I simply said that I would like my amendments to be voted on by roll call as they appear in the document, and also I would like the paragraphs of the draft resolution by Albania to be voted on by roll call. This is my right. The fair warning was not heeded. I am not bound by any appeal and, without vindictiveness, I am standing on my rights, I do ask this without going into the debate because it would be out of order to do so. Others have taken the liberty to go into the debate and they were out of order.

451. Therefore, Sir, kindly, coolly, I submit that I stand on my rights and ask that my amendments should be put to the vote one by one, by roll call, and also that the paragraphs of any draft resolution I choose should be put to vote by roll call so that we may know for the future what is what and who is who in connexion with this draft resolution and other draft resolutions.

452. Thank you, Mr. President, and I do apologize to you personally, Sir, and to the Secretary-General if I have raised my voice here. But I think you would defend me as my President as well as the President of this fellow who said "He should be expelled". I heard it. This is no rumour. I do warn anyone who wants to use foul language to beware.

453. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Sweden on a point of order.

454. Mr. RYDBECK (Sweden): I shall be brief. I have not asked or said that Mr. Baroody should be expelled.

455. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic on a point of order.

456. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): To put an end to this rather lengthy debate, I support the motions made by the representatives of Tanzania and Sierra Leone to apply rule 91. An objection to the motion for division has been made. I propose that we proceed immediately to the vote.

457. The PRESIDENT: I should like to make it clear again that the representative of Saudi Arabia has proposed several amendments contained in document A/L.637. According to the usual practice these amendments should be voted on one by one. There has been no request for a vote by division and therefore rule 91 does not apply.

458. May I ask representatives to turn their attention to the amendments contained in document A/L.637. I shall put them to the vote one by one by roll call, as requested.

459. I now put to the vote the first amendment pertaining to the second preambular paragraph.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Saudi Arabia, Mauritius.

Against: Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, France, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Israel, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway.

Abstaining: Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger.

The amendment was rejected by 60 votes to 2, with 66 abstentions.

460. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the second amendment in document A/L.637, relating to the third preambular paragraph.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Mauritius, Saudi Arabia.

Against: Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Israel, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chile.

Abstaining: Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Central African Republic, Chad.

The amendment was rejected by 52 votes to 2, with 64 abstentions.

461. The PRESIDENT: I now invite Members to turn their attention to the amendment appearing in paragraph 3 (a) of document A/L.637, reading:

“Replace the words ‘all its rights to the People's Republic of China’ by ‘all the rights to which the People's Republic of China is entitled at the United Nations’”.

462. I shall put that amendment to the vote by roll call. However, I shall first call on the representative of Somalia on a point of order.

463. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): From this rostrum I should like to address an appeal to the representative of Saudi Arabia to take into account that we have had a very long discussion today and to consider withdrawing his proposal that there should be a roll-call vote on each amendment he has submitted to the draft resolution under discussion. In making this appeal, my delegation is conscious of the fact that the representative of Saudi Arabia had hoped that the Assembly would allow him more time for the consideration

of his draft resolution. But we trust that he will take into account the explanations that have been given from this rostrum by many delegations, and that he will now allow the remainder of his amendments to be voted upon by recorded vote.

464. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I allowed the roll-call votes to take place to show members how upset people can be. And in reverse I would say that I was not upset when I told the Assembly that I would stand on my rights if I was not given time to have my draft resolution deliberated upon, perhaps privately, by those representatives who were not sure of how they were going to vote on the procedural draft resolution of the United States. It works both ways. But, indeed, so many of my friends, who incidentally are sponsors of the Albanian draft resolution, appealed to me personally and I thought of their personal human rights. That is why I shall ask you, Mr. President, to be kind enough to show them that I can afford to be generous, and I wish to state that it is not necessary to put the remainder of my amendments to the vote.

465. If I have demonstrated how uncouth inflexibility is, it was with an *arrière-pensée*. Those who did not heed my warning were very inflexible. But I should like to show my colleagues that I can afford to be generous.

466. Furthermore, so that there may be no ill feeling between me and my Swedish colleague, I would address a few words to him. There is no rancour or hatred or anger any more in my heart. If I told him what I told him, it was because I was under the impression that he made an insulting remark. If he does not think that he made it, let everything be forgotten between him and me.

467. In order to show members that I can afford to be generous, I request you, Mr. President, to act upon the request that I made earlier, namely, that the draft resolution which I submitted in document A/L.638 be kept in the records of this Assembly, not only *ipso facto*, but also, if possible, retained through any procedure open to the General Assembly so that in case of need—I repeat, in case of need, should we be faced with a deadlock—it may be reactivated as it is.

468. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Canada on a point of order.

