

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**1937th
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 24 September 1971,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 8:	
Adoption of the agenda	
First report of the General Committee	1

President: Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda

**FIRST REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE
(A/8500)**

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has before it the first report of the General Committee [A/8500]. We shall first examine the Committee's recommendations in section II, dealing with the organization of the session. These are contained in paragraphs 3 to 9. May I take it that the General Assembly approves the arrangements recommended in paragraph 3 concerning the schedule of meetings?

It was so decided.

2. The PRESIDENT: The next two paragraphs concern the general debate. I refer first to paragraph 4. May I take it that the Assembly takes note of the procedure approved at the twenty-fourth session concerning the general debate, particularly in connexion with the list of speakers and the exercise of the right of reply?

It was so decided.

3. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly may also wish to approve the recommendations contained in paragraph 5 regarding the general debate. If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

4. The PRESIDENT: Is there any objection to the proposal of the General Committee in paragraph 6 regarding the closing date of the session? If there is none, I shall take it that the Assembly approves that proposal.

It was so decided.

5. The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 7 deals with the question of verbatim records of the Main Committees. May I take it that the General Assembly approves the recommendations of the General Committee on that matter?

It was so decided.

6. The PRESIDENT: No action is required of the General Assembly on paragraph 8 concerning the seating arrangements to be observed for the session.

7. May I take it that the General Assembly approves the proposals contained in paragraphs 9 and 10 concerning the use of the General Assembly hall by the Main Committees?

It was so decided.

8. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider section III of the report of the General Committee relating to the adoption of the agenda. May I take it that the General Assembly takes note of paragraph 12, relating to the report of the Economic and Social Council?

It was so decided.

9. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to the recommendation of the General Committee in paragraph 13 with regard to item 84 of the draft agenda submitted by the Secretary-General in his memorandum [A/BUR/177, para. 15]. May I take it that the General Assembly approves that recommendation?

It was so decided.

10. The PRESIDENT: If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly likewise approves the recommendation in paragraph 14 regarding item 90 of the draft agenda.

It was so decided.

11. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to paragraph 15, which contains decisions made by the General Committee on various items proposed for deletion from the agenda of the twenty-sixth session and for inclusion in the provisional agenda of the twenty-seventh session.

12. If there is no objection to the recommendation of the General Committee in sub-paragraph (a), regarding item 24, I shall take it that the Assembly approves that recommendation.

It was so decided.

13. The PRESIDENT: May I take it that the General Assembly also approves the recommendation in sub-paragraph (b), regarding item 27?

It was so decided.

14. The PRESIDENT: Next, I put before the Assembly the recommendation of the General Committee in sub-

paragraph (c), regarding item 29 (b). If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly adopts that recommendation.

It was so decided.

15. The PRESIDENT: May I take it that the General Assembly also approves the recommendation regarding item 32 in sub-paragraph (d)?

It was so decided.

16. The PRESIDENT: No action was taken by the General Committee on the postponement of item 47 (d) and item 54. I take it that the Assembly takes note of sub-paragraphs (e) and (f).

It was so decided.

17. The PRESIDENT: Is there any objection to the recommendation in sub-paragraph (g), regarding item 95? If not, I shall take it that it is approved.

It was so decided.

18. The PRESIDENT: May I take it that the General Assembly approves also the recommendation in sub-paragraph (h) regarding item 96?

It was so decided.

19. The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection to the recommendation in sub-paragraph (i), regarding item 98, I shall take it that it is approved.

It was so decided.

20. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the recommendations of the General Committee contained in paragraph 16.

21. In this connexion, I should like to draw the attention of the Assembly to the fact that the inclusion of item 101 of the draft agenda, entitled "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations", and the inclusion of item 105 entitled "The representation of China in the United Nations" were discussed simultaneously in the General Committee.

22. If no one wishes to speak, we shall proceed to take a decision.

23. Does the General Assembly accept the General Committee's recommendation in sub-paragraph (a) on the inclusion of item 101?

It was so decided.

24. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to the recommendation of the General Committee on item 105 in sub-paragraph (b).

25. I call on the representative of Albania on a point of order.

26. Mr. MALILE (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of Albania would like to make a statement on item 105.

27. The General Assembly has just endorsed the inclusion in the agenda of the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. Now the Assembly is going to consider the recommendation concerning the item entitled "The representation of China in the United Nations", proposed by the United States delegation [A/8442], an item which has been the subject of lengthy debates in the General Committee.

28. Those debates have clearly demonstrated the unshakable will of Member States to reject the United States proposal. The overwhelming majority of delegations that spoke were against the recommendation to include item 105 in the agenda of the Assembly. The General Committee rejected the United States manoeuvre designed to combine item 101 with item 105 under a single heading—a manoeuvre which was another desperate attempt to prevent the immediate restoration of the lawful rights of China in the United Nations. The result of the voting in the General Committee on this subject constitutes another stinging defeat for the anti-Chinese policy of the United States; it shows that the plot of two Chinas is doomed to fail.

29. In the General Committee my delegation came out firmly against the inclusion of item 105 in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly. We acted in that fashion because the United States request represents intolerable interference in the domestic affairs of the Chinese people and a serious violation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the most elementary rules of international law and because the inclusion of this item in the agenda would only weaken the United Nations even more.

30. The United States proposal does not depart from the well-known United States policy of opposition to China and it is designed to maintain here, in the United Nations, the Chiang Kai-shek puppet, who represents nothing, and to impede in future the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations as well. My delegation considers that the United States proposal should be rejected, for it has nothing to do with the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of China in the United Nations; quite the contrary, it is directed against the general trend, which favours the speediest possible restoration of the lawful rights of China in the United Nations without any further delay and the expulsion of the remnants of the Chiang Kai-shek clique from this Organization.

31. The delegations of 17 countries have asked [A/8392] that the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations should be included in the agenda of the Assembly as a separate item. Our initiative is designed to restore without delay the rights of China in this Organization and to ensure its representation by the true representatives of great China, whereas by its proposal the United States is trying to divert the Assembly's attention from the fundamental issue before it and thus to prevent the great Chinese people from holding the seat which is rightfully theirs in this Organization. By their nature and purpose these two questions are diametrically opposed and have nothing in common.

