

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records



**2236th
PLENARY MEETING**

Saturday, 21 September 1974,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 8:	
Adoption of the agenda	
First report of the General Committee	39

President: Mr. Abdelaziz BOUTEFLIKA
(Algeria).

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda

FIRST REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE
(A/9750)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly has before it the first report of the General Committee [A/9750]. We shall first examine the Committee's recommendations in section II, dealing with the organization of the session. These are contained in paragraphs 2 to 15 inclusive.

2. Paragraphs 2 and 3 deal with the schedule of meetings and paragraphs 4 and 5 deal with the duration of the general debate and the closure of the list of speakers in that debate. Since the general debate begins on the 23rd, the list of speakers will be closed on the 25th at 6.00 p.m. in accordance with paragraph 4 (b). In paragraphs 6 and 7 the General Committee draws the Assembly's attention to certain recommendations concerning the exercise of the right of reply; paragraph 8 deals with the closing date of the session; paragraph 9 deals with the records of the Main Committees; paragraph 10 deals with the seating arrangements during the session; paragraphs 11 and 12 concern respectively the use of the General Assembly Hall and of the mechanical means of voting; paragraph 13 refers to the interpretation facilities; paragraph 14 deals with the financial implications of draft resolutions; and paragraph 15 relates to the reports of the Main Committees.

3. If there are no comments or objections with regard to the paragraphs I have just mentioned, namely, paragraphs 2 to 15, I shall take it that they are approved by the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We turn now to section III of the report of the General Committee, which deals with the adoption of the agenda. I should like to stress that at present we are not discussing the substance of any item except when such a discussion can assist the As-

sembly in deciding whether or not to include an item in the agenda.

5. Paragraph 17 relates to the report of the Economic and Social Council, item 12 of the draft agenda submitted by the Secretary-General in his memorandum [A/BUR/182 and Add.1]. May I take it that the General Assembly takes note of paragraph 17?

It was so decided.

6. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Paragraph 18 contains a recommendation to delete item 26 of the draft agenda, entitled "Illegal occupation by Portuguese military forces of certain sectors of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and acts of aggression committed by them against the people of the Republic". May I take it that the Assembly adopts that recommendation?

It was so decided.

7. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In paragraph 19, the General Committee recommends a rewording of item 85 of the draft agenda. May I take it that that recommendation is adopted by the General Assembly?

It was so decided.

8. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Paragraph 20 contains a recommendation to defer to the thirty-first session the consideration of item 99 of the draft agenda, entitled "Amendment to Article 22 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice (Seat of the Court) and consequential amendments to Articles 23 and 28". May I take it that the Assembly adopts that recommendation?

It was so decided.

9. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In paragraph 21, the General Committee recommends the inclusion of item 101 of the draft agenda, "Question of the establishment, in accordance with the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness, of a body to which persons claiming the benefit of the Convention may apply". Rule 23 of the rules of procedure provides that debate on the inclusion of an item in the agenda, when that item has been recommended for inclusion by the General Committee, shall be limited to three speakers in favour of, and three against, the inclusion. Does any member wish to speak on the inclusion of the item? May I take it that item 101 is included in the agenda?

It was so decided.

10. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Paragraph 22 recommends the inclusion of item 104 of the draft agenda, entitled "Status of the European Economic Community in the General Assembly", as a matter of high priority. May I take it that the Assembly adopts that recommendation?

It was so decided.

11. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We now come to paragraph 23, containing the General Committee's recommendations on items 106 and 110, relating to Korea. If there are no objections, I shall take it that those recommendations are adopted by the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

12. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We shall now consider the agenda the General Committee recommends to the General Assembly for adoption, as contained in paragraph 24 of its report. In accordance with past practice, we shall follow the numbering given in that paragraph and consider together several items in groups, when that seems appropriate.

13. May I once again remind members that at present we are not discussing the substance of any item except when such discussion can assist the Assembly in deciding whether or not to include an item in the agenda.

14. Agenda items 1 to 6 have already been acted upon in plenary meetings of the General Assembly. May I therefore consider that their inclusion has been approved?

Items 1 to 6 were included in the agenda.

15. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In connexion with agenda item 7, the General Assembly is required only to take note of the communication submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/9730. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly takes note of that communication and approves the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

Item 7 was included in the agenda.

16. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We shall now consider items 8 to 36. If there is no objection, I shall take it that those items are included in the agenda.

Items 8 to 36 were included in the agenda.

17. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We now come to items 37 to 41. Before the Assembly considers the inclusion of these items in the agenda, I call on the representative of South Africa.

18. Mr. BOTHA (South Africa): For the record, and for reasons which are well known, I wish to state that the South African delegation objects both to the inclusion in the agenda and the subsequent consideration of item 37.

19. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): I consider the presence on this rostrum of the speaker who has just spoken as a provocation and an insult to the General Assembly. But since he wishes to provoke, I wish to tell him, as of now, that he will lose nothing by waiting. For the time being, I would request the Assembly to approve the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the General Assembly.

20. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): May I take it that the Assembly decides to include items 37 to 41 in the agenda?

Items 37 to 41 were included in the agenda.

21. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We come next to items 42 to 98. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides to include those items in the agenda.

Items 42 to 98 were included in the agenda.

22. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Item 99—item 101 of the draft agenda—has already been included in the agenda by the decision adopted by the General Assembly [*see para. 9 above*] on paragraph 21 of the General Committee's report.

23. As for items 100 and 101, may I take it that the Assembly has decided to include those items in the agenda?

Items 100 and 101 were included in the agenda.

24. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Item 102—item 104 in the draft agenda—has already been included in the agenda by the decision adopted by the General Assembly [*see para. 10 above*] on paragraph 22 of the General Committee's report.

25. As for item 103, may I take it that the Assembly has decided to include this item in the agenda?

Item 103 was included in the agenda.

26. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Item 104—item 106 in the draft agenda—has already been included in the agenda by the decision adopted by the General Assembly [*see para. 11 above*] on paragraph 23 of the General Committee's report.

27. Now we come to items 105, 106 and 107. May I take it that the Assembly has decided to include these items in the agenda?

Items 105, 106 and 107 were included in the agenda.

28. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next item on the list is item 108, entitled "Question of Palestine".

29. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): At the General Committee's 219th meeting I asked for the floor to place on record the fact that inclusion in the agenda of the item entitled "Question of Palestine" is prejudicial to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and detrimental to the peace efforts in the Middle East. There was no need to wait for the actual debate on the item to find confirmation of these grave implications and dire repercussions. Such confirmation was provided in great abundance in the General Committee itself by the sponsors of the item. Indeed there could not have been a more blatant travesty of the Charter than the support expressed by those sponsors for a murder organization committed to the destruction of a State Member of the United Nations. The covenant of the umbrella organization of the Arab terrorist groups, the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], stipulates, *inter alia*—and I quote article 19: "The partition of Palestine in 1947 and the establishment of Israel are fundamentally null and void." Article 20 reads: "The claim of a historical or spiritual tie between Jews and Palestine does not tally with historical realities. The Jews are not one people with an independent personality." Article 21 states: "The liberation of Palestine will purge the Zionist presence from Palestine. The Palestine Arab people rejects every solution that is a substitute for a complete liberation of Palestine and rejects

all plans that aim at the settlement of the Palestinian issue."

30. That is the organization at whose behest the question of Palestine is being included in the agenda of the General Assembly. That is the group that is being assisted and defended by the sponsors and supporters of the item. Some of them have already specified that members of that group should be invited to participate in the General Assembly's deliberations on the question of Palestine. That would verily be a spectacle worth pondering: the murderers of Lod and Munich, the planners and executors of the massacres at Khartoum and Athens and Maalot, the hijackers of airplanes, the assassins of innocent children, women and men being accorded the recognition and hospitality of the United Nations. Would a single tenet of the Charter remain intact after such a development? Would any sensible human being find it possible to take the United Nations seriously if it were to act in so irresponsible a manner? If the intentions and aspirations of the States sponsoring the inclusion of the Palestine question in the agenda are fulfilled, we shall see the Charter of the United Nations torn to shreds, the equality of all nations and States trampled into the dust, and murder for the sake of murder triumphant. Is that the destiny of the United Nations? Is that the vocation of the international community? Is it by such an aberration that the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly will go down in history?

31. The masks behind which the sponsors of the item are masquerading cannot conceal their real designs. When they speak of assuring the right of self-determination to the Arab inhabitants of Palestine, they do not mean that at all. Do not the Arabs of Palestine exercise their right to self-determination in the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan? Do they not vote there? Is not the Parliament a Parliament of Palestinian Jordanian members? Is not the Government a Palestinian Jordanian Government? Do the Arabs of Palestine not exercise in Palestinian Jordan their national rights? Are they not independent in a State which is Palestinian historically, geographically, demographically and politically?

32. When those who have brought the Palestine question before the General Assembly speak of inalienable rights and self-determination, they have in mind not the vindication but the negation of those rights—the denial of the rights of self-determination, independence and sovereignty to the Jewish people. The Palestinian Arabs are already endowed with these rights and if their exercise leaves anything to be desired it can be supplemented and completed in the most natural manner within the framework of the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan. No one, including Israel, questions these rights. However, the sponsors of the inclusion of the Palestinian question in the agenda are openly and unabashedly questioning the inalienable national rights of the people of Israel. No protestations of alleged peaceful desires can cover up this sinister attitude.

33. A State siding with the so-called PLO, a State supporting that organization in its barbaric activities directed against the existence of Israel and the life of its people, cannot pretend to be desirous of true peace with Israel. A State raising the Palestine ques-

tion in a spirit of obvious belligerency towards Israel cannot be considered as being for the cause of constructing peace in the region in co-operation with Israel. A State fanning the flames of hostility towards Israel and encouraging public polemics and acrimony in the General Assembly inevitably raises doubts regarding its suitability for the co-chairmanship of diplomatic peace-making efforts.

34. Israel's primary objective is the attainment of peace with its Arab neighbours. It is precisely because of this deep-rooted aspiration and hope that Israel must bring to the attention of the General Assembly the adverse effects that the raising of the question of Palestine will have on the peace effort in the Middle East. It is precisely for that reason that Israel must emphasize the heavy responsibilities that States which lend their support to this initiative will be assuming. It is already evident that the inclusion of the item in the agenda is poisoning the atmosphere in the Middle East at a time when what is needed most is a relaxation of the acutely tense relationships there. A debate on the question of Palestine with its foregone conclusions resulting from a mechanical and one-sided majority could deal a crippling blow to the current efforts towards a just and durable peace in the area.

35. Such a possibility is of concern not only to Israel. This is a danger to which thought should be given by the Arab States, by their supporters and by all members of the General Assembly.

36. In any event, the Government of Israel will not stand idly by and watch its vital interests, its fundamental rights and the lives of its citizens being threatened and prejudiced. It will defend itself against the campaign of terrorism that lurks behind the proposed item on the question of Palestine. It will protect its citizens by all the means at its disposal and it will defend its national interests with continued vigour and determination. Israel is a democratic society, with a wealth of differing political views. We are, however, all one in the resolve to stand firm against aggression and belligerency, military and political alike. A desire for peace will always be met by an Israeli readiness for peace. Hostility and assault will always be met by an appropriate and resolute Israeli response. Those who are interested in peace in the Middle East will bear that in mind in formulating their attitude towards the discussion of the question of Palestine.

