

provisions of the Charter. For the rest the discussion was lost sight of in a procedural debate on a Guatemalan proposal that a sub-committee be appointed to report on whether trusteeship was desired or would be accepted by the population of Palestine and whether it was possible to implement trusteeship and make it workable. Finally, the delegate of France suggested that the United States delegation should tell the Committee what it considered to be the main points in its trusteeship plan. These items could then be discussed in turn without commitment, and the Committee would thus gain a general picture of the plan.

At this point the question of the protection of Jerusalem was referred to the Trusteeship Council, and the Council and the First Committee met contemporaneously. Later the First Committee again referred this question to Sub-committee 10, which met while Sub-committee 9 was discussing Palestine as a whole. In this way the problem of Jerusalem became almost a separate issue, and in order to report adequately upon it I have dealt with it in another section of this report, beginning at page 20.

In the First Committee the Chairman presented a list of the main points of the United States working paper on the lines of the summary mentioned earlier, and discussion was limited to each item in turn. In each case the United States representative, Dr. Jessup, made an explanatory statement and asked for the views of the other delegations. With rare exceptions, however, the Arab delegations, notably Syria and Egypt, were the only ones prepared to offer comments. Opposition was expressed to the wide executive and administrative powers proposed for the Governor-General, to the provisions for citizenship, land tenure, immigration, and to the proposal for the United Nations itself to be the administering authority. The crucial provision relating to the power of the Governor-General—to call on unspecified members of the United Nations for assistance in the enforcement of law and order—elicited no comment whatever from the Committee. Thus the detailed discussion clarified only one point—namely, that the Arab States would oppose any trusteeship agreement that did not meet the Arab viewpoint on all matters at issue in Palestine, particularly immigration and land tenure. When, finally, the representative of the Jewish Agency flatly rejected the trusteeship proposals both in principle and detail and the representatives of Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union, and Guatemala again attacked the proposals, it was apparent that the United States working paper was of little further use as a basis for discussion.

On 3rd May, twelve days before the termination of the mandate, Mr. Creech-Jones, United Kingdom, gave the debate new direction. Both Jews and Arabs had, he said, doubted the value of trusteeship,