

In making that statement and in outlining this policy, the objective was to begin, and we hoped it would begin, a process of breaking the log jam which has faced the United Nations Assembly for many years. We hoped it might produce some ideas which might result in some progress being made in dealing with the matter of representation of China, which is on the agenda of the United Nations, as it has been now year after year for more than 15 years. I believe the statement which has been made will have a helpful effect in that direction. I hope that it will result in other motions being made at the United Nations General Assembly, in the form of new and positive approaches to at least an examination of this problem with a view to finding a solution.

Before the United Nations Assembly at present there are three resolutions which deal with the question of Chinese representation. There is the resolution which comes up every year (and this is the one which I hope will be decided first), to decide whether or not this question is an important one within the meaning of the rules of procedure of the United Nations. If it is considered to be a question of great substance (and I cannot imagine a question of much greater importance), it then would require a two-thirds majority. That is important. This is one resolution. Then there is the perennial Albanian resolution, which provides for the admission of the Government of Peking, and at the same time for the expulsion from the United Nations of the Government of Taiwan.

When the Secretary of State for External Affairs issued his statement on Chinese representation in November 1965, he was dealing with the Albanian resolution and explaining why we would not support it at that time. We do not propose to support it this year either, because we cannot vote for a resolution which, in its terms, would expel the Government of Taiwan from the United Nations. Presumably this resolution will come up early next week for decision. There will be the same reluctance (and, indeed, impossibility), on our part, to support a resolution in those terms.

Then there is a third resolution put forward by the Italian, Belgian, Chilean and, I think, one or two other Delegations which provides for an examination of the matter by a committee which would report back to the United Nations Assembly a year from now. In its terms, it is almost the same kind of resolution which the Canadian Delegation put forward in 1950 without very much success.

We appreciate the desire of the sponsors of this resolution to join us and others in making a step forward and in making some progress in this matter. We feel it is a satisfactory resolution so far as it goes, but we do not feel that it goes far enough to ensure that, at the end of the year's examination, we shall be faced at the next meeting of the Assembly with a realistic and helpful report on this matter which could lead to further desirable action. That is the reason the Secretary of State for External Affairs made a statement yesterday and proposed an examination of the question, not in the form of a resolution.