

Mr. Reid (New Zealand), in explaining the proposal, said that he was aware that it did not have the agreement of both parties. It was true that the agreement of both Arabs and Jews had been obtained for certain actions, but it was necessary that the United Nations, if it were not to divest itself of responsibility for Jerusalem, should go further. The General Assembly had, in effect, asked the Council to recommend just some such measure as was now being proposed.

When the New Zealand amendment was put to the vote it was narrowly defeated by a vote of 5 to 4 (France, Australia, and the U.S.S.R. supporting New Zealand), with 1 abstention. The United States delegation voted against the proposal not because of any objection in principle, but solely because in their view only a trusteeship agreement would provide a legal basis for action by the United Nations. The representative of Belgium and several others declared themselves unable to support a proposed measure which did not have the agreement of the Arab Higher Committee.

Following upon the defeat of the New Zealand proposal, the Council adopted a Belgian draft which recognized that the appointment of a Special Municipal Commissioner would not provide adequate protection for Jerusalem and its inhabitants, and suggested that the General Assembly give urgent attention to the necessity for providing for the custody of the assets of the mandatory Power in Jerusalem and for the effective maintenance of law and order in the municipality pending a final settlement.

General Assembly

When the report of the Trusteeship Council came before the Assembly on 6th May, Sir Carl Berendsen took the opportunity of expressing again New Zealand's views on the matter. While applauding the success of the Trusteeship Council in obtaining a temporary truce in the Walled City, the leader of the New Zealand delegation attacked the "complete inadequacy" of the other measures envisaged in the report. Calling upon the Assembly to take active measures to ensure the maintenance of law and order in Jerusalem, he said that it might well be, not that the United Nations should make no decision until the parties had come to an agreement, but rather that there would be no agreement until the United Nations had decided its course and made it plain that that course would be followed with impartiality and determination. "New Zealand," he said, "would, of course, support any effective arrangement which met with the agreement of the Arabs and Jews, but an authority must be provided for Jerusalem whether it be agreed to by both parties or not." This could be done either by endowing a United Nations delegate with powers to maintain law and order or by establishing an *ad hoc* trusteeship for the city. Sir Carl Berendsen was