

United Nations  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



1603rd  
PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 21 November 1967,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

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

*President: Mr. Corneliu MANESCU (Romania).*

AGENDA ITEM 93

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

1. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) (translated from French): The so-called "question of China" has been on the General Assembly's agenda for seventeen years now. Thus simply and crudely stated, this sad longevity record attests to the inability and—to put in bluntly—the failure of the United Nations to find a lasting and final solution to the problem.
2. Despite changes of political régime, political leadership and political orientation in a good many Member States, changes which seemed to announce the beginning of a new trend and, consequently, a somewhat different appraisal of the elements contributing to the international climate, the "question of China"—like so many other questions that are taboo—has always been decided in the same way and by much the same majority.
3. This ritual is not what one would call stimulating. That is why my delegation is anxious to avoid having the General Assembly again engage on the old paths, particularly those which have led it to an impasse before, and into which it was drawn by vexatious recriminations and idle vituperation rather than by a concerted desire to seek a constructive solution and final settlement.
4. In creating problems where there should be none, in endeavouring to set new records for tenacity and perseverance, certain Member States, it seems to me, may cause the General Assembly to meet in permanent session or to waste energies for which a better use could be found by engaging in polemics, reviving old passions and widening breaches. The analysis of the situation and the statements offered thus far have been so lacking in objectivity and serenity that the present debate can hardly help the Assembly to find a just and durable solution. That is what we fear.
5. My delegation therefore deemed it useful to make its own modest contribution to the debate by explaining its position and the reasons for its choice. It does so in the belief that it is neither wise, nor realistic,

nor even expedient primly to close one's eyes to the behaviour of more than one-quarter of mankind—according to admittedly unverifiable statistics—especially at a time when so many "sorcerer's apprentices" seriously threaten world peace. It does so also because the majority of Member States have recognized that the question is of vital importance; in fact, at its sixteenth session the General Assembly expressly stated in its resolution 1668 (XVI) that "any proposal to change the representation of China is an important question" within the meaning of Article 18 of the Charter. That resolution was reaffirmed by resolutions 2025 (XX) and 2159 (XXI). We should like to make a few rapid comments on the two panels of a diptych neither of which must at any time be lost sight of in the search for a lasting solution.

6. First, in terms of international law, my delegation feels that the problem is not properly stated. We find the wording of the item debatable, both as to form and as to substance; moreover, it has a charge of dynamite in it, an obvious bias, an unfortunate prejudgement, all of which tend to interfere with tranquil and careful consideration.

7. Judge for yourselves: "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations." That wording does not stand up to legal analysis. It presupposes that there has been, at the very least, a case of "mistaken identity" or a "miscarriage of justice", in modern legal parlance. But for more than twenty years, since the historic meeting at San Francisco in 1945, the contested seat—if we can call it a contest—has been in fact occupied by the Republic of China. That country is, moreover, a founding Member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council (Article 23 of the Charter). Are we to think that all those who, ever since the question was raised, have invariably replied that there is no case of mistaken identity and that it is most certainly the Republic of China that should continue to sit in the United Nations, have been stricken with total and incurable blindness? What conclusive arguments can we advance to refute the comfortable majority which invariably votes against any change in "the representation of China" in the United Nations? Those to be found in the explanatory memorandum accompanying the request for the inclusion of the question in the agenda [A/6831] do not appear to me to be very convincing. Let us stop putting the cart before the horse. Let us first revise the Charter, open to question the annual reports of the Committee on Credentials, run the film backwards, as it were, to the opening of the session, for, as we can all testify, the votes of the Republic of China have counted in all the votes

taken. In short, let us suppress the fact that this same Republic of China was and remains a founding Member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council. After that we should examine—if examine is the word—the right of every State to belong to the international community. Obviously, none among us would wish to perform this exercise. Stated in those terms, the problem is insoluble.

8. We feel that these few preliminary comments should broaden the debate to encompass those philosophical and ideological choices which are still our barometer for evaluating international conditions. If that is so, my delegation would like to say that, even as it does not demand that others should share its views and reactions and its conception of the United Nations, so it will not allow anyone to force any given philosophy or ideology on it. The very principle of State sovereignty is here at stake.