32. The new manoeuvre of the United States is a measure which is imposed upon it by the new circumstances of its final isolation in the international arena in the face of the indisputable reality of the existence of the Chinese colossus in the world and its increasingly powerful role and influence. That manoeuvre is being executed at a time when an ever-growing number of countries, including allies of the United States, one after the other, are establishing diplomatic and other relations with the People's Republic of China.

33. We know that the United States proposal is in no way the result of a well-thought-out attitude adopted to correct its unfair position on the solution of this problem. On the contrary, it is a part of a whole series of efforts to get the United States out of the serious situation in which it has been plunged by the defeats it has suffered in its anti-Chinese policy. For 22 consecutive years, the American imperialists have tried by every possible means to prevent great China from occupying the seat which is rightfully China's in the General Assembly. Neither all this nor the anti-Chinese policy of the United States and its allies has of course succeeded in preventing the Chinese people and the People's Republic of China from progressing steadily. People's China is going forward on the path of revolution and the building of socialism in the country. It has won historic victories on all fronts. It has become the impregnable fortress in the struggle of peoples for independence, national sovereignty and social progress and the unshakable support of their struggle against the threats to their independence.

34. The great and undeniable importance of China at the international level has become an unquestioned reality; without its participation and its contribution, no international problem of any importance can be solved fairly and effectively. This was also shown by the favourable attitude of this Assembly at the last session, when a majority called for the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China and the immediate expulsion of the Chiang Kai-shek clique from the United Nations. The number of Member States that are in favour of the presence of People's China in the United Nations continues to increase steadily. The presence of China here would be a factor of inestimable value for the struggle of peace-loving Member States against the domination of the two great Powers and the use of the United Nations as an instrument of their imperialist policy.

35. It is now clear to everyone that the United States not only has failed in its aggressive plans designed to isolate and "hold down" the People's Republic of China, but has even found itself extremely isolated in its policy of opposing the restoration of its lawful rights in the United Nations. The proposal concerning the representation of China in the United Nations reflects the defeat of the United States policy in this regard. At the same time, it constitutes a new escalation of the hostile attitude of the United States to China and an attempt, for the purposes of United States imperialist designs, to involve the United Nations in the domestic affairs of the Chinese people; that is intolerable and likely to have very harmful consequences for the United Nations, and should give Member States cause for serious reflection.

36. In order to execute its plot to separate the Chinese territory of Taiwan from the national territory of the People's Republic of China, the United States Government has not failed to invent the concept of a so-called "Republic of China", which, allegedly, should hold a seat in the United Nations side by side with the People's Republic of China. But everyone knows that the Chinese people, by their revolution of October 1949, overthrew the feudal, *bourgeois* régime and the Chiang Kai-shek clique and proclaimed the People's Republic of China. Ever since, China has been represented in the world by its legitimate Government, the Government of the People's Republic of China. Taiwan is a province of China and an integral part of the People's Republic of China. That is attested to by international documents that are not open to question and that bear the signature of Presidents of the United States. The fact that the United States has occupied that island and its straits militarily can in no way change the sovereign rights of the People's Republic of China over Taiwan. The Chinese people will inevitably liberate Taiwan. No State has the right to intervene in the domestic affairs of China.

37. We must reject the insane attempts of the United States to make use of the United Nations to intervene once again in the domestic affairs of the great Chinese people under the fallacious pretext of solving the so-called question of the representation of China in the United Nations, which constitutes an artificial obstacle to the equitable solution of the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

38. It is quite obvious from official documents of the Government of the People's Republic of China that China has categorically rejected all the manoeuvres of the United States Government, including the so-called question of "the representation of China in the United Nations," which boils down to the hostile policy of "two Chinas". In this connexion we should like to draw the attention of Member States to the statement made on 20 August 1971 by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, in which he stated, *inter alia*:

"The Chinese Government solemnly declares: the Chinese people and Government firmly oppose 'two Chinas', 'one China, one Taiwan' or any similar absurdities, firmly oppose the fallacy that 'the status of Taiwan remains to be determined', and firmly oppose the scheme of creating 'an independent Taiwan'. 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.]

39. The United States of America should recognize the reality that there is only one China in the world, and that is the People's Republic of China—a great and powerful socialist State. It must recognize that reality and renounce its stubborn desire to keep in this Assembly a group of men who represent nothing.

40. The item proposed by the United States, whose inscription on the agenda was recommended illegally by the

General Committee, is a flagrant violation of the basic principles of the Charter and the rules of procedure. The United Nations must not be allowed to take the kind of action that the United States is seeking to impose on it for its own purposes by engaging in such illegal debates. The General Assembly has no legal foundation and no competence to discuss the domestic affairs of a State, and still less any questions such as that submitted by the United States, which constitutes a serious infringement of the national sovereignty of a State and which is a gross and inadmissible violation of the Charter and of international law.

41. It is obvious that the United States request is provocative and that it reveals the efforts of that Government to impose on the General Assembly the discussion of a question which is by no means within its competence and all this is being done so as to impede the work of the Assembly on the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

42. The question of the restoration of China's rights in the United Nations has been the subject-matter of continuing discussions here for more than two decades, and no solution has been found because it has always been obstructed by the United States, which, to this end, has resorted to the vilest methods of pressure. We feel that the time has come for Member States seriously to assume their responsibility in dealing with this problem and reject the efforts and methods of the United States, including its new manoeuvres on so-called dual representation or the two-thirds majority which is a serious violation of the Charter. The United Nations should be aware of the truth and take its stand on the side of justice, thus putting an end to the unprecedented anomaly that exists here as a result of the usurpation of the seat of great People's China by the puppets of Chiang Kai-shek.

43. Having appraised this situation in its true dimensions, the Albanian Government and the Governments of 16 other countries have submitted the item entitled "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations", and they have asked that it be included in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly as a separate item which takes account of all the aspects of the problem and provides the only fair solution. Accordingly that is the only item on this problem that should appear on the agenda for this session.

44. The draft resolution of 21 countries, including Albania,¹ calls for the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China; recognition of the representatives of its Government as the only lawful representatives of China in the United Nations; 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 occupying unlawfully in the United Nations and all its organs.

45. Without the People's Republic of China, a founding Member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council, the General Assembly cannot func-

tion normally, any more than can its principal organs, including the Security Council. On the contrary, the participation of the representatives of great China in the work of the Assembly will mark a very important step towards the liberation of the Organization from the grip of the two great Powers and thus will give fresh impetus to the struggle of the peace-loving Member States to inject new life into the Organization in the interests of peoples and of peace.