37. Mr. ABDEL-MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Since the establishment of this international Organization we have been hearing voices raised in this Hall calling for freedom and other voices that had no reason to be speaking against those demanding that sacred and everlasting right but that they were voices of rebels or terrorists. That is not strange, because the usurper can offer no pretext or excuse in defence of his usurpation and can only take the easy way out, by accusing the person who is in the right of terrorizing the world and sowing fear, when he asks for his rights and works for their restoration.

38. I do not need to expatiate on that cause today, particularly since in this Hall 138 States are now grouped, the majority of which has passed through

this experience and continued the struggle until they restored their freedom and liberty.

39. Since its establishment this Organization has witnessed a great many varied events, and the development of those events throughout the past years has shown that Israel, which was created by a resolution of the United Nations, is the Member of the United Nations which most violates the resolutions and principles of the Organization. It is not strange that the representative of Israel should be worried at hearing that the cause of the Palestinian people is put before this Organization. Perhaps that is a logical reaction on his part—to defend with determination the idea that this cause should be forgotten or ignored. He knows very well that the rights of the Palestinian people have been usurped and violated. It is not strange, either, that he should describe anyone demanding those rights as a terrorist. He knows full well how Israel has usurped rights through terrorism and other acts which exceeded terrorism—acts of extermination and oppression. Is it not strange that a country which pretends that it is defending the world against terrorism should have responsible authorities in it who are proud to state that their planes will always bombard, and with great barbarity, hundreds of civilians living in refugee camps in an Arab State? Israel, when it attacks an independent sovereign State, bombards its villages and kills its citizens is “only defending its security”.

40. When it tears down hundreds of refugee camps belonging to the Palestinian refugees who live on the voluntary aid of the States of the world and under the aegis of an international agency belonging to this Organization, Israel states that it is working for peace. This is the logic of Israel as the world community knows it today. When the Palestinian people come before this Organization and ask it to affirm its right to self-determination attempting to work within world legality and legitimacy—I repeat, attempting to work within international legitimacy—supported by all peace-loving Powers and those that hold freedom sacred, we see the representative of Israel coming here and rejecting that, and going so far as to describe those people who have been deprived of their rights and rendered homeless as people who do not deserve to have their cause discussed or to have the world uphold their just cause.

41. However, the strangest thing in the logic of the representative of Israel was his insistence that the presentation of the question of Palestine would obstruct peace. In fact, that the discussion of the roots of the problem would impede its settlement continues to be the logic of the representative of Israel. Israel comes here and attempts to convince the international community in this Hall of this kind of reverse logic. The representative of Israel must explain his judgement and justify it. He must show that the PLO is a terrorist group, as though all the resolutions adopted by international political conferences, and even those adopted by conferences held under the auspices of the United Nations, which recognized that organization as a liberation organization, are useless and devoid of meaning. In the final analysis Israel wants to be sole judge of whether

the PLO is a liberation organization or a terrorist group.

42. The representative of Israel, whose manoeuvres have often been witnessed in this Hall, should not have descended to a reversal of logic. But perhaps he has forgotten, or is pretending to forget, the political reality of our free world of today. Perhaps he has failed to understand that reality and to see that the quest by peoples for their rights has become a sacred thing and that this Organization alone is the only one that can decide on this matter and restore the rights of those peoples, and support them in their efforts to have those rights respected. In the light of this great support by all the peace-loving forces of the just cause of the Palestinian people, we hope for and look forward to the time when the representative of Israel will realize that the only road to peace is that of the restoration of all the rights of the Palestinian people—their legitimate national rights—and that Israel should terminate all forms of occupation. In that way Israel would really be supporting peace and demonstrating that it was ready for peace and ready to join our free world in working for the liberation of all the peoples of the world so as to establish justice and peace in an area that has looked forward to a durable peace based on justice in order to be able to participate actively in the advancement of all mankind.

43. Mr. HUANG (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The so-called question of Palestine is caused entirely by the Israeli Zionist aggression carried out with the support and connivance of the super-Powers. Over a million Palestinian people have been evicted from their homeland by the Israeli aggressors. Up to now these people have remained homeless, leading a most miserable life. Their sacred and inalienable national rights have thus far not been restored. It is evident that the Palestinian question is by no means a question of refugees, but a question of aggression versus anti-aggression, an important political question concerning the restoration of the Palestinian people's national rights and their struggle for national liberation. On such a question of great political importance, the United Nations should have held serious discussions long since and adopted appropriate resolutions for implementation. An end must be put to the state of affairs in which the two super-Powers take the national rights of the Palestinian people and the territory and sovereignty of Arab countries as a bargaining chip for political deals in their contention for hegemony and spheres of influence.

44. The Chinese Government and people have always deeply sympathized with the sufferings of the Palestinian people and firmly supported them in their just struggle against the Israeli Zionist aggression and for the return to their homeland and the restoration of their national rights. Based on the above position, we have joined the signatories requesting the inclusion of the question of Palestine in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly [A/9742 and Add.1-4], and hope that through the joint efforts of the Member States, particularly the third world countries, the current session will make positive contributions to supporting

the just struggle of the Palestinian people for the restoration of their national rights.

45. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq): The representative of Israel is the last person to lecture the Members of the United Nations on safeguarding the world Organization, its Charter and its resolutions. The Zionists hold a unique record in the annals of the United Nations in violating the Charter and resolutions of this Organization and, indeed, in showing nothing but contempt for the United Nations.