9. The retort could certainly be made that the defeat of General Chiang Kai-shek's troops by Mao Tse-tung's and Chiang Kai-shek's retreat with the remnants of his army, the core of his party, the Kuomintang, and his Parliament to the Island of Formosa amply justify a review of the Republic of China's claim that it genuinely represents all of China. But such a misinterpretation of a historical fact over which we no longer have any control would not induce my delegation to vote for an alleged "Restoration of the People's Republic of China" effected by expelling the Republic of China and to give preference to Mao over Chiang Kai-shek. We are not dealing with the case of an exiled sovereign who thinks he has lost a battle and not the war. Let us not forget that Formosa is an integral part of Chinese territory. Let us proceed by stages; let us not examine the question on our agenda until the Republic of China, as a sovereign State, has ceased to be. My delegation, for its part, considers such a sinister contingency to be highly improbable; it believes that in this case truth is stranger than fiction. It is certainly true that the two parts of China are still in a virtual state of belligerence. Why should the United Nations give preference to one of these two parts, and the very one which is constantly disturbing the peace in the region? Why should the United Nations expel the other part, which has proved to be a peaceful and co-operative member of the international community?

10. We also find it difficult to deny legitimacy to the Republic of China and attribute it exclusively to the People's Republic of China. Legally speaking, the Republic of China did not set up a government in exile; on the contrary, Marshal Chiang Kai-shek has carefully kept alive a government which is functioning in Chinese territory. To recognize it is no slur on either our courage or our honesty. Moreover, the National Assembly of the Republic of China is still the same one—the last—that was democratically elected by a free, universal and secret ballot, by all of China in 1948. By contrast, Chairman Mao Tse-tung has not yet held popular elections. The Nationalist Chinese State, represented de facto and de jure by the Government of President Chiang Kai-shek, exists, even if its territory has shrunk. By way of comparison, let me say that

the Republic of Upper Volta has a territory about half the size of the state of Texas and a population which is one-fortieth that of the United States; and yet, the United Nations and the world have agreed that our vote should count the same as that of our illustrious neighbour in the alphabet. Even more striking examples could be adduced.

11. My delegation would prefer not to analyze in detail the internal situation in the two parts of China; it continues to hold that every State, every national entity and every people is free to setup such régimes and institutions as it pleases, and that this is as it should be. We respect the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States. The people's communes, the great proletarian cultural revolution, the truths of yesterday's masters which the masters of today regard as lies, the purges and the demonstrations of the Red Guards—all these, we feel, are attempts at readjustment, and we do not wish to take a definite position on them here.

12. As a result of this analysis, my delegation will not say yes to Peking.

13. The wording of the item before us cannot stand up to comparison with the provisions of our Charter any more than to an objective legal analysis. Certain passages of the explanatory memorandum are not to be relied upon. I shall not dwell on those which contain subjective judgements, declarations of intention, pious hopes or propaganda; they are as indicative of a certain turn of mind as is much of the advertising which the world is so fond of today. That mere comment should suffice.

14. There is no provision in the Charter concerning the rights of States which are not yet Members of the United Nations. No State is entitled to claim only its rights, while either remaining silent on its obligations with regard to the Charter or proclaiming its intention of violating them and creating a "more revolutionary United Nations." Rather, one should stress one's obligations towards a praiseworthy institution which has succeeded in averting great perils. One should eschew anything that might reduce its effectiveness and moral authority. One should propose nothing until one actually belonged to it.

15. The authors of the Charter—to which every State must subscribe before being admitted here—erected the United Nations on the basis not of universality, but of selectivity. Let us not reproach them today for overriding desire to be realistic. The United Nations is an association of States guided by the same ideals, within which individual States must act jointly with others and pursue common ends. Article 4, which sets forth the admission requirements, Article 5, which deals with the suspension of a Member State, and Article 6, which provides for the expulsion of a Member State, make this very plain.

16. Finally, there are States which do not belong to the United Nations, although they are seen to abide by the provisions of the Charter. That proves that the United Nations is neither a tribunal nor a tool in the hands of the mighty; it proves that the United Nations does not exclude any State in the world. To join the United Nations means first of all to

fulfil, and undertake to fulfil, the obligations set forth in the Charter. If we were to agree to revise the Charter because that is Peking's condition for joining, we should be opening the door to all sorts of demands. Moreover, we have no indication that the new charter would have the blessing of the country which so bitterly attacks the Charter we have now.