46. In conclusion, my delegation trusts that the General Assembly will reject the United States manoeuvre of the so-called question of the representation of China in the United Nations and any other procedural devices designed to divert the Assembly's attention from the substance of the question. In this way the necessary conditions will be created for the normal and fair consideration and the equitable solution of the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

47. My delegation is firmly opposed to inclusion in the agenda of the item proposed by the United States. We ask that this question should be put to the vote; and, for the reasons we have just expressed, we shall vote against its inclusion in the agenda.

48. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw representatives' attention to rule 23 of the rules of procedure, which states:

"Debate on the inclusion of an item in the agenda, when that item has been recommended for inclusion by the General Committee, shall be limited to three speakers in favour of and three against the inclusion. The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule."

The names of three speakers in favour and three against are already on the list.

49. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): I have asked for the floor in order to speak against the proposal by the delegation of Albania to overturn the recommendation of the General Committee that item 105, which is entitled "The representation of China in the United Nations", should be included in the agenda. We bear in mind that, as the President has pointed out, the rules of procedure strictly limit the number of speakers on motions opposing a General Committee recommendation in favour of the inclusion of an item. I should like to point out that rule 23 expressly limits the debate to three speakers in favour of and three against the inclusion, just as the President has pointed out. Rule 23 further stresses the propriety of a sharply limited debate in these circumstances by stating further: "The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule." We will most respectfully respect this rule.

50. The General Committee discussed the two items concerning China, items 101 and 105. At the same time, at its 193rd meeting, on 23 September, the United States delegation, for its part, made it clear that, while we do not agree with the tendentious wording of the item submitted by Albania and others, we would not oppose its inclusion.

¹ Subsequently circulated as document A/L.630.

but intended to abstain in the vote on it. We did in fact abstain in that vote in the General Committee. At the same time, we also made it clear that we wished to provide a basis for a full, fair and dispassionate debate on the issue by the General Assembly when it takes up the substance of the matter. For this reason, the United States submitted a proposal for an agenda item on 17 August [A/8442] and we tried hard to convince the General Committee that in the interest of fair play, in the interest of full debate, our item should likewise be included.

51. The General Committee agreed with that point of view. The report of the General Committee refers to the simultaneous discussion of items 101 and 105, and we have no objection to the supporters of item 101 stating whatever they wish, or submitting whatever draft resolution they wish, when the plenary meeting takes up the substance of the item. But we ourselves want very much—and here we speak for many Members; this is not exclusively a United States proposal as it has the co-sponsorship at the outset of some 19 countries—to have an opportunity to state our point of view and to submit our own draft resolutions. Surely this is the right of every Member.

52. We do not see how the inclusion of item 105 could deprive delegations holding contrary views of an ample opportunity to state their own positions. The General Assembly has had a long tradition of agreeing to include any serious item. Our item is a serious item; it has broad sponsorship. We know and we recognize that many delegations do not share our point of view; that is their right and we certainly do not deny it. But we believe that the traditional respect that Members of the United Nations have shown for the principle of favouring the inclusion of serious items should not be cast out of the window. The General Committee has considered the question of inclusion with great care. Many delegations, including delegations that are not members of the General Committee, were permitted to speak. We did not object to this. They presented arguments for and against the inclusion of items 101 and 105. We do not believe that there is any sound basis for overturning the General Committee's recommendation that both of these items should be included in the agenda.

53. Mr. President, I hope that you will allow me to say just one further word concerning the deliberations of the General Committee. I think that all Members know that, in the General Committee, the United States proposed combining the Albanian item, item 101, and the United States item, item 105, under a single neutral heading entitled "Question of China". The General Committee did not accept our proposal. We are prepared to respect the recommendation of the General Committee and we do not seek here to revive that proposal. We believe that the General Committee's examination of the entire question has been careful and well considered. Just as we respect the General Committee's decision against a policy that 19 of us believe in very strongly, we ask all Members to join with us in supporting that Committee's recommendation in favour of the inclusion of item 105.

54. Let me say finally that I do not want here, as we discuss procedural items, to delve, as others have seen fit to do, into the question of substance. But let me conclude by

making the point that this is a serious effort. It is a broadly-supported effort, geographically and in every other way. It is imaginative. It proposes a brand-new solution to an old problem. We here talk about universality, and I cannot get through my mind that universality means the expulsion of a Member that has been in good standing for some 25 years. So let each nation, as it votes, bear in mind two principles: one, the dangerous precedent of expulsion, and two, the question, so dear to every country large and small, of freedom of speech.

55. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Before I make my statement, may I mention the name of my friend, Halim Budo of Albania, who passed away a few months ago. His friends will all miss him in this Assembly. He was a man of strong convictions. May God rest his soul in peace.

56. Halim Budo and myself were good friends, but this did not mean that we always saw eye-to-eye on various questions, including our opinions of major Powers. Today, we heard the voice of Halim Budo from beyond the grave. The gentleman who opened the debate on whether a certain item should be included has done justice to Halim Budo and no doubt to the policy of a small State which we all respect, none other than Albania. But this is not a question of friendship and solidarity. It is a question of whether the General Assembly is still a forum for the free interchange of ideas, with the hope of reaching agreement on issues of great or little import. The inclusion of item 105 does not prejudice the substance of the whole question, irrespective of what tabulation, by force of circumstances, is resorted to or adopted.

57. The General Committee—in other words, the steering committee—voted against the consolidation of the two items, but it also voted for the inclusion of both items—the so-called Albanian-*et al.* item and item 105.

58. I have been in this Organization for a quarter-century, and we have all discovered that it would be undemocratic not to allow a single Member—let alone a group of Members—to discuss its point of view. Nothing in the United Nations is mutually exclusive. That term has been used time and again. The last time I heard it was in the steering committee. We are here to air our views with the hope of coming to a compromise. We are not a one-party government here. We consist of 130 Governments, and each one may have a different view—not necessarily based on solidarity, not necessarily based on one State being the client of this or the other big Power. We small Powers are ourselves caught in the mesh of power politics, the balance of power and spheres of influence. But we should have minds of our own. We should give and take with other Powers and not be self-righteous and think that our individual formula is a panacea for solving problems.