469. Mr. BEAULNE (Canada): I have asked to speak simply to clear up this unfortunate matter that Ambassador Baroody attributed to the representative of Sweden. I simply should like to say that I am afraid Ambassador Baroody overheard a bit of private conversation between myself and the Ambassador of Sweden.

470. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put before the Assembly for decision the motion for division by the representative of the United States.

471. Objection has been made to the request for division. Rule 91 of the rules of procedure reads:

“If objection is made to the request for division, the motion for division shall be voted upon. Permission to speak on the motion for division shall be given only to two speakers in favour and two speakers against.”

472. In accordance with rule 91, I shall put to the vote the motion of the United States representative for a separate vote on the words “and to expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the place which they unlawfully occupy at the United Nations and in all the organizations related to it” in the operative paragraph of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Bahrain, Bolivia, Brazil, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Botswana, Cyprus, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Italy, Malta, Portugal, Qatar, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey.

The motion was rejected by 61 votes to 51, with 16 abstentions.

473. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of China on a point of order.

474. Mr. CHOW (China):³ The rejection of draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 is a flagrant violation of the Charter, which governs the expulsion of Member States. In view of the frenzied and irrational manners that have been exhibited in this hall, the delegation of the Republic of China has now decided not to take part in any further proceedings of this General Assembly.

475. I should like to take this opportunity to express the profound gratitude of my Government to those friendly Governments which have lent us their unstinting support throughout the years. My Government will further strengthen these relations in the years to come. We shall continue to struggle with like-minded Governments for the

³ See foot-note 1.

realization of the ideals upon which the United Nations was founded and which the General Assembly has now betrayed. We are confident that the cause for which we have been fighting for more than a quarter of a century will in the end prevail.

476. I shall issue another public statement later in the evening.

477. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Austria, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada.

Against: Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Gabon, Gambia, Guatamala, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Japan, Khmer Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Swaziland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil.

Abstentions: Colombia, Cyprus, Fiji, Greece, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Panama, Qatar, Spain, Thailand, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados.

The draft resolution was adopted by 76 votes to 35, with 17 abstentions (resolution 2758 (XXVI)).

478. The PRESIDENT: The draft resolution has been adopted and the Government of the People's Republic of China will be notified accordingly.

479. Since draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 has been adopted, I assume that the General Assembly does not wish to proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, since in any case that text is not being pressed to a vote.

It was so decided.

480. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Albania on a point of order.

481. Mr. MALILE (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): After the vote that has just taken place, I should like, on behalf of the Albanian delegation, to make the following statement.

482. The General Assembly of the United Nations has just adopted the draft resolution introduced by Albania and 22 other States, by which we have restored the lawful rights of the glorious Chinese people and the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, rights which have been unjustly denied it for 22 successive years as a direct result of the policy of *diktat* of the United States imperialists.

483. This historic decision will remain engraved in the annals of the United Nations as a great victory for all the peoples of the world and for peace-loving Member States, and at the same time as a great defeat for the United States of America. Today's vote has demonstrated the great role which the peoples of the world attribute to the People's Republic of China, its colossal strength and vitality in the service of freedom, independence, peace and progress, and the strength and will of all peace-loving peoples and States. This vote has confirmed the great truth that the United Nations needs China, that without its indispensable contribution the United Nations is incapable of resolving any of the important problems confronting it.—The United States of America.

484. The PRESIDENT: Is this on a point of order? If not, there will be an opportunity given tomorrow for explanations of votes.

485. Mr. MALILE (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): I shall be very brief, Mr. President.

486. The PRESIDENT: You may speak again tomorrow, if you so wish.

487. Mr. MALILE (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): I believe I have the right to say a few words on this matter. Everything has gone very well up to the present moment, Mr. President. Everything has gone very well in the Assembly as regards the voting because you have shown wisdom and have acted in the right direction. I would therefore ask you to be good enough to show the same wisdom to the very end by allowing me to conclude my very brief statement.

488. The PRESIDENT: Not for the purpose of explaining your vote. I cannot give that opportunity to Albania now, when we are about to terminate. I appeal to you again, please continue at our meeting tomorrow morning. You asked to speak on a point of order.

489. Mr. MALILE (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): I have only one more paragraph, Sir.

490. The decision that the General Assembly has just taken on the restoration of the lawful rights of China in the United Nations is the incarnation of the will of the peoples of the world. They regard it as their own victory and as the victory of all peace-loving forces and States that are

struggling for the triumph of the cause of liberty, independence and progress in the world. In the great People's Republic of China the peoples see the great citadel of socialism, the firm and resolute support essential to the peoples struggling for national and social liberation, the

resolute defender of the principles of justice, the opponent and impregnable barrier to the policy of hegemony and world domination of the two great imperialist Powers.

The meeting rose at 11.25 p.m.