46. In denouncing the inclusion of item 108 in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, the representative of Israel—inadvertently, no doubt—managed to make two admissions. He stated that the item, which deals with the question of Palestine and with the fate of the Palestinian people, is being included at the behest of the PLO. Thereby the representative of Israel identified the whole Palestinian people and their fate with the PLO. Then, too, in stating that the establishment, or even the discussion, of the rights of the Palestinian people is directed against Israel and its people, the representative of Israel admits that, had not the Zionists occupied Palestine by force and ejected the indigenous population by force, there would have been no Zionist Israel.

47. These points made by the representative of Israel stress all the more the necessity and the urgency of including this item in the agenda of the General Assembly.

48. Mr. SHARAF (Jordan): It is significant that in the General Committee there was total agreement with regard to the inclusion of the item entitled "Question of Palestine" in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly. Jordan supports the discussion of this item by the General Assembly.

49. The Palestinian holocaust and suffering is at the root of the conflict in the Middle East. Israel's initial aggression against the Palestinian people was the prelude to continued waves of military expansion at the expense of the territorial integrity and national security of the Arab States around Israel. Israel continues to deny over one and a half million Palestinian Arabs, forced out of their homes by Israel, the right to return to their homes. Since 1967 it has also been occupying a substantial area inhabited by over 1 million people who had been spared the agony of forceable expulsion in 1948 and are now suffering the agony of military occupation. The combined effect of these ruthless and systematic Israeli policies has been the denial of the right of self-determination of the people of Palestine.

50. The General Assembly must consider this matter and take proper action to redress the injustice and establish a just peace. The Israeli representative cannot blur this fact and distort the issues by injecting the name of Jordan and its historic ties with the Palestinian people as a cover to ignore and distort the issue of Palestinian rights. Palestinian rights are still blocked and suppressed by Israel through its initial act of expulsion and dispossession of the Palestinian people in 1948. Israel still denies them the right to return to their homes despite successive General Assembly resolutions since 1948.

51. The continued occupation of the Arab territories, invaded and occupied in 1967, complements and perpetuates the denial of self-determination to the Palestinian Arabs. There is an issue to be discussed by the Assembly. The Assembly has a task and a duty to perform in the establishment of justice and a just peace in the Middle East.

52. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): There are no further speakers on this item. May I take it that the Assembly decides to include item 108 in the agenda?

Item 108 was included in the agenda.

53. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We come now to items 109 and 110. May I take it that the Assembly decides to include items 109 and 110 in the agenda?

Items 109 and 110 were included in the agenda.

54. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We turn now to section IV of the General Committee's report, "Allocation of items". The allocation proposed takes into account the changes indicated in paragraph 25 and the decisions contained in paragraph 26. We shall consider them when we come to the relevant items.

55. Before we do that, however, I should like to invite members to turn their attention to paragraph 27, which concerns the Special Political Committee. The General Committee took note of the fact that since the agenda of the Special Political Committee continues to be relatively light, the General Assembly may wish to take that into account in considering the allocation of items recommended in paragraph 28. May I take it that the Assembly takes note of paragraph 27?

It was so decided.

56. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): May I invite members to turn to the list of items recommended for allocation to plenary meetings. With regard to item 22 on that list, I should like to refer to the recommendation of the General Committee in paragraph 25 (a) (i). May I take it that the General Assembly approves that recommendation?

It was so decided.

57. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Are there any objections to the allocation of the items listed for consideration in plenary meetings? If there are none, I shall take it that the allocation is approved.

It was so decided.

58. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We turn now to the list of items which the General Committee has recommended for allocation to the First Committee. With regard to item 9 on that list, may I refer to the recommendation in paragraph 25 (b) (ii). If there is no objection, I take it that the General Assembly approves that recommendation.

It was so decided.

59. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): May I now take it that the General Assembly approves the allocation of items to the First Committee recommended in the report?

It was so decided.

60. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Five items are recommended for allocation to the Special Political Committee. If there is no objection, I take it that the General Assembly approves that recommendation.

It was so decided.

61. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before we continue our consideration of the allocation of agenda items to the other Committees I wish to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that at the last minute two delegations have asked to speak on the question of the allocation of agenda item 110, "Question of Cyprus". The delegations are those of Turkey and Greece. With the Assembly's agreement, I shall now call on those delegations.

62. Mr. OLCAY (Turkey) (*interpretation from French*): I would not wish to speak for the first time in this Assembly under your presidency, Sir, without referring in advance to what I know my Minister will say about the fraternal feelings existing between our peoples and our respect for your personal qualities as a statesman. I shall confine myself, however, to offering you my delegation's most sincere congratulations on your unanimous election.

[The speaker continued in English.]

63. I had the opportunity at the General Committee's 219th meeting, with your indulgence, of explaining my delegation's views regarding the inclusion of the Cyprus question in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly. I stated clearly that my delegation does not object to consideration of the Cyprus question by the General Assembly. However, it questions the authority of the persons bringing the question before this body. I stated categorically that the so-called representatives of Cyprus do not have any authority to represent the Turkish Cypriot community, and therefore Cyprus as a whole. If the additional item entitled "Question of Cyprus" is taken up in the plenary Assembly without prior reference to a Main Committee, the General Assembly will not have a chance to hear the testimony of the representatives of the Turkish Cypriot community and will have to base its deliberations on the one-sided presentation by the representatives of the Greek Cypriot community. That is clearly the aim pursued by the Greek side in yet one more effort to silence the Turkish Cypriot community, whose rights it has usurped for more than 11 years under an oppressive system. Surely the General Assembly will not become a party to such a policy.