59. What is this attempt to exclude an item that may become the pivot of constructive discussion? It may be the will of any one State to reject it or accept it after we have heard the substance of that item discussed, but we should not dismiss it out of hand. That action would be arbitrary, and this Organization is not based on arbitrary actions.

60. This question is one of procedure. I do not know what the alignments are. They may not be based necessarily on

logic but on persuasion and imagined national self-interest. I say "imagined" because any self-interest that does not take into account the views of other nations, and any self-interest that does not harmonize, at least to a certain extent, with the interests of other nations, will, I think, backfire in the end.

61. That is why I urge my colleagues to let this forum remain one that encourages the interchange of ideas and free expression and not to allow it to be used to obstruct or to deny others the right to state their points of view.

62. We have a momentous question before us, and when the time comes I shall delve into its substance in the light of self-determination. But that would be premature now, and if I did go into substance I would plead with you, Mr. President, to declare me out of order.

63. Therefore, let us use good judgement, and let us include all items of such a nature that they have an impact not only on this Organization but on world public opinion—which, in the last analysis, will consider us responsible for what we do here today.

64. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): I have asked for the floor to speak against the recommendation made by the General Committee for the inclusion of item 105, "The representation of China in the United Nations", for reasons I shall now give. But before I do so, allow me to remind the General Assembly that my delegation has consistently, since this problem was first discussed in this Assembly, supported the item entitled "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations". Now, the reasons are as follows.

65. The two speakers who preceded me—the representatives of the United States and Saudi Arabia—both affirmed and emphasized the importance of free speech, implying that the inscription of our item, as originally submitted on 14 July [A/8392]—namely, "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations"—would prevent the exercise of the right of free speech. I would simply make the following remark: let us go back into the records of the General Assembly; let us find out whether this item, as co-sponsored by my delegation and included in the agenda, has ever, in the last two decades of the United Nations, prevented anybody from speaking against what we stand for or call for. On the contrary, if we go back into the history of the question, we find that the majority was against the inscription or approval of our item. When a mechanical majority obtained in the United Nations, very little indeed was heard of the freedom of speech and the right to be free and to vote freely. Therefore let us not play with such ideas. They work against those who do so.

66. The second reason is that the item as proposed by us, "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations", has been inscribed as such for the past two decades, and under that item all aspects of the problem have been considered. To include a new item, "The representation of China in the United Nations", would only confuse the issue and would not add anything to the substance of the problem or give any possibility of

opening up an avenue of debate which would not be opened by our own item.

67. Thirdly, in spite of the fact that the substance is not to be discussed, the item as presented by the United States, "The representation of China in the United Nations", does not really bring in any new element; it only brings old ideas in new forms, or old wine in new bottles.

68. Fourthly, our item as it appears is the only legal context within which the deliberations of all aspects of this problem can and must take place because, after all, what is it that decides the title of the item? It is ultimately the content. I shall not allude to the content; but when a principle is affirmed by the Charter—that of the integrity and unity of a people—whether that integrity and unity will be preserved by the restoration of the lawful rights of the people of China is the question to be discussed.

69. Fifthly, the representation of China does not take place in a vacuum and is not an abstract problem. It raises problems of a legal, judicial and historical nature; it raises problems which touch the very heart of the Charter of the United Nations. Indeed, the vote in the Assembly on our draft resolution last year—namely, 51 to 49, which meant that it was defeated only by a "gimmick" used by the United States delegation in asking for the application of Article 18 of the Charter—is only proof of the defeat which the United States delegation's new formulation will also suffer, because it is the United States delegation itself which is now acknowledging part of the mistake that it has perpetuated for two decades, that is not to recognize which is the real China. But it is trying to use a new "gimmick" by submitting a new item, "The representation of China in the United Nations", which has no aim other than to confuse and obfuscate the issue. The issue is not the importance of the problem; we all recognize the importance. The issue is not freedom of speech. No title will prevent anyone from saying whatever he wants to say. The issue is not to have two Chinas; it is that the United Nations, the General Assembly, wants to decide who is the lawful representative of the peoples of China.

70. Sixthly, I appeal to the General Assembly not to detract from the seriousness of this all-too-important question. It is the very people who claim that it is a serious problem which should be approached seriously that are detracting from it.

71. Finally, I second the motion made from this rostrum to take a roll-call vote on the recommendation of the General Committee.

72. Mr. NAKAGAWA (Japan): Mr. President, before speaking on the subject before us I should like to take this opportunity to extend my sincere congratulations to you on your assumption of the Presidency of this twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. I pledge to you, Sir, our whole-hearted co-operation. Our full tribute will be paid to you when Mr. Aichi, the head of our delegation, delivers his statement in the general debate on 27 September.

73. After careful consideration, the General Committee decided two days ago to recommend to the General

Assembly the inclusion of item 105, "The representation of China in the United Nations", in the agenda of the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly. My delegation was one of those which voted for its inclusion. My delegation does not oppose the inclusion of item 101 in the agenda, although we feel that the wording used in it tends to prejudice the substantive issues involved. In contrast, we consider that the wording of item 105 as requested by the United States is far more appropriate since it is formulated in much broader terms in order to enable the General Assembly to study the issues involved in all their shades without prejudging the substance of this complex question. We sincerely believe that it is of the utmost importance that the General Assembly should give broad and sober consideration to the whole question of China with objectivity and fairness, and I am sure that the majority of the Assembly shares our view that the solution of this question will not be brought about without a just assessment of the reality we face at present. We earnestly hope that the General Assembly will adopt item 105 as an agenda item of the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, as recommended by the General Committee.

74. Mr. DIOP (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): The inclusion of item 105 of the draft agenda is a dangerous game in an attempt to ward off the inevitable, to break the irreversible rotation of the wheel of history: the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

75. Item 105 is a pseudo-problem, created out of nothing—a delaying tactic prompted by despair. It is a pseudo-problem because we are not dealing with the admission of a new State to the United Nations. It is a pseudo-problem because those who claim here to represent China in fact represent only themselves: the travelling salesmen of Chiang Kai-shek.

76. Item 105 is aimed at maintaining a situation which, for 20 years now, has bogged down the General Assembly's debates in sterile oratory. Must we remain in this inextricable situation, thus making ourselves the accomplices of illegality? The delegation of the Republic of Guinea does not accept that approach and that concept. What we must do is denounce a struggle against procedural devices, and consider the question in its true light.