17. In the circumstances, how are we to restore the lawful rights of a State which has never at any time or in any way, informed us that it intends to become part of our international community? How are we to reconcile with the Charter our acting as godfather in the absence of a godchild? Can we overlook the deliberately extravagant and hence unacceptable conditions on which Peking will agree to rejoin our great family? Can we deny the fact that not only are these conditions unacceptable, but that they are also accompanied by declarations of intention with regard to the United Nations that are disquieting, to say the least? For a Member State deliberately to violate the fundamental laws of the United Nations does not necessarily deal a mortal blow to the Organization; this is unfortunately demonstrated with increasing frequency every year. But the situation would be fraught with peril if the United Nations itself, by admitting China on the above-mentioned conditions, were deliberately to violate its own rules and laws in order to make room for 700 million persons without whose presence, we are told, no major problem of our time can be solved. What guarantee is there that the major problems would, as if by magic, find satisfactory solutions as soon as Mao Tse-tung had replaced Chiang Kai-shek in these precincts?

18. That is why my delegation feels that the General Assembly must rise above partisan positions and emotional reflexes, even above the legal approach, which is useful in providing a frame of reference but is sometimes abstract, and must courageously, lucidly and objectively consider the facts and the possible consequences. It must take care not to mortgage the future too heavily. It must not too lightly abandon its proverbial caution and its wisdom.

19. Lastly, Peking's own statements give us great concern. My delegation cannot accept, as conditions for Peking's admissions, that the 1950 resolution [498 (V)] condemning the People's Republic of China as an aggressor in Korea should be withdrawn—we cannot see what procedure could possibly be used to that end; that a resolution should be passed recognizing that the United Nations had made a mistake on that occasion—we cannot be expected to undo the course of history; that we should completely revise the Charter—some preliminary precautions must be taken; and above all that we should expel the Republic of China—an act that would be both unjustified and illegal.

20. Again, my delegation cannot accept the following statement, which has not yet been denied and which was reported in the People's Daily on 28 June 1967:

"Countless facts show that the United Nations is the tool of United States imperialism in its counter-revolutionary double dealing and a tool of the Soviet revisionist clique in the counter-revolutionary double game it is playing in concert with United States imperialism.

"The United Nations has done a great deal of harm and is incapable of doing anything good for the simple reason that it had become a place where the great Powers engage in their infamous horse-trading and a tool of the power politics of the United States and the Soviet Union. At one time the United Nations was dominated by United States imperialism alone; today it is dominated by both United States imperialism and Soviet revisionism."

21. Other remarks are even more revealing. When Indonesia left us, Chou En-lai declared:

"In deciding to take Indonesia out of the United Nations, President Sukarno has opened the people's eyes. The understand now that the United Nations, whose strings are manipulated by Yankee imperialism, is not sacrosanct and that it is perfectly possible to oppose the United Nations and withdraw from it, that it is not essential to belong to it. It might perhaps be worthwhile to set up another United Nations, a revolutionary United Nations, to compete with the organization which calls itself the United Nations and which can only do harm and do nothing good."

22. That statement was soon given the lie in a most striking manner, for Indonesia has resumed its place among us. Just as we had regretted its departure, so we welcomed its return and its enlightened participation in our work.

23. But there is something disquieting about these recent remarks, even if they no longer apply. How can anyone rejoice when the dialogue between nations is broken off? In this particular context, and while wishing that Peking's policy towards the United Nations would undergo a radical change, my delegation still has the disagreeable impression that the examination of the so-called question of China has been falsified and distorted by emotional reflexes and by musty odours of the worst moments of the cold war. The examination of this question is also falsified and distorted by the fact that the great Powers, which once again hold the answer, and the small, the rank and file, have not come to an agreement to strike this item from our agenda. My delegation once more earnestly urges that we should all co-ordinate our efforts and our influence to stop these tragic confrontations at the expense of third States, and to enforce the right of every national entity to preserve its unity and live in peace and brotherhood with the rest of the world.

24. Because of these considerations, my delegation will not say yes to Peking.

25. The second panel of our diptych calls for a brief analysis of the international situation, on which, we believe, depends the final answer that every member State gives to the question. Well then, what do we find?

26. The wording of the present item recalls the problem of divided countries that is always with us. We keep going around in circles without catching a glimpse of any satisfactory solution. No problem concerning the division of a people has as yet been settled at the United Nations level. Our very approach to these problems makes it impossible for us to

solve them. Germany, Viet-Nam and Korea bear evidence to this.

