

prosecution of that great war for liberty, justice, peace, and order which has just concluded, had found itself as the result, as the direct result, of its efforts during that conflict in a position of great difficulty. I think no one will disagree that Britain's temporary weakness—because, believe me, it is temporary only—and the sacrifices in blood, in treasure, and in repute that she has been called upon to make in this thankless and perhaps impossible task, proved to be too much, and the United Kingdom, as you know, last year announced its intention of relinquishing the mandate and laying the whole matter before the United Nations, where, as a world problem, it unquestionably belongs.

I am not one of those who believe that the United Kingdom has deserved the criticism it has received for its administration of the mandate. I am not about to suggest that every step that the British have taken on the matter in Palestine has been wise or well-considered. But I do assert that what they have done from the inception of the mandate until they were forced to the conclusion that the problem was beyond them, and laid the question before the United Nations, they have done with the highest motives, and that no other State represented here, even had it been willing (which it was not) to accept these obligations, would, or indeed could, have done any better in the circumstances as they existed.

But last year Britain agreed that Britain had failed, and the United Nations, in Special Assembly, undertook the responsibility of finding a solution. You all know what happened. After very lengthy debate a Special Committee of the Assembly was sent to Palestine. It conducted exhaustive inquiries, and on its return produced a report to the Assembly, which I have no hesitation in characterizing as a model of moderate and constructive thought.

The views of this Special Committee—and other views—were considered at very great length at the General Assembly meeting in September, and after most careful consideration, and after hearing the representatives of both parties principally concerned in this tragic conflict of rights, the Assembly decided, by the requisite majority of two-thirds, that the course which appeared to offer the best chance of success in the circumstances was that of partition with economic union. Let me repeat that this was decided after the most lengthy and anxious consideration, and let me repeat that it was agreed to, that it was supported, by the requisite majority of the members of this body. Allow me to read the list of those delegations who placed themselves affirmatively on record as supporting the proposal for partition with economic union. They were as follows: Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Byelo-Russia, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Liberia, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Sweden, the Ukraine, South Africa, The Soviet Union, the United States, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

That, then, was the considered decision in November last, the considered decision of the "Town Meeting of the World," the expression of the conscience of this forum of the nations of the world, in a most earnest effort to solve this tragic problem.

Now, I do not think that any delegation which voted in favour of this decision felt that partition was a perfect solution. I think most people were of the opinion that the problem was susceptible of no perfect solution, that any decision at all must inevitably be the cause of injustice