77. Those who are seated here represent only themselves. All mankind is aware of the necessity not to accept the fallacious theory of two Chinas. Taiwan is an integral part of the Chinese territory. It is therefore for the Chinese people alone to settle this question, and we can count on that great people, which has demonstrated all the capacities of a powerful, highly organized and peace-loving State, to settle it in the interests of its 750 million people.

78. Because of this historical truth, item 105, whose unconfessed purpose cannot escape our vigilance, must be purely and simply eliminated. To enable the General Assembly to break the artificial deadlock which is imposed on us, it is clear that this year we must welcome here the true representatives of the 750 million Chinese. That is the greatest service that the General Assembly could render to the United Nations and to mankind.

79. One distinguished speaker, pleading the cause of democracy before the General Assembly, told us earlier that the Assembly should agree to the inclusion in the agenda of any question in the spirit of mutual tolerance. If that idea may appear to be prompted by a concern for fairness, then why should not the General Assembly, despite the recommendation of the General Committee, forthwith include the question of the colonial case of Puerto Rico in the agenda, as proposed by the delegation of Cuba under item 104. That would be an act of justice, equity and democracy.

80. That is why the delegation of the Republic of Guinea will resolutely oppose the inclusion of item 105 in the agenda, and it takes that stand in its concern to restore justice and to contribute to the advent of a better world based upon equity, and also in the interest of the effective work of the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

81. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the General Committee's recommendation that item 105 should be included in the agenda. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Botswana, Brazil, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khrner Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia.

Against: Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, 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, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bhutan.

Abstaining: Burundi, Canada, France, Ghana, Iran, Kuwait, Laos, Malaysia, Mauritius, Morocco, Senegal, Singapore, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Austria.

The recommendation was adopted by 65 votes to 47, with 15 abstentions.

82. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wished to explain their vote after the voting.

83. Mr. HYVÄRINEN (Finland): I should like to explain the position of the four Nordic Governments, of Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland, on the question just voted on by the General Assembly.

84. For many years now, the General Assembly has been considering the item on the "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations", and the Nordic countries, on whose behalf I am now speaking, have consistently voted in favour of the inclusion of that item in the agenda in that particular form. They have done so—and continue to do so—because they believe that that heading expresses correctly the nature of the problem before the General Assembly. The new item entitled "The representation of China in the United Nations" proposed by the General Committee for inclusion in the agenda would change the basis on which the question should be dealt with. That is the reason why the four Nordic Governments voted against the inclusion of this item in the agenda. It was our understanding that no delegation would be prevented from presenting its case on the matter.

85. Mr. BAYÜLKEN (Turkey): My delegation has been in favour of the inclusion of both items—item 101 and item 105—in the agenda. The fact that we are in favour of the inclusion of item 101 needs no explanation. Turkey has recognized the People's Republic of China as the sole legal Government of China. We should like to have it seated in this House as soon as possible and we believe that any delay in bringing the People's Republic of China to its rightful place in this community cannot be beneficial to the interests of the United Nations.

86. We voted in favour of the inclusion of item 105 for two reasons. First, it has been a long-established tradition in this House to accept the recommendations of the General Committee. This tradition has served us well. It has saved us from useless exacerbation of differences. Secondly, we voted in favour of the inclusion of item 105 because such a stand in favour of traditional expeditiousness does not in any way reflect our basic stand on the essence of the problem. On that we are very clear and decided: we favour the seating of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations with its full rights this year.

87. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZA (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Argentine delegation wishes to make it clear that its vote in favour of the inclusion of item 105 entitled "The representation of China in the United Nations" has only one meaning: that we do not oppose the free discussion of a question of such importance in which many countries have special interest and on which they intend to make their views known. For the same reason we did not oppose the inclusion of item 101 entitled "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations".

88. Having made that clarification my delegation would like to make it abundantly clear that our vote in no way prejudices our stand or commits us to a particular position when we consider the substantive aspects of item 101 in depth.

89. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): I should like very simply to say that my delegation voted for

the inclusion of item 105 of the draft agenda in view of the deliberations which took place in the General Committee. We believe that it is quite in order for delegations asking for an item to be placed on the agenda to be able to make their views known. Nevertheless, the affirmative vote we have just cast in no way implies a political stand on the substance. That stand will be set forth at the appropriate time.

90. I avail myself of this opportunity to say to my friends on all hands that in the existing circumstances one ought to be moderate. Last year, when we discussed the substance of the problem, we did not know that the great meeting between President Nixon and Chairman Mao Tse-tung was to take place this year or next—an event of the first importance, and a surprise to international opinion. We do not know what further surprises are in store for us in the future.

91. We think it is a matter of urgency that People's China should be admitted to or reinstated in the United Nations. This is an urgent problem. At the same time, we recognize that it is a political one, and every effort must be made to ensure that this question be solved sensibly—that is to say, in such a way that the international community emerges more united and with better mutual understanding.

92. My delegation believes that men can conceive many possibilities and many solutions for enabling People's China to sit among us and for ensuring that the problem is definitively solved for the benefit of all mankind.

93. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain that it voted in favour of the inclusion in the agenda of item 105, and not on the intentions of its sponsors. This is in keeping with the traditional position of our Government that any State has the right to request the inclusion of an item on our agenda within the limits established by the United Nations Charter. However, a vote in favour of its inclusion in no way prejudices our attitude on the substance.

94. Our views on the substance will be given in due course and I should like to state forthwith that my Government considers that the lawful representation of the State of China is the province of the People's Republic of China, with its full measure of rights.

95. Mr. TEKOAHI (Israel): My delegation voted in favour of accepting the recommendation of the General Committee regarding item 105. I should like to place it on record that my delegation cast its vote in the knowledge that the Assembly was voting on a procedural question, which does not affect the ultimate conclusions of the substantive discussion.

96. Mr. CARDOSO (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*interpretation from French*): As in the case of other delegations, the vote cast by my delegation was a vote on a procedural matter: the placing on the agenda of item 105. Our vote was affirmative, but that in no way prejudices the substance of the problem, to which I shall have occasion to address myself very shortly in the cause of the general debate.

97. Mr. LONGERSTAEY (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): Our vote today is not in contradiction with the vote we cast in the General Committee yesterday: namely, our abstention on items 101 and 105 of the draft agenda and our vote in favour of the combining of those items.