27. Are we going to give our blessing to these divisions on the basis of false criteria? Are we going to demonstrate that we are opposed to the trend towards universality by excluding an entire nation from the Organization because the authorities which govern the 700 million Chinese so demand? Shall we go on discouraging all the divided and bruised peoples which, unlike China, have a right to expect from the United Nations a quite different attitude towards their problems and difficulties? To expel the Republic of China for the benefit of the People's Republic of China would solve nothing. It would place the United Nations in a vicious circle; it would, on the contrary, create insoluble problems.

28. Population cannot provide a valid criterion, any more than good international conduct. For it is not the United Nations that ignores 700 million Chinese, but the latter's authorities that ignore the United Nations. These authorities forget that there can be no coexistence without tolerance, no association without overriding principles, and no fruitful international co-operation without justice, security, and a stable peace. If the trumpets of a nuclear Apocalypse are sounded every day, they will in the end shake our fragile planet. My delegation fears that the United Nations would be paralyzed if there were to be an expulsion of Chiang Kai-shek's representatives, followed by the spectacular intrusion of the representatives of Mao Tse-tung.

29. The struggle to divide the world into zones of influence should give food for thought to those who would like to expel Chiang Kai-shek and install Mao Tse-tung. Just as they ask us, and rightly, to recognize that we cannot continue putting 700 million persons beyond the pale, so we ask them, no less rightly, to recognize that, no matter how eminent the leaders who wield authority over those 700 million may be, they should not minimize, to the point of neglecting it altogether, the part played here by 120 Member States, quite apart from the two great Powers—120 States which have no desire to be regarded as puppets manipulated by the United States and the Soviet Union. Neither extravagant statements nor dark threats will induce my delegation to vote for a draft resolution changing the representation of China.

30. In questioning, for no reason, our political maturity and sense of responsibility, in denying us any opportunity of deciding matters for ourselves, the People's Republic of China is making it plain that it would like, as it were, to be the third thief of the fable and serve as a counter-weight to the two great Powers taken together. The prospect of becoming a victim of this new equation in the United Nations does not tempt us in the least. We are therefore rather concerned, and our reaction reflects our concern.

31. Upper Volta does not wish to condemn anyone as a matter of principle. On the contrary, it would like to maintain good relations with all peoples which practice peace and tolerance and are willing to help it out of its economic difficulties while fully respecting its freedom of choice. The experience of friendly States in co-operating with the People's

Republic of China incites us to constant vigilance. The Republic of China, on the other hand, maintains with Upper Volta and with many other countries excellent relations based on mutual respect, friendship and co-operation.

32. Be that as it may, to have been defeated because of having been abandoned by a powerful ally, to retreat to a small part of the vast territory one previously controlled, to reorganize that mountainous island so that 13 million Chinese can live there in prosperity, to resist successfully the slings of a Goliath who spares no effort to finish off this David; better still, to retain and publicly proclaim the hope of returning to the mainland, to progress in so brief a time from the status of an assisted nation to that of one offering assistance, and to give our world, which is no longer surprised at anything, a fine example of courage, tenacity and ingenuity—that is a tour de force which, in truth, few States have achieved. And yet there are some who would have the United Nations "redress a wrong" and drive out Chiang Kai-shek in order to let in Mao Tse-tung without anything or anyone clearly justifying the call to this crusade against the Republic of China! Let us reply by a resounding "No." Expelling the Republic of China when it has done nothing to deserve expulsion is not, in our view, consistent with the ideal we ought to strive for.

33. In conclusion, my delegation would like to emphasize that what is immutable is not its attitude towards the 700 million Chinese, whose achievements it admires, whose hopes for a better future it shares, whose anxieties, concerns and difficulties it understands. What is immutable is its respect for the principles of peaceful coexistence, tolerance, non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States, loyal co-operation and reciprocal assistance. What is immutable is its desire to do its share towards making the United Nations an instrument for peace and international co-operation. It could therefore not approve of any prospect or vote for any draft resolution contrary to these primary objectives.

34. In his statement to this same General Assembly, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Upper Volta said:

"Today, nations have to live together whether they like it or not; and there is no other choice but to live together in mutual respect, tolerance and mutual assistance. War is no more the ineluctable fate of mankind than peace is a gift from the strongest Power. The United Nations must strengthen its moral authority and its international prestige in order to meet more adequately the difficult demands of modern times." [1568th meeting, para. 116].

