

“(4) This special session has not found it possible to agree upon any definitive alternative for the future Government of Palestine, or upon trusteeship, or upon any other form of provisional regime which could exercise authority in Palestine after 15th May ;

“(5) While it is clear, in the light of *present* circumstances, that the plan for partition with economic union as envisaged in the 29th November resolution cannot be implemented, it is likewise clear that pending further action by the General Assembly with regard to the future Government of Palestine, the resolution of 29th November, although it cannot be implemented, remains on the books as a recommendation.”

On the morning of 14th May the First Committee began consideration of the sub-committee's proposal. There was very little debate, as the closure was applied for the second time during the special session. A number of amendments were proposed, two of them by the New Zealand delegation. One of these, which was accepted, inserted the words “ the General Assembly or the ” before the words “ Security Council ” in Section II (3). The other, which was defeated, proposed that paragraph III should read :

Thanks the members of the Palestine Commission for their efforts, and, pending a further decision by the General Assembly or the Security Council, resolves, in the light of the present situation and without prejudice to the General Assembly's Resolution 181 (II) of 29th November, 1947, to suspend the responsibility of the Palestine Commission under that resolution as from a date to be fixed by the Secretary-General.

In moving these amendments Sir Carl Berendsen characterized the action proposed by the sub-committee as “ pitifully inadequate ” and the least the Assembly could do. He deplored the fact that the Assembly was retreating from its decision in the face of opposition and said that it was not surprising that, having now departed from the path of principle, it now found itself floundering in the mire of expediency.

As regards the first New Zealand amendment, Sir Carl said that while he did not object to the Security Council issuing instructions to the Mediator, the paragraph seemed to imply that the Assembly would surrender the powers of direction. It was likely that the Assembly might wish to take up the problem of Palestine at a future session and he therefore considered this amendment appropriate.

On the second amendment Sir Carl said that Section III of the resolution seemed to be an attempt to derogate from the resolution of 29th November or to pretend that it did not exist. The amendment was therefore designed to clarify the understanding that the suspension of the Palestine Commission in no way impaired the authority of the resolution of 29th November.