98. In voting in favour of the recommendation of the General Committee to endorse the paragraph recommending the inclusion of item 105 in the agenda, my delegation went along with the majority decision of the General Committee. Moreover, we noted that the General Committee adopted by a large majority the paragraph concerning the inclusion of item 101. We also noted that the practice of accepting *en bloc* the recommendations of the General Committee was questioned by some delegations, in particular in connexion with item 105.

99. We should also like to affirm as clearly as we possibly can that we interpret the vote cast in the Assembly as a purely procedural vote which in no way prejudices the substance of the issues dealt with in items 101 and 105.

100. Mr. VINCI (Italy): I wish to explain and put on record the position of the Italian delegation. The vote my delegation has just cast, in favour of the inscription of item 105, was based solely on the long-standing practice of my delegation, in accordance with the tradition of this House to support the proposals of the General Committee. As a matter of fact, we were ready to approve, as it stands, the report which has been submitted to this Assembly.

101. At the same time, I wish to make clear that our vote must not be construed as implying that the Italian delegation would be prepared to support a two-China formula or any proposal that might delay the seating of the People's Republic of China in all United Nations organs, including the Security Council. The Italian Government has recognized the Government of the People's Republic of China as the only legal Government of China. As such, we consider it the only Government which is entitled to represent China in the United Nations.

102. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): We abstained in the vote on item 105 because we think that its inclusion has a purely formal value and has in fact no real meaning. For us the important thing, the real question, is item 101, and in the General Committee we voted not only in favour of the inclusion of item 101 but also its presentation as such, without merger or confusion.

103. We state in advance that we shall oppose any attempt, procedural or substantive, to prevent or even to postpone the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China.

104. Since we shall be voting first on the pertinent resolutions under item 101, we believe that the inclusion of item 105 will be virtually pointless and will fall of itself.

105. Mr. KAMEL (Qatar) (*interpretation from French*): As this is the first time that the delegation of Qatar is participating in a vote in the General Assembly, I should like to explain our attitude in favour of the inclusion of item 105 in the agenda. My delegation rests firmly on the

principle that any question involving matters of capital importance to the international community should be fully discussed in the General Assembly. It goes without saying that this in no way prejudices the attitude that we shall take in the final analysis on this item.

106. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The vote my delegation has just cast was designed solely to decide the procedural question put to us, namely, the question of the inclusion on the agenda of the General Assembly of what was item 105 of the draft agenda. That vote, therefore, does not imply any decision on our part on the substance of the issue raised in what has become item 96 of the Assembly's agenda.

107. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Rwanda) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has just supported the inclusion in the agenda of item 105. We did so wishing to uphold the General Committee's recommendation and considering that at this level this is simply a procedural question, so that the vote can in no way prejudice our future position when we come to the problem of substance. However, Rwanda's prime concern is to see 750 million people take the active part they deserve in the world community. It will be for the head of my delegation to expatiate on that thought when we tackle the question of substance. At this stage, therefore, my delegation, while supporting the inclusion of item 105 on the agenda, reserves the right fully to express its definitive position when the question of the representation of China is discussed in the world Assembly.

108. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): A great philosopher said: "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." Kuwait abstained, though my country maintains diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China and recognizes it as the sole representative of the Chinese people. We abstained, for we believe that every country in this Assembly has the right to express its views. When the substance of the problem comes before this Assembly, we shall follow the line we believe in. We cannot compromise in our conviction that the People's Republic of China should assume its rights in the United Nations as the only representative of the Chinese people.

109. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the recommendation of the General Committee in paragraph 17 of its report regarding item 104 of the draft agenda, entitled "The colonial case of Puerto Rico".

110. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation is firmly opposed to the recommendation made by the General Committee to the effect that the additional item requested by Cuba should not be included. In stating this, we wish to emphasize that the inclusion or non-inclusion of this item on the agenda—as we stressed yesterday at the 192nd meeting of the General Committee—is an issue involving principles. It is a question that affects the very foundations of this Organization, because, depending on the attitude taken by the Assembly, it is a question of deciding whether this Organization, when it proclaims its anti-colonialist vocation, does so in fulfilment of its own decisions and with the idea that it is safeguarding a universal right to which all peoples subjected to colonialism are entitled, or whether those principles and

those decisions will become dead letters when it comes to applying them to United States imperialism.

111. At the meeting of the General Committee, the United States delegation argued that Puerto Rico had attained the status of self-government and that that status had allegedly been obtained through the free consent of the people of that Territory. Reference was made to a few figures concerning colonial elections that had been held in the Island without any guarantee whatsoever for the forces opposing Yankee domination which were under the total control of the colonial authorities and in conditions of full military occupation by the United States. Reference was also made to an alleged plebiscite carried out in 1952.

112. In this connexion my delegation would like to repeat that that plebiscite was carried out in conditions that would be unacceptable to any Member of this Organization, in conditions that this Organization does not accept as valid in relation to other colonial Territories. My delegation would like to know how many African or Asian States that have recently lived through the experience of colonialism would accept as valid the results of a consultation carried out under the exclusive control of the administering authority, in a situation of complete military occupation by that authority in the midst of the most ruthless repression of patriotic movements, and, what is more, without such a plebiscite having been based on a prior commitment from the administering Power to respect the people's decision and also without such a plebiscite offering the people of Puerto Rico a choice for independence, as was the case in the so-called 1952 plebiscite.

113. If such conditions are not acceptable for Africa, Asia or Oceania, if such conditions are not accepted by the international community in the case of other colonial situations, my delegation is fully entitled to require the representatives of the peoples who in these other regions of the world have gone through similar experiences to express here the same firmness and the same consistency in the case of a small people in the Caribbean which has never had the opportunity to exercise its right to self-determination and which has lived in conditions similar to those of the people of Namibia and the peoples of the Portuguese colonies of Africa.

114. The representative of the United States also tried to minimize the significance that the Puerto Rican Liberation Movement has had, and still has, by skilfully juggling some election figures. I, too, should like to refer to the same electoral results mentioned by Mr. Bush, drawing only on United States sources as recorded in the data provided by the State Board of Elections of the so-called associated free State of Puerto Rico.