35. Since no new facts have come to light to change the fundamental aspects of the problem, my delegation feels that one of these demands, in the present circumstances, is that we vote against any draft resolution altering the representation of China in the United Nations and to see to it that the item does not so much as reappear on our agenda.

36. Mr. SHAW (Australia): The item which we are now considering is not a new one in the history of the United Nations, although it is an item which each year must be considered in the light of an international



situation where there are elements of change. Since the item was last debated in the twenty-first regular session of the General Assembly, the internal dissension and political and ideological conflicts within mainland China, which were apparent at that time, have spread further and assumed more serious proportions. The deepening and widening of these divisions have led to a deterioration in the political, economic and social fabric of the country. In its external aspects, divisions within the mainland Chinese hierarchy have been reflected in extreme forms of behaviour. In recent months we have all been made too acutely aware of the shameless treatment of foreign diplomatic representatives in Peking representing a wide variety of countries with diverse social systems. There has been provocative incitement of disorders in Hong Kong and other incidents along borders with a number of mainland China's neighbours. There has been a serious deterioration in the relations of Peking with some of its neighbours.

37. At its twenty-first regular session, the General Assembly decided not to make any change with regard to the representation of China in this body. It can be said that an important element in the thinking of many countries at that time was that, in view of the events on the mainland and in the international attitude of Peking, 1966 was not an appropriate time for making any fundamental change on this issue. It was difficult to predict what the effect of the representation of Peking in the United Nations would have been on this Organization because we could only judge from its words and deeds how Peking would react if it were so represented. Certainly the United Nations would become a very different Organization from the one it is now. In such an Organization, one would not feel any great confidence that the principles which are at the basis of the Charter system would be respected and preserved.

38. Perhaps it was for that reason that many States, not unsympathetic in other respects to the régime in Peking, were disinclined to press the claims of Peking too vigorously at that time. It was for the same reason that there was considerable opposition to the efforts of some countries, and we respected their efforts even though we disagreed with them, to introduce an element of what they regarded as some new movement into the consideration of this question in the United Nations.

39. In our view, those considerations of prudent caution which characterized the actions of a majority of Member States last year, have been reinforced by the events in mainland China over the past twelve months and more especially by the external manifestations of the internal turmoil within China. Do we know whom we would be inviting, if this Assembly decided to extend an invitation to representatives from Peking? Which of the contending forces is really controlling events in the mainland of China? Is it indeed still possible to speak of a unified leadership?

40. The recent developments in mainland China can only make it more difficult for countries situated in the Asian and Pacific area to gauge how they are to face the future in the regions which they share with China. The immensity of the task facing nations of these regions who desire to live in peace with

China is apparent. No one would wish to pretend that China does not exist or can be treated as if it did not exist, much less ignored. The problem is to come to terms under which other nations can live alongside China in a relationship free from the threat or fear of intervention in their internal affairs. The task of bringing about this situation will remain one of the major tasks of diplomacy in the next decades. To face the developments which are occurring in South East Asia now will require great firmness and patience in the application of that diplomacy.

41. It is the hope of the Australian Government that over a period of time, mainland China will be accommodated within the international community. But the acceptance of representatives of Peking into the United Nations now—and they have not said that they wish to be represented here—is not a short cut to that objective and would not automatically make mainland China a respected Member of the community of nations. Even if Peking were to be represented in the United Nations tomorrow, the great problems of peaceful co-existence would still remain. It has been argued that if Peking were represented in the United Nations, there would be opportunities of closer contact and that, having accepted certain obligations, mainland China would be held accountable to the Membership of this Organization. While we do not sweep these contentions aside without due consideration, we find it difficult to believe that the mere assumption of a seat in this Assembly would make much practical difference to the conduct of Peking's policies. Indeed, we are all aware that the Peking authorities have in effect imposed conditions for diplomatic recognition which are unacceptable to many countries and that any claims that may be made for it for a seat in the United Nations stand against a background of virulent attacks on this Organization.

