

peace and security, to seek a solution by any of the methods of peaceful settlement open to them under the Charter. Now I may not have been able to agree so far with my Indian and some other colleagues on the exact terms of a resolution by which the responsibilities of the Council might be fulfilled but I do not differ with them on this basic approach. This approach is that the Mandate of the special representative should be clearly within Chapter 6, that the principles and guidelines should be balanced and non-prejudicial to both sides and that the objective is to initiate the process of peaceful settlement of the crisis without delay.

The third area of common ground relates to the despatch of a special representative within the kind of framework we have been discussing. I take it there is basic agreement that we in this Council are not trying, as several Members here have pointed out, to impose a settlement or the terms of a settlement. I believe that what we are trying to do is to follow up the cease-fire by facilitating the settlement of the issues in dispute with the help of a special representative of the Secretary-General. Clearly the mission of this intermediary must be without prejudice to the rights, claims or positions of the States concerned with regard to those issues. Furthermore, it must be acceptable to the Council and be acquiesced in by both sides if it is to get under way as soon as possible and have any hope of success.

I would therefore urge that we now make that additional and determined effort in further private consultations as proposed by the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom earlier today to see if the differences that remain can be reconciled.