

again by the Indian delegate at later meetings of the General Committee, when Sir Alexander Cadogan reiterated his explanation and pointed out that the United Kingdom alone had carried the burden of responsibility and had poured out treasure and blood, and that he did not consider it would be proper for the United Kingdom again to undertake alone such a responsibility if the policy recommended by the Assembly were against the conscience of his Government.

When the item proposed by the United Kingdom was called for discussion the Indian delegate endeavoured to have that proposed by the Arab States dealt with first, but eventually accepted the President's ruling that the United Kingdom item had precedence. After some general discussion this item was approved.

For the debate on the item proposed by the Arab States (the phrase which they themselves applied to their group), the Chairman referred to the provisions of Rule 34 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure, and in accordance with that rule invited the representatives of Iraq, the Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and Syria to come to the table, Egypt already having a seat. The Egyptian delegate opened the case for the Arab item on the agenda, basing his claims on the fact that neither the Balfour declaration nor the mandate had ever been accepted by the population of Palestine, and that both were in contradiction to the spirit and letter of the Covenant of the League of Nations, which in such cases provisionally recognized the principle of independence. For that reason he pressed for inclusion of the Arab item to enable the Assembly to discuss the termination of the mandate and the independence of Palestine. The Egyptian delegate pointed out that the Arabs and Jews are both members of the Semitic race, and that they had been living together in peace and amity all over the world, even in Palestine, until the mandate was established. The whole of the merits of the subject of Palestine would have to be discussed and the appropriate manner in which to provide for such a discussion was to allow this second item proposed by the Arab States to be placed on the agenda.

These views were supported by numerous speeches from all the Arab States during the session of the General Committee—which dragged on for three days—in debates in which the Arab States took the greatest part. The attitude of most of the other members of the General Committee was that, although it was important that the point raised by the suggested item should be discussed in due course, the Special Assembly was not the proper time for such a discussion. It was only one of the possible solutions which should be considered by the proposed Committee of Inquiry, and to include it in the agenda at that time would be to prejudge the issue.

The Soviet representative adopted the attitude that it would be improper to deny to those delegations which desired a full and complete debate on the whole question of Palestine an opportunity to express