

of a political settlement in Indonesia;

Commends the members of the Committee of Good Offices for the assistance they have given the two parties in their endeavours to settle their dispute by peaceful means, and endorses their offer of continued good offices in the working out of a political settlement;

Maintains its offer of good offices contained in the Resolution of August 25th, 1947, and, to this end,

Requests both parties and the Committee of Good Offices to keep the Council directly informed about the progress of the political settlement in Indonesia.

### PROBLEM OF PALESTINE

**CANADA URGES CONCILIATION:** Gen. McNaughton, Canadian representative, made an urgent plea for conciliation when the Palestine question again came before the Security Council, March 3.

"Even at this late hour, Gen. McNaughton pressed, conciliation in our view must be tried for surely the realization must be growing upon both communities in Palestine that the present course of violence and inflexible resistance against one another can only bring chaos and mutual destruction."

The position taken by Canada, Gen. McNaughton added, was not to be interpreted as in any way repudiating or abandoning the recommendations of the General Assembly on partition with economic union. That was a matter, on which the Council should not, in the opinion of the Canadian delegation, take a decision until the Committee of the five permanent members had a further opportunity to investigate, consult and report.

#### AMENDMENT TO U.S. RESOLUTION

Gen. McNaughton gave his support to a Belgian amendment to the resolution on Palestine previously submitted by the United States.

The U.S. resolution, which was submitted to the Security Council February 25, proposed that a committee of the Big Five (U.S., Russia, U.K., France and China) should consider whether the situation in Palestine constitutes a threat to international peace and to report its conclusions "as a matter of urgency" with any recommendations for action it considers appropriate.

The first operative paragraph of the United States draft resolution reads:

The Security Council Resolves:

1. To accept, subject to the authority of the Security Council under the Charter, the requests addressed by the General Assembly to it in paragraphs (a) (b) and (c) of the General Assembly resolution of 29 November, 1947.

(The indicated requests of the General Assembly resolution are:

- (a) Request of the Assembly for the Security

Council to take necessary measures as provided in the Palestine partition plan for its implementation;

- (b) Consideration by the Security Council of the question whether the situation in Palestine in the transitional period constitutes a threat to peace and
- (c) Determination by the Security Council as threat to peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression under Article 39 of the Charter of any attempt to alter by force the settlement envisaged by the Assembly resolution).

The remaining paragraphs of the United States resolution provide for appointment of the Big Five Committee.

#### EFFECT OF BELGIAN AMENDMENT

The Belgian amendment would delete paragraph 1 from the United States resolution, containing the acceptance by the Security Council of the requests addressed to it in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c). Provision for appointment of a Big Five Committee would remain.

Warren B. Austin (United States) opposing the Belgian amendment, said a vote for the first paragraph of the U.S. resolution would be a vote for partition as a Palestine solution. "The USA voted for that solution and still supports it, Mr. Austin said. The United States supports the General Assembly plan for partition as the framework of implementation by pacific means".

Taken altogether, Mr. Austin said, paragraph 1 of the U.S. resolution meant "that the Security Council will do everything it can under the Charter to give effect to the recommendation of the General Assembly".

#### BRITISH ATTITUDE UNCHANGED

Arthur Creech-Jones (United Kingdom) told the Council that the "date of the termination of our responsibility is irrevocably fixed" and the United Kingdom could not participate in any committee such as the one envisaged by the U.S. resolution, but would assist with all necessary information.

Andrei Gromyki (USSR) while agreeing to paragraph 1 to the U.S. resolution opposed the U.S. proposal for a Council committee of the Big Five. "In our opinion," said Mr. Gromyko, "the Five Powers should consult among themselves directly, outside of any committee, insofar as permanent members of the Security Council have as yet shown any initiative in the matter, the Security Council could appeal to them, or request them, to begin immediately with such consultation and to inform the Council of the results within 10-15 days".

