

tributions to the Fund.

PALESTINE PARTITION: The General Assembly in plenary session continues today discussion of the report of the ad hoc Committee on Palestine. The report (which was adopted by the ad hoc Committee on a vote of 25 to 13) calls for the partition of Palestine into two states -- one Arab, one Jewish -- which would gain full independence not later than Oct. 1, 1948. A two-thirds majority of those present and voting will be needed to secure Assembly approval of the plan.

Speaking in the General Assembly plenary, Nov. 26, the Minister of Justice, Mr. Ilsey, said: We are voting for the partition plan, because it is in our judgment the best of four unattractive and difficult alternatives.

These alternatives are:

To do nothing.

To set up a unitary Arab state in accordance with the plan of Sub-Committee II.

To set up a federal state in accordance with the minority recommendations of the United Nations Special Commission on Palestine.

Partition.

Let us take these one by one. First, the objections to doing nothing are obvious. For the United Nations to do nothing in this situation would be an abdication, a shirking of its responsibilities in a situation which is pregnant with peril to peace. It would invite not only confusion but widespread violence, involving not only the people of Palestine, but people elsewhere. It would, not improbably, result in blood-shed and a kind of irregular and murderous warfare which might spread far. We dismissed this first alternative as not worthy of the United Nations, highly dangerous in its probable consequences, indexed as virtually unthinkable.

PROPOSED UNITARY STATE

The second alternative is to set up a unitary Arab state along the lines recommended by Sub-Committee II of the ad hoc Committee, or at least to let such a unitary Arab state emerge at the time of the termination of the mandate. This course would have been the normal and natural one to pursue had it not been for the Balfour declaration, the League of Nations mandate, the encouragement given to the immigration of Jews into Palestine over a quarter of a century, the establishment of a well rooted community of nearly 700,000 Jews in Palestine who have invested there, as we are told, \$600,000,000, and the devotion on the part of Jews all over the world to the idea of a Jewish national home in a country which once at least was a Jewish land. But these factors cannot be ignored, they make the Palestine problem sue generis and unique. They constitute a fatal flaw in the otherwise unanswerable Arab case. It is because of these factors that the project for a unitary state - has been repeatedly dismissed by a multiplicity of commissions on the Palestine problem, of which the United Nations Special Commission on

Palestine was the, latest, and decisively rejected by the ad hoc Committee. There is not a chance that this alternative can find acceptance by any but a small minority of the nations of the world. As a solution it is beyond the realm of the practical.

THE YUGOSLAV PLAN

Similarly, the third alternative, a federal state, while more defensible than the one I have just discussed, has made in this organization very little appeal. Espoused by Yugoslavia, which has argued the case with care, patience and conviction, the minority report of the United Nations Special Commission on Palestine has made no headway, received little support from other nations and was not presented for consideration by a section of the ad hoc Committee large enough even to justify the setting up of a Sub-Committee to explore its possibilities. Embodying as it does the essential features of a federal scheme, the Yugoslav plan, as I shall call it, has certain elements of attractiveness to Canadians. As I indicated in my opening speech on the Palestine question before the ad hoc Committee, the Canadian delegation wished that a federal plan could be worked out along these or similar lines. They are the lines along which our own national development has proceeded, with reasonable satisfaction to both racial elements in our population. But Palestine is not Canada, and the Yugoslav plan has received no support whatever either from the Jewish Agency or the Arab Higher Committee. A plan which appeals to neither Jews nor Arabs and which opens up vast vistas of difficulty in adjustment and administration is not a plan upon which this Assembly would be justified in concentrating further attention.

PLAN OF PARTITION

This leaves the fourth plan - the plan of partition - which we have decided to support as the least objectionable of the four. We support this plan with heavy hearts and many misgivings. No responsible delegation could do otherwise, after listening to the threats of reprisals and all the talk of fire and sword which we have heard from both sides to this controversy, in the ad hoc Committee, and today. But it would be folly to assume that there would be any less likelihood of disorder if any of the other alternatives were adopted. Indeed, in our judgment, this likelihood in the case of every one of them would be not less but greater. The fact that after twenty-five years of international action in relation to Palestine, culminating with months of consideration by the General Assembly of the United Nations, we should find ourselves in this atmosphere of acrimonious recrimination is a melancholy one. The air is heavy with gloomy forebodings, represented by one side or the other as savage threats or responsible predictions.

