

The roots of this crisis go deep. Its development has been complex. No one government can in our view be held wholly responsible for what has happened and the impartial reports of the Secretary-General support this assessment. It was on the basis of those reports that we were concerned first to prevent the conflict; then to stop it; and now to find the basis for a just and lasting peace.

In 1948-49 and in 1956-57 the Canadian delegation at the Assembly emphasized that the peace and security of the Middle East depended primarily on the recognition of two facts: the first was that the new state of Israel had been born and that in part at least it owed its existence as a member of the international community to a recommendation of this Assembly, approved by two-thirds of its members; the second was the obligation of the state of Israel, to quote the Canadian Representative speaking on November 22, 1948, to "place self-imposed limits on its demands." Mr. Pearson, then Secretary of State for External Affairs, stated here 10 years ago: "We cannot but agree that if Israel has a right to live and prosper free from the fear of strangulation from its neighbours the Arab states also have a right to feel confident that Israel will not attempt to expand its territory at their expense."

These expectations remain valid. They must be the basis on which peace and security is built in the Middle East. We shall continue to do our part, both as a member of the Security Council and as a participant in the efforts of the United Nations to keep the peace in the area, to have them recognized and implemented. The international community has a right to expect that the parties to any dispute will make their best efforts, as they are required to do under the Charter, to find a peaceful means of settlement. At the same time the United Nations has a responsibility to offer its services and if necessary to point the way towards such a settlement. In any event, this is the context in which my Government will judge the specific issues before us.

The position of Canada remains the same on these issues as it was in 1957. On January 18 of that year we stated in the Assembly that "there must be no return, if we can avoid it, to the conditions which helped provoke the initial military action." On that occasion Mr. Pearson recalled an earlier intervention in which he was even more specific. This is what he said:

"What then...six months from now? Are we to go through all this again? Are we to return merely to the status quo ante? Such a return would not be to a position of security..but would be a return to terror, bloodshed, strife, incidents, charges, and counter-charges, and ultimately another explosion ..."