

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE 442nd

MEETING

Wednesday, 7 February 1951, at 3 p.m.

Lake Success, New York

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
The question of Formosa	625
Point of order regarding a circular distributed to Chinese nationals in the United Nations Secretariat	626
Future meetings of the General Assembly and the First Committee	627

Chairman: Mr. Roberto URDANETA ARBELÁEZ (Colombia).

The question of Formosa

[Item 71]*

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE DEBATE

1. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom) wondered if it would not be wiser to adjourn the debate on the question of Formosa (Taiwan). In view of the unsettled nature of the situation in the Far East, any decision taken might give rise to misunderstanding at a later date. If the United States representative had no objection, he would make a formal motion to that effect.

2. Mr. AUSTIN (United States of America) recalled that, when the question was raised in the First Committee in November (399th meeting), the United States delegation had proposed that its consideration should be deferred.

3. The United States Government had been and still was convinced that the fate of Formosa should not be settled by force and unilateral action. The international community had a vital interest in having the matter settled by peaceful means. The item should therefore remain on the General Assembly's agenda, even though no useful purpose would be served by discussing it at the present stage. At the time of its inclusion in the Assembly's agenda, there had been prospects of an early end to the hostilities in Korea.

4. That situation had, however, been changed as a result of the mass intervention of Chinese forces; that was why the United States delegation had then agreed to defer the discussion of the item. Chinese intervention had assumed such proportions that the Assembly had just adopted a resolution (A/1770) declaring that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China was engaged in aggression in Korea. A satisfactory settlement of the question of Formosa was unlikely in the circumstances. The United States delega-

tion was accordingly agreeable to adjourn the debate on the question.

5. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom) formally moved the adjournment of the debate on the question of Formosa (Taiwan).

6. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) opposed adjournment of the debate on the question of Formosa until the sixth session of the General Assembly.

7. The representative of the USSR recalled that his delegation had opposed the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the General Assembly (294th plenary meeting) because it had felt that the question was contrary to the Charter and constituted an insult to the Chinese people. The legal status of Taiwan (Formosa) and the fact that it belonged to China could not be questioned. The Cairo Declaration clearly recognized that Manchuria, Formosa and the Pescadores belonged to China and would be restored to it. Article 8 of the Potsdam Declaration confirmed the decisions taken at Cairo on the subject. The act of surrender of Japan provided, among other things, that the Chinese authorities should accept the surrender of the Japanese forces in Taiwan and the Pescadores. All those acts established beyond doubt China's sovereignty over Taiwan, which had not been denied since 1945. The United States Government itself had confirmed the facts in a *communiqué* dated 5 January 1950.¹

8. The United States was now trying, however, to make it appear that the fate of Taiwan had to be settled by the United Nations. The United Nations had no competence in the matter; the legal status of Taiwan and China's sovereignty over it had been determined by agreements concluded during and after the war, and those agreements were not subject to review. Any at-

¹ See *Department of State bulletin*, Vol. XXII, No. 550, page 79.

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

tempt to reopen the question of the agreements would constitute an intervention in the domestic affairs of China, and would be contrary to the Charter. In that connexion, Mr. Tsarapkin quoted the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, and of Article 107 of the Charter.

9. The USSR delegation would therefore vote against the question being considered at either the fifth or the sixth session of the General Assembly, and, hence, against adjourning the debate until the sixth session.

10. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom) wished to make it clear that the purpose of his proposal was not to adjourn the debate until the next regular session of the General Assembly. He had merely proposed the adjournment of the debate on the question, in accordance with rule 115 of the rules of procedure. If that motion was adopted, the Committee could resume consideration of the question whenever it thought fit.

11. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to know whether the debate would be adjourned until the end of the fifth session, or whether it could be resumed at any time after the close of the fifth session.

12. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom) explained that his proposal was that the debate on the question should be adjourned *sine die* during the current session.

13. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) emphasized that the position taken by the United States and the United Kingdom had been known to everyone in advance. The purposeless exchange of questions and answers between Sir Gladwyn and Mr. Austin had in no way altered the Polish delegation's attitude. It had from the outset been opposed to the inclusion of the item in the agenda because it constituted an act of intervention in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of China, which had exclusive sovereignty over the territory of Taiwan (Formosa). Retention of the item on the agenda was contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter and was intended to conceal the aggressive designs of the United States with regard to China. The representative of Poland referred to the statement (A/C.1/661) by General Wu, representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, to the effect that the Chinese people were determined to recover Taiwan from the clutches of the United States aggressors and that the Government of the United States must bear full responsibility for all consequences that might arise. The Polish delegation fully endorsed the position which the representative of China had taken on that question.

14. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the motion of the United Kingdom representative to adjourn the debate *sine die*.

The motion to adjourn the debate sine die was adopted by 38 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions

15. Mr. LOURIE (Israel) said that the principles approved by the First Committee on 13 January (425th meeting) remained valid and included reference to the settlement of the question of Formosa. The Good Offices Committee set up by the General Assembly resolution of 1 February would undoubtedly take those principles into account. The Israel delegation therefore saw no

purpose in beginning a discussion on Formosa at that time.

16. Mr. HSU (China) recalled that his delegation had been and still was opposed to the inclusion of the question in the agenda. He had therefore abstained from voting.

17. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had opposed, and still opposed, any consideration of the question of Taiwan by the General Assembly, whether at the fifth or at the sixth session. The vote of his delegation against the motion for adjournment should be interpreted in the light of that explanation.

18. Faris EL-KHOURI Bey (Syria) said that he had abstained because he felt that, if the motion for adjournment were adopted, representatives would be left in doubt concerning the subsequent work of the Committee.

19. Mr. SHVETSOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he had voted against the motion for adjournment because in his delegation's opinion the question of the legal status of Taiwan did not arise. The legality of Chinese sovereignty over that island had never been in doubt, particularly since it had been confirmed at Cairo and Potsdam, and since, moreover, both the President and the Secretary of State of the United States had quite recently reaffirmed that the island belonged to China.

20. Obviously, both the inclusion of the question in the agenda and the motion for adjournment were part of a hostile policy towards China and had been inspired by the United States in an attempt to camouflage the aggression which it was carrying on under the aegis of the United Nations.

Point of order regarding a circular distributed to Chinese nationals in the United Nations Secretariat

21. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) stated that Chinese nationals in the Secretariat had received a circular dated 30 January 1951 from the United Nations administration informing them that they must file a declaration of their assets in excess of \$1,000 with the United States Treasury.

22. The circular referred to a Treasury order which was one of the measures of economic warfare, such as the freezing of assets, which had been undertaken by the United States Government against China and its nationals. He believed that the order transmitted to the members of the Secretariat was in violation of the Headquarters Agreement (General Assembly resolution 169 (II)) and infringed the extra-territorial rights of the Organization and its staff members. He wished to know on whose authority the circular had been distributed.

23. The CHAIRMAN replied that the question was not within his competence. He would transmit it to the Secretary-General.

24. Mr. KYROU (Greece) thought that the point raised by the Polish representative was out of order because it was not on the Committee's agenda. The representative of Poland should address his question

to the Secretary-General, in the event that he still recognized him.

25. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom) held an opinion similar to that of the Chairman and the representative of Greece. As it appeared that the representative of Poland did not recognize the Secretary-General, he could address his question to the Secretariat.

26. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) pointed out that he had not asked the Chairman for an immediate answer. The matter could be clarified only after an investigation, which was clearly called for, had been carried out.

27. The argument that the point he had raised was out of order was entirely invalid. Since the First Committee was the only organ of the General Assembly

which was then in session, it could take cognizance of anything that concerned the General Assembly.

Future meetings of the General Assembly and the First Committee

28. The CHAIRMAN, in reply to a question by Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa), said that the President of the General Assembly had not yet informed him of the date of the next plenary meeting.

29. In reply to Faris EL-KHOURI Bey (Syria), the CHAIRMAN said that he would call a meeting of the First Committee as soon as the Good Offices Committee or the committee on additional measures had drawn up a report on its work.

The meeting rose at 4.7 p.m.