

the situation on the ground does not seem to have varied greatly from what it was at the resumption of hostilities. Egyptian forces are established in strength on the east bank of the Suez Canal but their further advance into Sinai is hotly contested by Israeli forces.

On the Golan Heights, Israel has apparently recovered ground yielded initially to Syrian forces but has met strong resistance in its penetration of Syrian territory. What is clear is that the continuing fighting in the air and at sea, as well as on the ground, the steadily mounting casualties on both sides, the resupply of destroyed arms, and finally the growing involvement of civilian populations altogether give a distressing picture unrelieved by clear hopes of a cessation of hostilities.

At a time like this we look to the United Nations. The Secretary General stated in his appeal last week:

I am profoundly concerned with the role of the UN in such circumstances. The primary purpose of our organization is the maintenance of international peace and security. If we fail in that role, the central point of the organization's existence is jeopardized.

With the United Nations Security Council apparently unable to agree on the terms of an appeal for a ceasefire, there is increasing concern that the conflict in the Middle-East may have wider implications for the world at large, and may indeed endanger the whole process of détente which eastern and western governments had laboriously been working at over the past few years and with which Canada has been very much concerned.

I do not intend to dwell on why the fighting resumed at this particular time. The facts are that the truce has been violently broken, a truce which never evolved as was intended toward a settlement in the intervening years since 1967. Immediately at the end of that conflict a long and difficult negotiation, in which Canada actively participated, took place in the Security Council of the United Nations, with the result that resolution 242 was adopted unanimously. Every word of that resolution was negotiated and its delicate balance results from a protracted effort at setting out in the clearest possible terms, acceptable to the greatest possible number of states, the main points which have to be dealt with in order that there may be the beginning of a settlement to the Middle-Eastern conflict which has been with us for 25 years.

I had thought, Mr. Speaker, that I might read into the record the terms of resolution 242, but in order to save time I wonder whether it might be agreed that the text be included in *Hansard* at this point in my speech.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

[*Editor's note: The resolution referred to above is as follows:*]

**RESOLUTION 242 (1967)**

Adopted by the Security Council at its 1382nd meeting, on 22 November, 1967

The Security Council,

Expressing its continuing concern with the grave situation in the Middle-East,

*Arab-Israeli War*

Emphasizing the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and the need to work for a just and lasting peace in which every state in the area can live in security,

Emphasizing further that all member states in their acceptance of the Charter of the United Nations have undertaken a commitment to act in accordance with article 2 of the charter,

1. *Affirms* that the fulfilment of charter principles requires the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle-East which should include the application of both the following principles:

- (i) Withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict;
- (ii) Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force;

2. *Affirms further* the necessity

- (a) For guaranteeing freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area;
- (b) For achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem;
- (c) For guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every state in the area, through measures including the establishment of demilitarized zones;

3. *Requests* the Secretary General to designate a special representative to proceed to the Middle-East to establish and maintain contacts with the states concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles in this resolution;

4. *Requests* the Secretary General to report to the Security Council on the progress of the efforts of the special representative as soon as possible.

**Mr. Sharp:** Canada has supported resolution 242 since its adoption in 1967. Our adherence has been total but strictly limited to the terms of the resolution itself, and we have always refused to add anything to it or subtract anything from it or even to interpret it or draw implications from it that were not immediately apparent from the very wording. Since it is the only text in the whole 25 years of recent Middle-Eastern history that has met with wide acceptance, we still believe that it constitutes the only suitable and available framework for peace.

● (2010)

This peace must come from a settlement negotiated by all the parties involved in the conflict. There is no other way to devise a just and lasting settlement. One implication that can be drawn from the recent resumption of hostilities is that even the greatest powers cannot impose a settlement but, on the contrary, may be drawn into the conflict on opposing sides and thereby endanger their own attempts at opening a dialogue and developing a better climate for the peaceful resolution of other world problems.

When I say that a negotiated settlement on the basis of resolution 242 is the only way finally to resolve the conflict, I am fully aware that since 1967 the two sides have never come together on the means of getting down to negotiations or the discussion of a settlement. While the numerous efforts of intermediaries such as Ambassador Jarring on behalf of the United Nations went on, the positions of the two sides never came quite close enough to open the avenue to negotiations and to the implementation of resolution 242. Therefore, the ceasefire which was to open these avenues finally broke down.