

With these considerations in mind Australia presented a draft resolution which stressed that the 29 November resolution was the "basic starting point of settlement." The resolution also contained a paragraph requesting the Security Council to give sympathetic consideration to Israel's application for admission to the United Nations.

The representative of the *Soviet Union*, supported by other Eastern European States, strongly attacked the Mediator's proposals and the British resolution on the grounds that they were clearly contrary to the Assembly's decision of 29 November and constituted a new attempt to impose a decision on the United Nations "in the interests of the United States and United Kingdom General Staffs and the oil monopolies." The policy of the United Kingdom and the United States was one of self-interest aimed at annexing valuable strategic areas to Transjordan, which every one knew was merely "a puppet of the United Kingdom." The interests of the people of Palestine, on the other hand, required the substantial implementation of the resolution of 29 November. Furthermore, in order to establish peace in Palestine it was necessary to withdraw all foreign armed forces from the territory of Palestine.

The position at the conclusion of the general debate was extremely confused and it was clear that there was as yet no chance of the emergence of a majority view. In addition to the draft resolutions already mentioned, a considerable number of other resolutions and amendments had been introduced. The *New Zealand* representative proposed the establishment of a sub-committee to list the major issues in order to enable the Committee to deal rapidly with the essentials of the problem and to reach, if possible, a unanimous solution. Eventually a working group was appointed to prepare a consolidated list of the various texts presented.

The *New Zealand* representative (Mr Fraser) took the opportunity afforded by the discussion of this list to express the general views of his delegation on the present situation in Palestine. While he agreed that it was eminently desirable that the problem of boundaries should be decided by mutual agreement, there could be no attempt to revise the 29 November resolution, since the fact of the existence of Israel could not be disputed. Further, there appeared to be no possibility of agreement between the parties unless the United Nations recognized its responsibility to induce them, by all possible means, to negotiate. The New Zealand delegation still fully supported the Assembly resolution of 29 November and considered that it should constitute the basis of the work of the proposed Commission, but there was no objection to the Mediator's conclusions being taken into account in subsequent negotiations. The aim of the New Zealand delegation was to see the institution of a real peace, and it was to be hoped that the