

at the same time, to offer a way to give effect to the basic principle of the protection of the Holy Places and freedom of access thereto. It offers a much simpler and less arbitrary scheme of international control than the plan proposed by the Trusteeship Council in April 1948, under which an undivided Jerusalem would have been ruled, under the Trusteeship Council, by a United Nations Governor, exercising full executive power and authorized during emergencies to exercise legislative power as well.

In our view, the Conciliation Commission plan is much more practical in that it accepts the existing fact of a divided Jerusalem. The duties of the United Nations Representative, or Commissioner, which it proposes are restricted to what is essential and other matters are left to the competence of responsible Arab and Israeli municipal authorities in the two zones with adequate provision so that they can cooperate in their common interest through the mechanism of the General Council to be created under the plan. Unlike the former proposals of the Trusteeship Council, the Conciliation Commission plan was drafted only after the matters at issue had been fully discussed both in Palestine and at Lausanne with the Arab and Israeli authorities. While these discussions did not succeed in producing an agreed solution, nevertheless, the members of the Conciliation Commission have had at least the benefit of the views of the two parties locally concerned and they have been able to evaluate considerations in the light of the evidence placed before them.

The Canadian Delegation therefore supports the Conciliation Commission plan as a basis for discussion; as regards procedure we suggest that the Sub-Committee might go into details with a view to adjusting the provisions of this plan as may be found necessary or expedient, bearing always in mind the two essential elements of the resolution of December 11, 1948, that is, the effective safeguarding of the Holy Places and free access thereto as a first and paramount requirement, and the "maximum local autonomy" as a second.

It may be that in the Committee it will be found expedient to amend the wording of the Conciliation Commission's plan somewhat to make abundantly certain that the first requirement will take precedence over the second, and further that the General Assembly will continue to have the duty to keep the situation constantly under review so that if arrangements made in relation to the Holy Places should not prove to have worked out satisfactorily, then, the General Assembly will have the right to effect whatever revision it may deem necessary.

The General Assembly could, of course, decide now to go back to the resolution of November 29, 1947, if it wished. In such a case, however, I think we should first make quite sure that we have not only the desire to establish an international city on the grounds that this far-reaching solution is really necessary for the purpose in view, but also we must be sure that we have the willingness to assume the heavy financial, administrative and military obligations which a territorial internationalization would entail. The distinguished Delegate of France, on Saturday, has very pertinently raised that issue. We should not mislead ourselves with words. The Canadian Delegation feels that we would fail to serve either the interest of the international religious community or of the people who live in Jerusalem if we were to adopt such an ambitious scheme without being satisfied that it is really essential and also being fully determined to carry it out in the face of the vigorous opposition which it would certainly arouse. The Canadian Delegation also shares the view expressed by the eminent and experienced