

informed the United Kingdom and United States delegations about our intention to proceed. I concluded from previous conversations that we could not persuade them to take any positive steps toward a solution. On the same day we had a long discussion of the whole subject, including the course we proposed to follow, with Lodge and Dixon and their advisors (My telegrams Nos. 269-71 of November 11).

8. At no stage in these proceedings did we leave any doubt about the inclusion of Outer Mongolia in the Canadian proposal. I had in mind your intervention in the Standing Committee in which you said, among other things, that "I think it would probably be a good thing if they were all in, even Outer Mongolia, about which I have very little information." Other powers among the prospective co-sponsors shared our belief that any effort in the Assembly should be directed toward attaining the widest possible membership and Menon had expressed an intention to insist on the inclusion of Outer Mongolia. Accordingly, it seemed inevitable that we should envisage the group of eighteen in presenting our draft resolution. Of course, if the great powers could reach an agreement without including Outer Mongolia, we would not have pressed for its inclusion. However, there seemed to be no disposition to reach an agreement on any group, mainly because of Soviet insistence on eighteen or nothing and the United States rejection of Outer Mongolia.

9. On November 15, when I learned *indirectly* that the United States delegation had sent a letter to the President of the Security Council notifying him of their desire to have a meeting to discuss new members, I arranged for a meeting of our co-sponsors. As I reported in my telegram No. 293 of that date, I discussed our intentions with Lodge before the meeting was held. After the meeting, I reported the views of the other co-sponsors to Lodge and Dixon.

10. At the second meeting of co-sponsors, held on the following day, and in deference to view expressed by the United States and the United Kingdom delegations, we changed the wording of our draft resolution to exclude reference to "universality" and to speak of "the widest possible membership of the United Nations." Both Lodge and Dixon said that the changes in the draft resolution would "make their position easier." (My telegram No 298 of Nov 16.)

11. As for Dulles' plea for time, we have made it clear to all concerned that we have no intention of interrupting the current proceedings in the Ad Hoc Political Committee on Palestine refugees. This item is unlikely to be disposed of before the end of this week because as yet there has been no agreement on a draft resolution. When consideration of that item has been completed, however, there will undoubtedly be a strong demand that the admission of new members be considered next. Menon has already indicated that he does not wish to proceed at this stage with the discussion of the treatment of Indians in South Africa. Accordingly, as a matter of regular procedure, we expect the item on new members to be called early next week. Since our draft resolution is now a matter in the hands of twenty-five co-sponsors and since the majority of these are anxious to have the matter considered soon, I see no possibility of delaying discussion beyond the date when it comes up for discussion. In my view it would be not only disastrous to the Canadian position to ask for a further delay but extremely risky from the point of view of all the Western powers.

R.A. MACKAY