

### Canadian Position

The Canadian delegation considered that the plan of partition with economic union, which was the only proposal that seemed likely to receive the support of the Assembly, was, in the circumstances, worthy of consideration. It urged that any study of the partition plan should include an examination of methods for implementation and enforcement.

In discussions on the Palestine question, the Canadian representative attempted to ensure that any plan should be constitutionally sound, practicable and effective and that there should be an adequate legal basis for implementation. Canada also felt that responsibility for the maintenance of order in Palestine should devolve as quickly as possible on the people themselves. If this proved impossible, the problem should be dealt with in the Security Council, where big power support was necessary, by the methods provided in the Charter for settlements of threats to the peace.

In the General Assembly, Canada supported partition "as the best of four (partition, unitary state, federal state, no U.N. recommendation at all) unattractive and difficult alternatives". Canada's policy, admittedly pragmatic, was, if possible, to support a plan that did not make unrealistic demands on the United Kingdom nor leave Canada or other smaller states involved in an operation to which the permanent members of the Security Council did not give united support.

### WAR PROPAGANDA

In his opening speech before the General Assembly and on several later occasions, Mr. Vishinsky, Chairman of the Soviet delegation, made a number of allegations to the effect that efforts were being made in the United States and United Kingdom to incite a new war. He named individuals who, he said, were guilty of "war-mongering", and charged that a deliberate attempt was being made in the press of the western democracies to provoke an attack on the U.S.S.R.

The Soviet introduced a proposal making war-mongering a criminal offence and specifying that the United States, Turkey and Greece were the principal offenders. This was unacceptable to most delegations though it was felt that some more general resolution might be introduced. A joint Australian-Canadian-French resolution was finally adopted unanimously. It called on member nations to take steps to promote friendly relations and "to encourage dissemination of all information designed to give expression to the undoubted desire of all peoples for peace." It condemned all forms of propaganda designed or likely to provoke or encourage any threat to the peace or any act of aggression. Another resolution asked nations to study measures to combat the diffusion of false or distorted reports likely to injure friendly relations.

### Canadian Position

The Canadian delegation was of the opinion that no useful purpose would be accomplished by outright rejection of the Soviet resolution on war propaganda (as some countries wished), since it could then be argued that western states had rejected a proposal that propaganda inciting to war should be condemned.

The Canadian delegation therefore proposed a short resolution which dealt with the positive side of this question and urged members to promote, by all means of publicity and propaganda available, friendly relations among nations on the basis of the purposes and principles of the Charter. The joint Australian-Canadian-French resolution, which was adopted unanimously, was based mainly on the original Canadian proposal.