42. The Chinese communists also insist that their own admission to this Organization would entail recognition of their sovereignty over Taiwan and the expulsion and withdrawal of recognition from the Government of the Republic of China. No one who has visited Formosa has found anything that would indicate that the 13 million people of that island wanted to be ruled by Peking. The Republic of China is a founding Member of this Organization. It has participated constructively and peacefully in international affairs and it has fulfilled all the obligations of membership of the United Nations. It enjoys a wide degree of international acceptance and it occupies an honoured place in the community of nations and in the affairs of the Asian region. Moreover, over the past twenty years great strides have been made in promoting economic progress and the standard of living in Taiwan has been seen to rise to one of the highest levels in Asia.

43. It has been said by some that, since the overriding objective is to come to terms with the 700 million people of mainland China, we should not allow the 13 million people of Taiwan to stand in the way of this objective. According to this view, if Taiwan has to be jettisoned in the interest of a settlement with Peking, such is the price of progress. Coming from a country which itself has a population smaller than that of Taiwan, I find this argument quite unacceptable.

That the interests of 13 million people could be abandoned in order to satisfy wider political ends is an argument to which we have the most serious objections, both in principle and as a question of what is practical in ensuring peaceful evolution in the East Asian region.

44. There are therefore difficulties which lie in the path of progress on this issue, difficulties which are in part of Peking's own making. But this does not mean that we can or should abandon the search for an accommodation on which ultimately the peace of the region, indeed of the world, may depend. We have to try to bring the authorities in Peking to see that aggressive interference in the affairs of other countries, direct or indirect, cannot succeed, and that, if persisted in, it will only work to their own disadvantage. We have to instil in the authorities in Peking a realization of the limits beyond which policies cannot be forced by one authority in disregard of others and to reveal those places where it will be to the common advantage to reach some understandings. In the long term, we look towards greater regional cohesion among the countries of Asia and the Pacific, so that they will all come to play their part in promoting the stability and economic advancement of that area.

45. These objectives may take some time to achieve. But international life is not static. In time, conditions inside mainland China and in the world will change. We should be on the watch for indications of changing attitudes rather than aggravate the present situation by trying to force openings that are now shut against us.

46. The Australian Government in its policies has been seeking to proceed in accordance with the ideas which I have expressed. We have not recognized the Peking régime and recent events, regrettably, would seem to confirm the wisdom of that course. Neither have we sought to isolate ourselves from mainland China. Where it has been possible for us to develop relations, principally through trade but also in other ways, the Australian Government has not sought to prevent this. In recent years there has been a significant expansion in our peaceful trade with the Chinese mainland. Australia will continue to be alive to the possibilities of exploiting such other avenues towards peaceful accommodation as may present themselves from time to time.

47. But, of course, it must be realized that understanding and accommodation cannot come only from one side. Some of those who call for recognition of Communist China and its admission to the United Nations bring all their pressure to bear on other Governments, and not on Peking, and they call for all the concessions to be made by others rather than by Peking. Those of us who have doubts about the policies of Communist China are the ones that they call on to recognize what are termed the realities of the situation. We are called upon to reach friendly relations with Peking by, in effect, giving Communist China everything it asks for. But an accommodation cannot be a one-sided affair. Peking must indicate a readiness to live in harmony with its neighbours, to accept international obligations and to enter into arrangements for their effective performance. The need for some movement of this kind must be more widely recognized if the

world is eventually to move towards a better relationship with Peking.

48. We now have before us three draft resolutions. The first draft resolution has been introduced by Albania and a number of other sponsors [A/L.531]. This calls for the replacement of the representatives of the Republic of China by representatives from Peking. For the reasons that I have indicated, we cannot support and will vote against that draft resolution.

49. The second draft resolution [A/L.532 and Add.1], which has been submitted by a number of delegations, including Australia, is essentially a procedural resolution. It asks the Assembly to confirm what should in any event be clear, that any proposal to change the representation of China in the United Nations is an important question requiring a two-thirds majority in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the Charter. The General Assembly has on many occasions, and most recently in resolution 2159 (XXI), reaffirmed this situation. As a matter of orderly procedure, it is appropriate that it should do so again.