64. I therefore, with due respect, formally request that, in connexion with the allocation of this additional item to the plenary Assembly, rule 15 of the rules of procedure be fully applied—that is to say, that a two-thirds majority decide if a decision is to be made for the allocation of this additional item to the plenary Assembly. In other words, unless this two-thirds majority exists the question of Cyprus will go, as it should according to rule 15, to a Committee.

65. If the result of the vote does not produce the required majority in accordance with rule 15 of the rules of procedure, the additional item entitled "Ques-

tion of Cyprus" cannot be considered by the plenary Assembly until one of the competent Main Committees has considered the item and reported on it.

66. Perhaps I need not remind the members that if the General Assembly decides to consider the Cyprus question without hearing one of the principal parties to the conflict and bases its deliberations solely on the one-sided presentation of the Greek Cypriot party, the value of its contribution to the solution of the Cyprus problem will, of necessity, be questionable.

67. With your permission, Mr. President, I therefore urge the members to cast their votes negatively so that the item is not allocated directly to the plenary Assembly and that it can be considered in one of the Main Committees to be chosen by the General Assembly. I would further request that a roll-call vote be taken. With your indulgence, Mr. President, I ask the members to pronounce themselves clearly between the alternatives I have just outlined.

68. Mr. CARAYANNIS (Greece): Because I am in the position of asking nothing for Greece and everything for Cyprus, I should like to put a question to the representative of Turkey. He does not seem to like Archbishop Makarios; he has doubts about Acting President Clerides; and he does not think that Mr. Rossides should represent Cyprus in this room. He has also said this in the General Committee. As somebody obviously must represent Cyprus in our deliberations, I should like to ask Mr. Olcay who he suggests it should be—Mr. Kuçuk or Ankara and Mr. Olcay?

69. Turkish representatives have on various occasions referred to the Greek intervention in Cyprus. Very well. But if there was Greek intervention in Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios fought against it and risked his life while fighting against it. Is the representative of Turkey in a position to tell us whether Mr. Kuçuk fought against the Turkish intervention in Cyprus?

70. The problem of Cyprus is much more serious than Mr. Olcay seems to think. When the time comes, it will be discussed by this Assembly. But as time may run short, I should like to stress right now to those in this room—and I think there are many—who would like in the future to see an independent Cyprus in their midst, that never before in the long centuries of its history has Cyprus been in greater danger of losing not only its independence—because independence can be recovered—but also its identity.

71. As for rule 15, I shall say only this to my fellow representatives: This rule has never been called for or applied before in this room in the 29 years of United Nations history, and one of the reasons for this is that it is too obscure; nobody understands exactly what it means. If you wish to apply it now for the first time in the case of Cyprus, you may adopt a double standard and do so.

72. Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan): Mr. President, as I am taking the floor here for the first time, allow me to offer you my warmest and most respectful congratulations on your election to the high office of President of the General Assembly. When my Minister speaks here in a few days, he will do the

same on behalf of the Government and the people of Pakistan.

73. I do not wish to speak on the substance of the particular question the Assembly is discussing at the moment. That would be neither appropriate nor useful. I do wish to say, however, on behalf of my delegation and my country, that we have the friendliest relations with Turkey, we have admiration for the people of Greece and we have the warmest regard for their new leaders and Government. It is our view—a view influenced by the legal and political realities of the situation as much as by our relations with the participants, the antagonists, in this tragic drama—that the most appropriate way, and possibly the only way, to reach a solution of this conflict is through direct talks between the parties immediately concerned. We feel that at this stage the world community can best help in this process by encouraging the parties to come together.

74. Now, on this seemingly procedural issue we have heard one of the parties favouring discussion in plenary meetings, while the other wishes the matter to be taken up first in committee. In the circumstances, it seems to my delegation that the best course for us would be to follow strictly the rules of procedure, which, whether or not they have been used in the past, were after all drawn up with the intention of enabling the General Assembly to conduct its business in the most efficient manner possible. I would go further and say that there have to be very strong reasons for departing from those rules.

75. The representative of Turkey, Mr. Olcay, pointed out one reason—which is a weighty reason—why the matter should be taken up in committee in the first instance. In supporting this argument I am not suggesting, of course, that the General Assembly is not competent to grant a hearing, whenever it so wishes, to any individual, person or group.

76. There is another reason why, in my delegation's view, it would be most appropriate and useful to allow this matter to go first to committee. The nature of the Cyprus conflict being what it is—and I think there is general agreement that, whatever the merits of the case might be, it is best to encourage the parties to come together—the formal atmosphere and procedures of this Assembly will not lend themselves to furthering that objective. On the other hand, in committee, as we know, procedures are more informal, and there is a certain atmosphere of intimacy which favours attempts at compromise and allows for the sort of behind-the-scenes diplomacy which has been so often used and found successful.

77. For those reasons, I would suggest that the Assembly should adhere to the rules—in this particular case rule 15, which, at least in the view of my delegation, is free of ambiguity. It says:

“No additional item may, unless the General Assembly decides otherwise by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, be considered until seven days have elapsed since it was placed on the agenda and until a committee has reported upon the question concerned.”

I see absolutely no doubt or ambiguity there. The Assembly has to decide by a two-thirds majority to set this rule aside, but in the normal course an

additional item must go to committee. There is not the least doubt about it. So I should say that both in terms of the rules and in terms of political realities and of the best interests of all the parties concerned, it would be best to send this item to committee.

