

We did not then and do not now see how it is to be implemented.

We have studied with care the statements of other delegations regarding this resolution, and I would be less than frank if I did not state that the explanations of those who supported this resolution in the committee did not give us any reason to believe that this proposal will offer a practicable solution.

We are strengthened in that view by the comments which have been made by the representatives of the United Kingdom, The Netherlands and Sweden in this Assembly, and by the United States in committee.

My delegation has emphasized that our first consideration is the effective protection of the Holy Places. We believe, as the vast majority of delegations here believe, that this effective protection can only be ensured by effective and adequate international authority.

This does not mean, however, that the mere adoption by this Assembly of a sweeping resolution for the most complete international administration over a city, irrespective of the wishes of the inhabitants, can give this protection. Indeed, there is reason to fear that if the Assembly disregards the real needs and the genuine aspirations of the people who live in the Jerusalem area, the result may be to endanger the very Holy Places whose protection is our greatest interest and concern.

The wishes of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and of the populations of the neighbouring areas, cannot, in the view of my delegation, be the sole or in any sense an over-riding criterion, in determining the appropriate measures necessary for sites whose sacred character makes them a matter of deep and abiding concern for millions and millions of people throughout the world.

It is, however, no less true that the legitimate interests, and the attitudes and aspirations of the inhabitants, cannot be ignored if we are to achieve a solution that will work and which will endure. To adopt in this General Assembly a solution that would not work would, in our view, be a great disservice to the United Nations, and more particularly, it would be an act of irresponsibility in regard to the Holy Places whose protection, I repeat, it must be our first duty to ensure.

My delegation will therefore vote against the proposal initiated by Australia, and amended by the delegations of Salvador, Lebanon and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L.B. Pearson, made a statement in the general debate at the opening of this session of the Assembly, which illustrates the attitude of my Government on this, as on many other matters affecting the United Nations. Mr. Pearson said, and I quote:

"So far as the Canadian Government is concerned, we have tried to make practicability the touchstone of our attitude towards the United Nations. Where we consider there is any real promise that a proposed course of action will contribute effectively to the solution of any particular problem, we are prepared to give it our full support. On the other hand, we wish to avoid giving to the United Nations, tasks which in the light of the