50. In this connexion, my delegation notes that the draft resolution proposed by Albania and other countries was submitted before the proposal which my delegation has the honour to co-sponsor and that it would normally be put to the vote before that draft resolution. It seems to my delegation that an essentially procedural resolution concerning the majority which would be required for the adoption of a substantive resolution, should logically be put to the vote first. If this were not the case, we could be in the position of voting on a draft resolution without knowing what majority would be required for its adoption. My delegation believes that we should avoid any such uncertainty. For this reason, we wish formally to propose as a motion as to procedure that draft resolution A/L.532 and Add.1 should be given priority in the voting. We ask that you, Mr. President, should request the Assembly to decide on this draft resolution before putting draft resolution A/L.531 to the vote. We believe that in this way it will be possible for us to clarify the procedural situation in a way which will facilitate the voting.

51. The delegation of Italy and a number of other delegations have proposed a third draft resolution for our consideration [A/L.533]. I do not wish to discuss that draft now, except to say that, while we understand the reasons which have led those delegations to present it, for our own part we believe that the time is not opportune for the sort of action that is proposed. We do not believe that the passage of such a resolution now would help us to arrive at what we are seeking—namely, the attainment of an understanding on the basis of which Peking would be willing to live in conditions of peace and respect with the rest of the world.

52. Those are the considerations which underlie the attitude of the Australian Government on the issue of the representation of China in this Organization. The question is not simply one of recognizing that the mainland of China exists. We are well aware that it exists. We want to develop a peaceful relationship with it and are prepared to explore new ways

of doing so. At the same time, we cannot ignore the obstacles which Peking itself places in our path. In the meantime, we shall play our part in strengthening the regional solidarity of the countries in the Asian and Pacific regions. With other like-minded countries in the region, we shall work for the time when a more harmonious relationship between the mainland of China and its neighbours seems more possible than it does at the present time.

53. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): For many years the General Assembly has been discussing the question of the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

54. We need hardly mention that the Soviet delegation has frequently stated its position of principle on this subject. Consequently, today it hardly seems necessary to repeat well-known and clear arguments, especially since the representatives of a number of countries of Asia and Africa have dealt with the matter in detail.

55. The Soviet Union has been consistently in favour, and continues to be in favour, of the early restoration of the legal rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and of the expulsion from the Organization and all its organs of the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique. We are firmly opposed to the concept of the so-called "two Chinas", which is inimical to the Chinese people and is aimed at perpetuating the United States occupation of Taiwan.

56. The fact that China, one of the founding Members of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council, is deprived of the opportunity to assume its rightful place in the United Nations is not only flagrantly unjust but also undermines the principle of universality of the United Nations, which is one of the essential prerequisites of its activities.

57. The Soviet Union, as was stressed by the USSR Minister for Foreign Affairs, A. A. Gromyko, in his speech [1563rd meeting] at the present session of the General Assembly, has always wanted the United Nations to be a genuinely universal international organization. It is not possible to accept a situation in which a number of sovereign States which have already been in existence for more than a decade continue to remain outside our Organization. Quite apart from the People's Republic of China, there is, we would point out, the case of the German Democratic

Republic, a peace-loving socialist State of workers and peasants. The Soviet Union is also in favour of an early solution of the question of the admission of the German Democratic Republic to the United Nations. Of course, we have no objection to the acceptance by the United Nations at the same time of the other German State—the Federal Republic of Germany.

58. It is no secret that the principal opponent of a solution of the problem of restoring the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China and the acceptance of the German Democratic Republic in the United Nations is the United States of America, which assumes a position that runs counter to common sense and is at variance with the United Nations Charter—a position that does considerable harm to the cause of international co-operation.

59. This year again Washington and some of its allies, in an attempt to prevent a solution to the problem of the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations at the present session of the General Assembly, have resorted to the old manoeuvre of submitting a draft resolution [A/L.532 and Add.1] in which, with no foundation whatsoever, a procedural question is declared to be a substantive matter.

60. The Soviet delegation objects most strongly to such manoeuvres on the part of the United States and other opponents of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and, as in the past, declares that the question of the representation of any country in the United Nations is a procedural matter which does not call for a qualified majority.

61. The Soviet delegation supports and will vote for the draft resolution introduced by the delegations of Algeria, Cambodia, Cuba, Guinea, Romania and other countries [A/L.531].

62. As in the previous session, we wish to indicate again that on this question the issues are abundantly clear and there is no need for any further studies or the fictitious creation of a committee of enquiry such as is proposed in the draft resolution submitted by Belgium, Italy and other countries [A/L.533]. Such an approach might lead only to further delays and procrastination in solving the problem of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

*The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.*