115. According to this data, at the time the plebiscite was held in 1952 there were in Puerto Rico 1,450,000 persons entitled to vote. Of this number only 702,601 persons voted; which on the basis of sound arithmetic is only 46 per cent of the people entitled to vote. In the last colonial elections held in the Island—again according to the same source of data, which is the colonial State Board of Elections of the United States—918,820 persons voted, which is barely the equivalent of 36 or 37 per cent of the persons entitled to vote in 1968.

116. Mr. Bush referred to the electoral percentage of votes won by a small party, financed out of the colonial administration's resources, which according to him received a low percentage of votes. If we were to resort to the same line of reasoning, I could show him that in the 1952 plebiscite the principal independent and nationalist forces, those whose leaders were at that time imprisoned—and some of them are still imprisoned today in United States prisons—precisely called on their people not to participate in the elections, to reject the false Yankee plebiscite. If Mr. Bush wants to claim the percentages of those parties that voted in favour of annexation pure and simple by the United States or in favour of the so-called associated free State, I would have the same right to claim that 54 per cent of the population of Puerto Rico acted in accordance with the recommendations of the nationalist party at that time and with the recommendations of the principal forces fighting for independence.

117. In the 1968 election the majority of the political parties in Puerto Rico publicly and officially stated that what was at stake in that electoral process was not the legal status of the Island but rather other matters of local interest. Only two parties included the question of status in their programmes as basic platforms: the Puerto Rican Independence Party, which is one of the forces promoting independence in the island—but not the only one—and the Republican State Party which advocated the annexation of the island to the United States. Mr. Bush referred to the 2.82 per cent of the votes won by the first Party; but he forgot to mention the 0.46 per cent won by the only colonial Party of the island, the only one which three years ago voted for the complete subjugation of the Territory to the United States. And he forgot to mention that the majority of the Puerto Rican electorate, following the guidance of the rest of the patriotic movements, refrained from participating in the elections. So that, if what we are talking about here are statistics—if Texan arithmetic is the same as or similar to that in other areas—I would recommend that the United States delegation should not continue along a course that may demonstrate the very opposite of what it is trying to prove.

118. Moreover, efforts are being made to prevent this Organization from examining this problem, precisely because the present status of Puerto Rico is identical to that of any other classic type of colony existing anywhere else in the world. At least there is the same degree of central control over all the activities of that Territory; in other words, it is impossible to distinguish—in terms of fact—between the degree of colonial subjugation endured by Puerto Rico and that suffered by the colonies in other areas of the world.

119. Yesterday in the General Committee my delegation asked itself whence the concern of the United States delegation stems, its fear even to come to grips with the consideration of this problem—if, according to the United States, there is no such problem; if relations between Puerto Rico and the United States do not give rise to any type of colonial problem. The truth of the matter is that the United States wants to prevent the international community from getting to know the true conditions existing on that island and the degree of colonial domination imposed upon it by United States colonialism. Yester-

day in the General Committee my delegation had, in accordance with the rules of procedure, to confine itself to the procedural issues and it could not go into the substance of the item. We therefore waited until today to submit to this Assembly the picture that Puerto Rico presents now—the degree of self-government enjoyed by that island, the degree of delegation of authority which the colonial central Power has consigned to the local colonial authority—so that this Assembly might be in a position to express an opinion on whether or not there exists a colonial problem in respect of that Territory.

120. So that Mr. Bush may not describe this statement as either frivolous or malevolent, I shall draw on only one source—a North American source, that is, the *United States Government Organization Manual, 1971/72*,² which is the most recent edition. I shall not advance arguments, opinions or data from sources of the Puerto Rican liberation movement, from Cuban sources or any source other than this book published by the United States Government, which in its foreword says it contains statements of the functions and the organization of the United States Administration. Let us see, from an examination of this document, what remains of the alleged autonomy of Puerto Rico and let us see whether in this Territory those rights were observed which the General Assembly considers basic to the conduct of a referendum on the association of a dependent Territory with an independent State; that is to say, not only the right of self-determination but also equal rights.

121. There are of course no references made to Puerto Rico in this book under the categories of either foreign relations or armed forces, simply because in this sense Puerto Rico does not exist. Its international relations are not manifested in any way and it is only the Department of State that can act on behalf of Puerto Rico. Nor does it emerge on the scene in respect of military forces, [see A/8441] because, as I have ascertained and as we pointed out in our memorandum [see A/8441], that Territory has no armed forces of its own—although it would of course be mentioned in respect to compulsory military service, because while Puerto Ricans do not have their own armed military forces they are compelled to fight in North American imperialism's wars of aggression.

122. There is a modest reference to the legislative power of the United States, since equality of rights between Puerto Rico and the United States is expressed in pathetic and ridiculous terms by the presence of a gentleman in the United States Congress to whom they give the title of Resident Commissioner and who has the right to speak only if no United States Congressman opposes his speaking—and, of course, he has no right to vote.

123. In our memorandum we have mentioned how, from the judicial standpoint, Puerto Rico is subordinate to the courts of the United States, and to put this in the official language of that Government—in those matters which concern the system of judicial circuits and courts of

appeal—Puerto Rico is an entity which, together with others, forms part of the so-called First Circuit which—and this is very odd—includes New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Puerto Rico. In other words, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Justice Brennan, is empowered to review all cases that the superior courts of Puerto Rico may hear. We could say the same about the so-called territorial courts and the rest of the United States judicial system.

124. On page 65 of this manual, reference is made to an executive office, annexed to the presidency of the United States, which, according to the text, deals with the question of economic opportunities for the people. According to that Office, Puerto Rico constitutes a part of Region II, together with New York, New Jersey and the Virgin Islands, which are also a colonial Territory. This Region is administered from the City of New York, from 26 Federal Plaza, New York 10007. For the purposes of emergency preparedness—this is another Office attached to the Presidency—Puerto Rico is not defined precisely as an autonomous or associated Territory of the United States, but rather as a component of Region I, which includes, more or less, all of New England and which has its headquarters in Maynard, Massachusetts, and is headed by Albert D. O'Connor—a typically Spanish name!

125. As to customs, Puerto Rico forms part of regional district IV, with headquarters in Miami, Florida, under the directorship of Mr. James H. Stover. With regard to internal revenue, Puerto Rico also appears as a regional office under the control of the Department of the Treasury of the United States. With respect to the Secret Service—a very important branch of United States power—Puerto Rico also appears as a district under Federal control. As regards another fundamental question such as immigration and naturalization of citizens, page 208 of this *Manual* states that Puerto Rico is a district under the administration of the Department of Justice.