But something must be done with this problem and we are satisfied that, full of dif-

iculties as the partition solution is, any other solution would be worse. There is, of course, the hope that once definitive action is taken there will be a change of heart on the part of the responsible leaders of the two opposing camps. This is the more likely from the fact that of all the solutions proposed, partition alone has received the support of the two greatest world powers. We must take it as certain that well meant and fervent exhortations to conciliation, the kind of exhortation that we have heard during the last two months are getting nowhere. These appeals and entreaties may make more progress after a decision by this organization on the partition solution is arrived at. This is the ray of hope in the situation.

FAR-REACHING RESPONSIBILITY

It is not for Canada to advise other nations on the course they should take in this vote, and we doubt whether such advice would be either welcome or effective. But we find it difficult to understand the large number of abstentions which we assume will take place when we come to the vote. In the case of some nations reasons have been given. In other cases the explanation probably is that nations like our own, far removed from Palestine, which had no part in the events leading up to this denouement, which made no promises to the Arabs and no promises to the Jews, least of all to both, which played no politics with the situation, and which have nothing but the kindest feelings toward both Arabs and Jews, find it difficult to see why there should be thrown upon their shoulders a profoundly disturbing responsibility for a grave and far-reaching decision.

The Canadian delegation appreciates these sentiments on the part of many nations. Indeed to some extent we share them. But we do not feel that they would justify us in abstaining from this vote. We have, as this Assembly knows, taken our full share of responsibility in this matter throughout the entire session. We have worked unremittingly in an attempt to obtain a solution which would be practical and workable, and we feel that our obligations, not only to this organization, but to our own people, are such that we could not justify an abstention and should vote for the resolution. This we propose to do.

In the ad hoc Palestine Committee --- where only a simple majority is needed --- the partition plan carried on a vote of 25 to 13. Canada voted for partition.

The Committee divided:

For partition: (25) Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, White Russia, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Iceland, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Sweden, Ukraine, South Africa, Russia, the United States, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against partition: (13) Afghanistan, Cuba, Egypt, India, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Siam, Syria, Turkey, Yemen.

Abstain: (17) Argentina, Belgium, China, Colombia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Britain, Yugoslavia.

Absent: (2) Paraguay, Philippines.

Before the Committee vote, Canada and Denmark collaborated in an amendment to the partition plan aimed to remove doubts held by some delegates as to the legality of the scheme under the UN Charter.

L.B. Pearson, Under-Secretary for External Affairs, successfully urged the Committee to accept the amendment.

He said there had been doubts in the Palestine Sub-Committee, which drafted the partition plan, over the legal aspect of the scheme.

The Canadian delegation had not been satisfied with its legality, but others had and the plan was allowed to be passed on to the full Committee.

He was glad this effort could be made now to smooth out some of the legal difficulties.

Mr. Pearson added: If there is no threat to peace in the estimation of the Security Council, then the UN Commission's authority will rest on the Assembly resolution.

But if there is a threat, the commission's authority would be strengthened by the authority of the Security Council. Its authority would be strengthened when action had to be taken and this added authority was needed.

Mr. Pearson explained that the amendment would not give the council authority over the commission, except in case of a threat to peace.

It helps to remove some of the constitutional doubts regarding the commission's position in time of an emergency, he added.

A further Canadian amendment, which was approved, would give residents of one of the new states the right to opt for citizenship in the other and to take part in elections.

10,000 DUTCH IMMIGRANTS

ULTIMATE FARM OWNERS: Their aim the ultimate ownership of farms in this country, 10,000 Dutch agriculturists will emigrate to Canada next year, it is announced jointly by Mr. J. Allison Glen, Minister of Mines and Resources, and Dr. A.S. Tuinman, Agricultural Attache of the Netherlands Embassy at Ottawa.

To facilitate the passage of the Dutch families, who will pay their way to Canada, the Netherlands Government has chartered two vessels, the S.S. "Tabinta" and the S.S. "Kotabaroe", which will make a total of thirteen trips, carrying approximately 770 passengers each time. The first two arrivals will be at Halifax early in March, with the remainder scheduled for St. Lawrence River ports.

Owing to present exchange restrictions, these Dutch families will be unable at first to establish themselves on farms in Canada. They have agreed, however, to accept agricultural employment in all parts of the Dominion