

I do not mean by this that the parties must approve what we do. Clearly the members of the Council have to accept their responsibilities under the Charter to take practical steps leading to a just solution. But in the context of what is admittedly a diplomatic initiative, not an imposed solution, this means that the acquiescence of the States directly concerned is essential. The mandate given to the special representative therefore requires that it entail an equitable balance of obligations on all parties.

In our discussions emphasis has been placed on withdrawal and on the context in which it should take place. This indeed, I suggest, is the main question dividing us at the present time. Some have argued that withdrawal is the prior condition required for a settlement: that we should resurrect a situation which existed before hostilities broke out in June. We believe this is both unrealistic and undesirable. Withdrawal is indeed a crucial element, but it cannot stand in isolation and we must at all costs avoid re-creating the circumstances which led to the outbreak of hostilities last June; and we must ensure that those circumstances do not recur.

In brief, our aim should be to move from a state of war to a state of peace - a just peace. If our aim is to bring about a settlement or a political solution, there must be withdrawal to secure and recognized borders, or borders which are respected and acknowledged, as we said in working drafts which Canada and Denmark discussed with other Council members in recent days in our informal consultations. These drafts have all included a provision for withdrawal. Our contribution to the negotiating process of the past several weeks has been to try to suggest the definition of the nature of the equilibrium required in order to bring the process of peaceful settlement into operation.

We regret that the draft resolution offered in the name of India, Nigeria and Mali does not seem to us likely to have the effect that we desire of beginning the process of peaceful settlement. We prefer the United States draft because it more fully meets the criteria of equilibrium which I have mentioned. Our aim, however, is not -- and I agree in this with the representative of Ethiopia -- to enter into competition and contention but to seek agreement among us and the **earliest possible action by the Council** that would be of help to the parties in the dispute and the suffering peoples of the Middle East.

Canada is for withdrawal -- yes, withdrawal which leads to peaceful conditions and not to a return to the state of affairs which led ~~to~~ the recent conflict and which was brought to this Council by Denmark and ourselves on 24 May last.

The time for moving to a peaceful settlement or political solution is long overdue and we urge the Council not to lose heart but to continue all efforts to try to reach agreement on a text which will achieve this goal.