

Representation of China in the United Nations” for inclusion as an item of the provisional agenda for this session. In paragraph 17 of the draft article, following an outline of the treatment of this thorny question of Chinese representation in past sessions, it is proposed that Canada should follow the practice of previous years and give restrained support to the resolution which the United States regularly submits for postponement of consideration of the question of Chinese representation. The Canadian Delegation would:

- (a) refrain from giving support *in debate* to this year’s resolution for postponement; but
- (b) vote in favour of a procedural motion postponing consideration of the issue for a fixed period such as “for the duration of the Thirteenth Session of the General Assembly”; and
- (c) vote in favour of accepting the credentials of the representative of the Republic of China if these are challenged.¹⁷

2. If Canada were to reverse its vote and oppose the procedural motion for postponement, which the United States is again expected to sponsor, it would almost certainly be taken as an indication that Canada was moving towards getting Peking seated in the United Nations. Such a move would be regarded with dismay by the United States and might, by encouraging others to vote against the postponement resolution, bring about its defeat.

3. Against this must be weighed the fact that what is at issue is discussion of the question, and not a substantive decision on Chinese representation. It is this consideration which makes it increasingly difficult to give continued Canadian support to the refusal of the United States even to consider a discussion and to the rigid insistence of the United States on the status quo.

4. Perhaps this difficulty in determining a reasonable position for our Delegation can be met by our attitude towards the expected Indian amendment to the resolution of the United States. In the last two sessions the Indians have proposed an amendment to the resolution for postponement which would have the effect of placing the item of Chinese representation on the agenda for consideration at the current session. Canada has voted against the Indian amendment, and it was defeated last year by only 43 votes against to 29 in favour with 9 abstentions. It is probable that the Indian amendment will again be defeated, although no doubt by a smaller margin, and the Canadian Delegation is instructed in the attached draft article to continue the practice of voting against it, if its defeat appears likely. There is, however, a possibility that it will succeed. I am suggesting, subject to your approval, that Canada should abstain rather than vote against this amendment, if the Delegation considers that there may be a significant shift towards favouring the Indian request for inclusion of the item on the Agenda. (See paragraph 18 of the attached article.)

5. An abstention could be defended on the grounds that Canada, while not committing itself on the issue of Chinese representation, is unwilling to oppose the desire of a large number of members *to discuss* the issue. By way of further justification it can be pointed out that, should the Indians succeed and the item be included on the Agenda, and should a motion subsequently be made to decide who should actually sit as the representatives of the Government of China, the General Assembly could — and no doubt would — decide by a simple majority vote (including Canada) that this is an important question and therefore requires a two-thirds majority for a decision. There is, therefore, very little danger that the United States will not be able, in the final analysis, to prevent admission of Communist China.

¹⁷ Note marginale :/Marginal note:
OK SE S[mith]