## 3 5036 01031950 n

## CANADIAN MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

PRESS RELEASE No. 78

November 15, 1967

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Press Office 866 United Nations Plaza Suite 250 New York, N. Y. 10017 PLaza 1-5600

## MIDDLE EAST

Text of Statement made by the Canadian Permanent Representative, Mr. George Ignatieff, in the Security Council, on Wednesday, November 15, 1967.

My delegation has listened with greatest care and attention to the statements made at our meetings on November 9, November 13, as well as today. I have also been, as I am sure all of us around this table have been, reflecting on the situation facing the Council and this leads me to offer a few additional comments at this time on the best way I see that we might proceed if we are to avoid an impasse. Despite the firm and to some extent contradictory positions adopted by the parties involved in the dispute and notwithstanding the conflicting interpretations we have heard of motives and intentions and indeed of events, it does seem to me that certain things are becoming clear.

First of all, I do believe that there is a strong momentum in this Council in favour of making further effort to reach agreement. Many of my colleagues have openly supported this approach; none has rejected it. It is also significant that the representatives of the States directly concerned in the area, whatever their views on the draft resolutions before us, have not rejected efforts to find a formula designed to enable a special representative to go out to the area provided that this mission does not prejudice their respective basic positions.

Secondly, there seems to be a more general acceptance than ever before that Council action at this time has to be within the framework of Chapter 6--a framework which enables us to seek agreement on a diplomatic initiative designed to open the way to a peaceful settlement.

In this connection I welcome the constructive contribution of the distinguished representative of India as set forth at our meeting on November 13, when he recalled the terms of Article 33 which enjoins the parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger international

		 	** ** *
	a · ·		
%			
			٠.,
•			·
'			

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.