

6. It is obvious that Communist China cannot be kept out of the United Nations indefinitely. Evidence shows that support for the seating of Communist China and opposition to the United States approach is growing each year. At this time it seems within the realm of possibility that the first step — a successful Indian amendment, to bring about discussion of this issue, — may be made in the direction of admission of Communist China, despite the strong opposition of the United States. The slight modification of our past voting procedure on the Chinese representation question which I have suggested is an attempt to meet this possibility.

J. L[ÉGER]

16.

DEA/5475-EJ-40

*Le chef de la délégation à l'Assemblée générale des Nations Unies
au secrétaire d'État aux Affaires extérieures*

*Chairman, Delegation to United Nations General Assembly,
to Secretary of State for External Affairs*

TELEGRAM 1417

New York, September 19, 1958

RESTRICTED. PRIORITY.

Repeat Washington, London, Paris, NATO Paris (Information).

CHINESE REPRESENTATION

The General Committee devoted its meeting this morning to the consideration of the Indian request for inclusion of an item dealing with the question of the representation of China. The discussion followed the pattern of earlier years and no repeat no significant new arguments were advanced. The USA presented a draft resolution for the General Assembly's consideration by which the Assembly would decide "(1) to reject the request of India for the inclusion in the agenda of its thirteenth regular session of the item entitled: Question of the Representation of China in the UN; and (2) not repeat not to consider, at its thirteenth regular session, any proposals to exclude the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China or to seat representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China".

2. Before the vote the USSR questioned the competence of the General Committee to adopt a resolution of this nature and the Chairman then ruled that no repeat no question of competence arose in relation to paragraph one of the draft resolution and that paragraph two was within the Committee's competence since it amounted to a request for the non-inclusion of an item. This the Chairman considered to be within the Committee's competence in relation to the second sentence of rule 40.

3. Malik's ruling was challenged by the USSR and upheld by a vote of ten in favour to 3 against with 7 abstentions. A USA motion that the text of their resolution be put to the vote before voting on the inclusion of the item proposed by India was adopted by 10 in favour to 4 against with 5 abstentions.

4. The USA draft resolution was then put to a roll call vote in parts with first paragraph being adopted by a vote of 12 in favour 7 against and 2 abstentions. The second paragraph was adopted by a vote of 11 in favour 7 against with 3 abstentions. The text as a whole was adopted by 12 in favour (Pakistan, UK, USA, Uruguay, Australia, China, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Japan, Lebanon and Netherlands) 7 against (Rumania, USSR, Ceylon,