126. With regard to control over narcotics and dangerous drugs, Puerto Rico is not autonomous, but, rather, together with Florida, Georgia and South Carolina, it forms part of a region that has its headquarters in Miami, Florida, on Biscayne Boulevard.

127. Concerning oil imports there isn't even a local authority there to engage in such transactions, according to Presidential Proclamation 3279 of 10 March 1959, which created the Oil Import Administration. Puerto Rico is one of the districts that for these matters is under the control of the United States Department of the Interior.

128. We might have conceived optimistically that the local authorities would at least have power to plant trees or trim them. We see, to our surprise, however, that under the national Forest Service, in accordance with the provisions on page 245 of the *Manual*, this authority is vested with the Department of Agriculture, which manages 154 national forests and 19 additional areas, comprising 187 million acres in 41 states and Puerto Rico. The text then goes on to explain the functions of this national Forest Service, where it is quite clear that the administration of Puerto Rican forests is also carried out from Washington. We might have thought that, at least as far as domestic commerce is

² Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1971).

concerned, since it does not have autonomy in foreign trade. Puerto Rico had attained some sort of local authority. Nonetheless, on pages 276 and 277, it is explained that, within the United States Department of Commerce, there is what is called the Bureau of Domestic Commerce, which has 42 Business Services Field offices, one of which covers the Puerto Rican area. We might also point to the same situation concerning maritime administration, with respect to the application of justice for workers; the administration of the labour force; labour-management relations; the administration of standards of employment; the Bureau for dealing with women workers; health and safety at work; labour statistics; housing and urban development; mortgages; transport, including the highway administration and highway traffic safety. We could say the same thing about the Federal Communications Commission, the General Services Administration, the system of collective services, the Small Business Administration, the Civil Service Commission, the free trade zones of which there are two in Puerto Rico: they are also controlled from Washington. According to page 704, even rehabilitation from the hurricane which struck Puerto Rico quite recently is controlled or administered by an *ad hoc* committee set up by the President of the United States—which for that matter was recently dissolved. This is very interesting. According to this document: "Functions, employees, and records transferred to Division of Territories and Island Possessions, of the Department of the Interior."*

129. I am not going to tax the patience of the Assembly by reading in detail all of the explanations that this *Manual* of the United States Government provides, which appropriately reflects the degree of self-government, even the degree of delegation of authority, to the local colonial power, which, as is seen, is practically non-existent in respect of Puerto Rico.

130. It would be interesting, when the United States delegation comes to this rostrum shortly, to see whether the same energy, the same categorical terms with which Mr. Bush banged the table in the General Committee yesterday will be displayed here to refute the data contained in this official publication of the United States Government that I have been quoting. If he cannot refute these facts—and it is to be hoped that he will confirm the official information given by Washington—my delegation would like to know, even though it were only as a matter of curiosity, what authority is left for the resident local administration in San Juan de Puerto Rico. Where are its powers? What functions does this alleged self-government of the island possess, which cannot even control drugs? Nor does it have power to plant trees or prune them; nor does it have any control over small business, or authority over public health, housing and urbanization, not to speak of foreign relations, defence, foreign trade or economic planning.

131. My delegation reserves its right to intervene later in order to refute or comment on, as the case may be, the allegations that may be made in the remainder of the debate devoted to this item. I should like to conclude my

statement by reaffirming that what the Assembly has before it is not a Puerto Rican problem or Cuban obstinacy, but, rather, a question of principle for the Assembly.

132. In the General Committee yesterday, the day when the people of Puerto Rico commemorated the 103rd anniversary of the proclamation of the first independent Republic in Lares, I said that Puerto Rico would attain independence with or without the United Nations, would attain it by its own struggle, and with the solidarity of the revolutionary peoples of the world. It is not a question of whether the independence of Puerto Rico will depend upon the vote that the Assembly casts now. But the vote cast by this Assembly will indeed be decisive in the judgement that the peoples of the world and history will pass on this concert of nations met together here. It is a question of defining whether the Assembly is going to be faithful to itself, if it is going to abide by the principles that the Assembly itself, in its sovereignty, has proclaimed, whether it is going to act in this instance with the same diligence and firmness that it has displayed on other occasions.

133. The people of Puerto Rico will be free and independent because they have a long history of heroism and sacrifice in the cause of national emancipation. This people was represented in the early stages of the struggle for American emancipation by General Antonio Valero Bernabé, who was an aide to Simon Bolívar and who was to have been head of the expedition the Liberator was planning for the liberation of the Antilles; the people that rose up on the day commemorated yesterday in the town of Lares and struggled for 30 years to gain its independence from Spain; the people that, together with José Martí in the Puerto Rican section of the Cuban Revolutionary Party, never ceased for an instant during those 30 years to fight for its national emancipation; the people that was, moreover, massacred in Río Piedras in 1935 and again in Ponce in 1937; the people that took up arms on 30 October 1950 and proclaimed the second republic in Jayuya and suffered bombardment from Yankee aircraft over that town, Utuado, and other Puerto Rican towns; the people that cried out, "Yankee, go home" last 12 September in a massive repudiation of the meeting of United States Governors at San Juan and in tribute to Pedro Albizu Campos; the people that yesterday in all the towns of the island commemorated the glorious date of the cry of Lares—that people cannot be prevented from exercising its rights by any parliamentary manoeuvre, by any pressure that any powerful delegation may exert, because history has shown that in the long run peoples who fight for their rights win them.

134. But in the case of Puerto Rico we must say that its people has had to meet its destiny under particularly trying circumstances. That is so because of its island isolation, because it has encountered not a weak, colonialist régime on the run but rather the colonialism of the most powerful imperialist Power, and has had to do so under conditions of relative international isolation.

135. It was Don José de Diego who, describing this situation at the beginning of this century, called the Puerto Ricans a people "without weapons, without allies in the solitary wastes of the sea".

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

136. Puerto Rico will no longer be without allies in the solitary wastes of the sea because since the liberation of Cuba in 1959 the old Antillan solidarity has been fully restored, and Puerto Rico will always have our full, complete and firmest solidarity in its struggle for complete national emancipation.

137. It now befits the Assembly, not to ensure the independence of that people, but rather to confirm this Organization's loyalty to its principles and its future prestige in the eyes of peoples throughout the world.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

