

proceeded with if the mandatory Power were to vote against it he would abstain on the question. He further stated that if the Assembly were to approve the principle of trusteeship for Jerusalem the United Kingdom vote would not be used in such a way as to preclude the possibility of the plan coming into effect. The representatives of Australia and the U.S.S.R. opposed the United States plan on the grounds that the Assembly had settled the future of Jerusalem last November and that the resolution of 29th November was still in force. Australia rejected the United States argument that the assumption of authority in Jerusalem by the United Nations could be placed on a legal basis only by the conclusion of a trusteeship agreement, and suggested that the only sensible procedure was for the Council to adopt the draft statute forthwith and appoint a United Nations official who might proceed to Jerusalem and apply the emergency measures contained in the statute.

The New Zealand delegation considered, of course, that the Australian suggestion, if it could have been put into effect, would have provided the best means of dealing with the question. The Council had spent a considerable amount of time in the months after adoption of the General Assembly resolution of 29th November in drafting the details of the statute; it had, indeed, decided that the statute was now "in satisfactory form," but had deferred formal adoption of the document, and, in view of the uncertainties surrounding the whole question of Palestine, had, on 21st April, referred the matter to the General Assembly for instructions. Obviously the simplest method of securing the protection of Jerusalem would have been to adopt the statute, appoint a Governor for the city as provided for in the statute, and empower him to bring into effect immediately those articles of the statute which would permit the recruitment of a police force and other measures designed to assure the maintenance of law and order. Jerusalem and its environs would then have become an international zone in accordance with the Assembly's partition plan. Neither the Assembly, however, nor the majority of the Trusteeship Council were in the mood for such action since the general view (and the New Zealand delegation considered this highly regrettable) was that the partition plan should be regarded as suspended in the meantime.

During the discussion of the United States trusteeship plan the Council was informed by the representative of the mandatory Power that negotiations were simultaneously being conducted in Jerusalem by the chief representative of the International Red Cross with a view to obtaining the agreement of Arabs and Jews to a scheme for placing the municipal area of Jerusalem under the Red Cross. Under this scheme Jews and Arabs would agree to a standstill arrangement and