#### GEN. McNAUGHTON TEXT

General McNaughton said: At this stage in the discussion of the Palestine question it is not necessary for me, Mr. President, to emphasize the seriousness of the situation which has been drawn to the attention of the Council by the two reports of the Palestine Commission

which are before us. Every day which passes brings news of continued violence, of hostility, and of the mounting toll of lives which have been lost.

That the situation is very grave indeed is not questioned by any of the parties directly concerned. What is in question is the action which the Council should now take in the face of this serious and critical situation.

We continue to hear charges and counter charges from the representatives of the parties involved; we continue to hear, as we did during the meetings of the General Assembly, expressions of defiance and of threats to resort to arms.

#### SITUATION BEFORE COUNCIL

Members of Council will recall that the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 29th November, 1947 not only recommended the terms for a political settlement, but also called upon the inhabitants of Palestine to "take such steps as may be necessary on their part to put this plan into effect" and appealed to all Governments and all peoples "to refrain from taking any action which might hamper or delay the carrying out of these recommendations".

The situation which confronts the Council today is that these recommendations and these appeals have not had the effect of bringing peace and order in the Holy Land. The threats uttered during the General Assembly have now turned into acts of violence verging on civil war. The sparks ignited by intense emotion and conflicting passions now might at any moment, unless quenched, cause a conflagration which would certainly result in a breach of international peace.

#### ACTION TO ENSURE PEACE

The question then before the Council is what action can and should it take to ensure international peace and security.

As a basis for taking its first decision on this case, the Council has been offered the draft resolution submitted by the distinguished representative of the United States and the amendment to it presented by the distinguished representative of Belgium.

The main difference between these proposals lies in the first paragraph of the United States draft resolution. This provides that subject to certain reservations which have been explained by the distinguished representative of the United States, the Council would accept paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of the General Assembly Resolution of 29th November, 1947.

The Belgian draft contains no such provision but provides, as does the United States proposal, for the setting up of a Committee comprising the five permanent members of the Security Council to look into the situation, to consult with the Palestine Commission, the mandatory Power, and others directly concerned and then to report to the Council as a matter of urgency.

#### PARAMOUNT NECESSITY

It is the opinion of the Canadian delegation that before the Council accepts the position given in the first paragraph of the United States draft, including consideration of action under Article 39 and the other provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, "action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression", the Council should first satisfy itself by its own enquiries and efforts that the situation has indeed passed beyond the possibilities of the "pacific settlement of disputes" as provided for in Chapter VI of the Charter.

In our view it is a paramount necessity that the Council should make every effort towards conciliation before the Council considers taking measures under Chapter VII. Our view in this respect is reinforced by statements made by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom in the Council yesterday. The distinguished representative of the United States for instance stated, and I quote from the verbatim record of the 260th meeting (S/PV260, page 27):

"That armed force cannot be used for implementation of the plan because the Charter limits the use of United Nations force expressly to threats to and breaches of the peace and aggression affecting international peace. Therefore, we must interpret the General Assembly Resolution as meaning that the United Nations measures to implement this Resolution are peaceful measures."

The distinguished representative of the United Kingdom emphasized a further argument in favour of conciliation, when he stated, (S/PV260 page 42-45).

"Whatever may be the merits or demerits of the General Assembly's recommendations, their workability essentially depends upon some measure of cooperation between Jews and Arabs. This cooperation, on which the maintenance of the essential services and normal life of the country depends, cannot be secured by coercion."

#### "EVEN AT THIS LATE HOUR"

Even at this late hour conciliation in our view must be tried for surely the realization must be growing upon both communities in Palestine that the present course of violence and inflexible resistance against one another can only bring chaos and mutual destruction.

For various reasons including the views of the U.S. and U.K. Governments to which I have just made reference, the Canadian delegation therefore believes that the five permanent members, representing as they do countries with special rights and privileges in the Security Council, should make a most serious, and indeed supreme effort, to resolve this situation through conciliation. For this purpose we feel that it would be natural for them to take the General Assembly Resolution of 29th November, 1947, as a starting point, as