78. Mr. President, you have just drawn the attention of the Assembly to paragraph 27 of the General Committee's report in which the Committee notes that the Secretary-General has pointed out that the Special Political Committee seems to be languishing for want of work. Perhaps it would be worth considering whether the Cyprus question should not be sent to the Special Political Committee. This is not a proposal; it is a suggestion for the consideration of members.

79. Mr. KYPRIANOU (Cyprus): Mr. President, as an old colleague, I should like to join those who have offered you warmest congratulations on your well-deserved election to the presidency of the General Assembly. We hope that under your guidance this Assembly will be led to some constructive results.

80. An occasion has just arisen on which your delicate guidance will be necessary. A procedural matter has been discussed from this rostrum. It was raised by the representative of Turkey, and his views were more or less supported by the representative of Pakistan, recalling rule 15. However, I was under the impression that the item on Cyprus was already allocated, and this point arose after the allocation had been decided without any objection on the part of anyone. Therefore, if I am correct in my assumption, I do not wish to deal in the abstract with rule 15, but I simply wish to reserve my position on that. Therefore, if the item was allocated and the objection is an afterthought, one should look to rule 81 rather than rule 15. So I leave this for your guidance, Mr. President.

81. Regarding some of the other remarks, although I do not intend at this stage to go into the substance I should like to say that it is really too much for the representative of a country which invaded Cyprus and is still illegally holding part of its land under occupation to try to impose upon this Assembly the manner in which the problem should be discussed, where it should be discussed and who should represent Cyprus. Obviously Cyprus cannot be represented by those who are, to say the least, spokesmen for the Turkish occupation force in Cyprus.

82. The representative of Turkey spoke both in the General Committee and here—perhaps not so much here as in the Committee—in a way that gave the impression that Turkey was really under threat from Cyprus. I do not want to go into detail. We shall have ample opportunity to do that, I hope, in plenary meetings—in accordance with the decision that has already been taken. But I should like in this connexion and in parenthesis to make one small point again. I would ask those who do not think that this item should have been allocated to the plenary Assembly why they did not think that other items allocated to plenary meetings, today and previously, should be otherwise allocated? Why should there again be something unprecedented in the case of Cyprus? Should everything be unprecedented in the case of Cyprus—the tragedy, the attack, the circumstances, the conspiracy, even

the mode of negotiation, the mode of discussion? It is a little too much to take such an attitude, especially before the General Assembly.

83. To the representative of Pakistan, who was kind enough to quote both the delegations of Greece and Turkey but had nothing to say about the delegation of Cyprus, I should simply like to say that we are also here.

84. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): As I understood it, there was no objection to this item being allocated to the plenary Assembly. But we are now faced with a new situation. Because of the complexity of the proposals that have been made, it seems to me that it would be appropriate for the plenary Assembly to remain seized of the question as was previously decided. However, the plenary Assembly would consider the question only on the basis of a report to be prepared by an *ad hoc* committee of one of the Main Committees of the General Assembly. That report could be prepared by, for example, the Special Political Committee. It would be on the basis of that report that the discussion in the plenary Assembly on the question of Cyprus, agenda item 110, would take place.

85. Mr. KYPRIANOU (Cyprus): Mr. President, this is really very awkward; I hate to challenge your ruling, if it was a ruling. But I would sincerely suggest that, if some delegations have today suddenly become sensitive to the rules of procedure, and since you have just confirmed that the item was allocated to the plenary Assembly directly and thus rule 15 does not apply, you should at least put to a vote either a proposal for a reversal of the decision that has been taken, or, if in your view a decision has not been taken, the suggestion that it should go directly to the plenary Assembly under rule 15.

86. Mr. CARAYANNIS (Greece): I fully support the proposal of the representative of Cyprus. It is my understanding that this item was recommended for inclusion in the agenda of the General Assembly yesterday by the General Committee, and that it was recommended for allocation to the plenary Assembly. If any change is to be made, I think it will require a vote by this body.

87. Mr. OLCAY (Turkey) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I apologize for speaking a second time, particularly after the ruling you have just made, with which I completely agree. But the representatives of the two Greeces have once again proved that they will try by every means to prevent the voice of the Turks of Cyprus from being heard. I therefore place myself in your hands and rely on your wisdom and the wisdom of the General Assembly to ensure that the game which, it is perfectly clear, is being played may be unplayed either by a vote of the General Assembly or by a ruling by you, Mr. President.

88. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka): Mr. President, I value your friendship very much, but I also value the rules of procedure.

89. It has been said that rule 15 has never been invoked before and that it is ambiguous. I do not agree with the second part of that statement. Rule 15 says that an additional item may be placed on the agenda of the General Assembly by a decision of

a majority of members present and voting. It has been placed on the agenda of the General Assembly.

90. The second part of that rule refers to the consideration of the item, and says that no additional item may, unless the General Assembly decides otherwise by a two-thirds majority of members present and voting, be considered until seven days have elapsed since it was placed on the agenda and until a committee has reported upon the question concerned.

91. That problem has not arisen today because by acclamation the General Assembly has allocated this item to the plenary Assembly. You had obtained the Assembly's concurrence in the recommendations relating to the items assigned to the plenary Assembly, items assigned to the First Committee and items assigned to the Special Political Committee. It was then that this situation arose and the second part of rule 15 was invoked. Therefore, Mr. President, you must decide whether a decision was taken by the General Assembly to allocate this item to the plenary Assembly. If you agree that that decision was taken, then the only course open to the Assembly, if an attempt is made to reverse its decision, is the application of rule 81, and a reversal of the decision will require a two-thirds majority.

92. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, since it is the first time that I am addressing the General Assembly, without prejudging what my Foreign Minister will say, I should like to express to you my great satisfaction at finding myself on this rostrum when you yourself are presiding. Today we have had yet another proof of the congratulations that we deserve on having unanimously elected you—because in your wisdom, Mr. President, you have just proposed a solution to the situation that has been created here, a solution that will obviate our having to enter into a procedural debate on an important and extremely painful problem.

93. It is not a question of procedure, but a real, traumatic situation which exists in the world and for which we must find a solution. The role of the United Nations in such a case is to give help in creating a propitious atmosphere for reaching a solution on the spot. The role of the United Nations is not to drag out a procedural discussion, when the problem involved is so grave. That is why my delegation supports your proposal, Mr. President.

94. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Cyprus on a point of order.

95. Mr. KYPRIANOU (Cyprus): Mr. President, on a point of order, I would submit humbly that the debate is going on and on. Of course we all have a lot to say. However, I submit to you, Mr. President, that, before we find out if it is necessary to continue, you tell us if there was a decision before the Turkish representative took the floor originally. As we understood it, there was a decision by acclamation and in fact we heard the sound of your gavel, Mr. President. If that is the case, then only rule 81 could be discussed.

96. Mr. OLCAY (Turkey): (*interpretation from French*): The Greek representative who preceded me here on the rostrum has raised a point of order,

asking you, Mr. President, whether a decision was taken by the General Assembly before I took the floor.

97. In my previous statement, I did not wish to point out that by an error, a human error, the name of Turkey, which has been on the list for a long time, was not brought to the attention of the President at the moment when the question arose. I would not have wished to say that the error was due to the fact that the Secretariat did not advise you at the proper time that I had requested the floor.

98. In clarifying this point, I think I have also clarified the point raised by the representative of Sri Lanka and by the Greek speaker who preceded me, and thus what they had said is not valid. That is what I had to say. Thank you for calling on me again.

99. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Indeed, I think I am in duty bound to confirm the interpretation that has just been given by the representative of Turkey concerning the inscription of the names of the delegations of Turkey and Greece on the list to speak on the allocation of item 110 to the plenary meetings or the Committees. However, I was informed of this point at a time when we were already considering items to be allocated to the Special Political Committee.

100. I would again wish to propose to the Assembly that it should in no way revoke a decision already adopted: namely, that the problem should be discussed in the plenary Assembly. However, before being discussed in plenary meeting, it should be made the subject of a report submitted by one of the Committees, which you will have designated. I suggest that that committee be the Special Political Committee.

101. I would enlist the co-operation of all concerned, so as not to prolong this procedural debate. This is an extremely serious problem which will be appropriately studied in the plenary Assembly and in the committees.

102. Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation realizes that what you have just stated, Mr. President, is entirely appropriate. The question of Cyprus is indeed a serious problem. It is for that reason that my delegation would wish to express its sincere hope that through the medium of the good offices of the Secretary-General it will be possible to resolve the problem before us. It is also for that reason that my delegation is satisfied to note that a national of Mexico is representing the Secretary-General on the Cyprus question at this stage.

103. For those reasons, we should spare no effort whatsoever to enable the representatives of the parties directly concerned to go through this session without being acrimonious and without receiving the impression that their rights have in any way been ignored. This seems to me to be feasible since, as I am sure the representative of Turkey and the representatives of Greece and Cyprus, all of whom are very experienced in United Nations affairs, know, it is very difficult, if not impossible—and indeed I cannot remember a single case—for a question of this kind not to be discussed by the United Nations when a State or group of States proposes that it

should be. My delegation believes that this is grounds for rejoicing because that was one of the essential reasons for establishing the United Nations, namely, the idea of giving all States, large and small, an opportunity to be heard, a right which is stated in Article 35 of the Charter.

104. Now, what is the matter at hand? What is it that the representative of Turkey has requested? He stated that the Assembly could not deal with the item until a committee had reported on it. According to the practice in force, that would mean two debates, one in the committee and the other in plenary, because it is well known that when a group of delegations opposes an examination of a report from a committee limited to explanations of vote, then the General Assembly discusses the matter. Accordingly, in this case we could fully meet the wishes of the representative of Turkey, but, far from avoiding a debate in plenary, we should be creating two debates.

105. Then there is another aspect of the matter. That would imply that the debate in the plenary Assembly could not take place before two other things happened. First, seven days would have had to elapse, and, secondly, there would have to be a report from the committee, which could be prepared only at the end of the debate in that body. Therefore, that would mean also that the question of Cyprus could be brought before the plenary Assembly only after 10 or 15 days had elapsed after the discussion in the committee. But the question is far from being insoluble. I believe there would be the means of resolving it by agreement between the parties. You yourself, Mr. President, could informally, after this meeting, speak to the parties in question. If it is preferred that that should be done by the Secretary-General, then I am sure that he would accept the task. That could be a solution.

106. Nothing obliges us at the present meeting on this Saturday morning to take a final decision on this procedural matter. My delegation, as the Assembly is aware, is on the General Committee and it remembers that in the General Committee nobody invoked rule 15 of the rules of procedure. It is also a fact, as you yourself, Mr. President, recalled and highlighted a few moments ago, and as several other speakers, including the representative of Sri Lanka, have said, that when the General Committee decided to allocate certain matters to the plenary Assembly nobody raised any objection. So if we wish to abide strictly by the rules of procedure it is obvious that the only rule it is possible to refer to is rule 81. But I repeat that my delegation does not see why we should now be held to taking an immediate decision. We could continue considering the allocation of the other items which, I believe, give rise to no problems whatsoever, and the allocation of the item on Cyprus could be held in abeyance until, through either your good offices, Sir, or perhaps those of the Secretary-General, it may be possible to resolve this procedural matter, which, after all, is the rather simple one of finding an appropriate solution acceptable to all the parties concerned.

107. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia): We could go on and on for an hour or so without achieving any conclusive result. The rules of procedure are

supposed to facilitate the work of the Assembly and the committees. We find ourselves entangled, however, by certain rules. No doubt the Assembly must have been hasty when it voiced no objection to those items that you, Sir, mentioned were scheduled to be discussed in the plenary Assembly. At the same time, our colleague from Turkey assured us that he had placed his name on the list to address himself to the point he later raised. This has happened quite often. I, for one, have sometimes been ignored, forgotten or neglected when I inscribed my name, here at this very table. So I am talking from experience.

108. But why beat around the bush? We are thankful to our colleagues from Cyprus and from Greece, and our thanks go also to our colleague from Turkey for having expressed certain fears that loom around this question. It is most disheartening to find those Powers—I am not going to name them, because the Assembly knows which they are—that started this mischief keeping silent as if they are spectators, waiting to see what the next move should be. We should put an end right now to these altercations that will bear no fruit.

109. What shall we do? As someone who has served in so many sessions of the Assembly—in fact in all save that in London in 1946, when I was silent—I venture to say that this question should be resolved by not resorting to the rules of procedure because, as I said, they are entangling us instead of facilitating our work.

110. We know what the fears of Turkey are. The Turkish community happens to be a minority. It fell to me to negotiate with the late Foreign Minister of Turkey, none other than Mr. Zorlu, may God rest his soul in peace. That was before Cyprus was formed. It was here, at Sutton Place, at the house of Ambassador Esin. I was called to play a modest role and finally, after clearing what I had to say with my Government, got approval for there being one Cyprus.

111. It might be said: "You are delving into the substance"; but the substance has been touched upon as a result of Turkey's fear that the minority might not be heard, through the manipulations of any Member States, regardless of the parties concerned. That is the gist of the matter. On the other hand, I think the Greeks got a very raw deal through someone involving them in this Middle East situation, because this Cyprus question is part of the Middle East situation. Who were the victims? The Cypriot people, whether Greek or Turkish. They have been the victims. All we are witnessing here is how this question may be manipulated in favour of one party or the other—which is wrong, Sir.

112. I therefore formally propose, with your permission, Mr. President—and I will withdraw my proposal, if you would prefer to do something else—that we do not continue deliberation on procedure this morning, but that, taking the cue from my good friend, Mr. García Robles of Mexico, whose view coincides with my own, perhaps the Secretary-General in his wisdom and you in your own, Sir, together with whomever you might want to have with you, would meet with the parties concerned to agree on the manner in which this question should

be dealt with during this twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

113. I would not specify at this juncture whether it should be in a plenary meeting, in the Special Political Committee or in the First Committee, but I would specify that it should be on this understanding, which is at the core of the whole difficulty: that the Turkish Cypriot minority, like the Greek Cypriot majority, should be given ample chance, with no obstruction, to be heard, no matter in what body the item will be discussed. That is the core of the problem: that the Turkish Cypriot minority should be heard in full. And the Greek Cypriot majority will, I hope, also be heard in full.

114. Of course they will be, because after all I believe the Archbishop is still—is he not?—the President of Cyprus and we do not want any manipulation by major Powers, or lesser Powers; and we, the smaller countries that belong to the area, reserve our right to make our voices heard when we say that we cannot any longer allow manipulation by the major Powers that will make victims of the people in whom sovereignty resides.

115. Sir, that is my proposal. The Secretary-General, with yourself and two or three others whom you may select, should meet as soon as possible to seek not only a *modus vivendi* but also a way in which we can deal intelligently with the question without acrimony. Having said that, I make this proviso: that after you have accepted my proposal, or if perhaps you think of a better idea, I warn this Assembly that, after hearing what you have to say, I shall ask for an adjournment.

116. Mr. CARAYANNIS (Greece): I am grateful to Mr. Baroody because I think he has made the whole situation clearer to me and perhaps I shall be in a position to help you also, Mr. President.

117. As I understand it, the whole problem of this discussion is that Mr. Denktas should be given an opportunity to speak in any committee of this Assembly, where we are not afraid of anybody being heard. More than that, we think that it would be valuable for everybody who has anything to say on this issue to have the opportunity of doing so. So, to come back to what you, Mr. President, have proposed, if really the only way for Mr. Denktas to be heard by this Assembly is for him to be heard by a committee, I do not know how the representative of Cyprus may feel about it but as far as I am concerned I should be very willing to have one meeting of the Special Political Committee and for Mr. Denktas to be given the opportunity to speak and for anybody who would like to ask him questions to be given the opportunity to do so in that Committee. A report on that speech of Mr. Denktas should be made and sent here for the discussion of the item by the members of this Assembly. The point I make is that the Cyprus crisis has reached such dimensions that it should be discussed here, in this Assembly.

118. Mr. OLCAY (Turkey) (*interpretation from French*): It is my impression that finally reason seems to be prevailing and that we are moving towards the possibility of reaching agreement. But I cannot completely agree with the representative of Greece,

who preceded me to this rostrum—perhaps I misunderstood him—that the plenary Assembly or a committee would meet once to hear a statement to be made by Mr. Denktaş and that thereafter the debate would resume. If my interpretation is, as I hope, mistaken, and if a decision is taken today—I do not quite see how it can be, but perhaps it is possible—to allow Mr. Denktaş, the Vice-President of Cyprus and the leader of the Turkish Cypriot community, to take part in the debate on Cyprus here, I would agree completely with such a procedure and the problem would be solved.

119. I must thank the representative of Greece for having corrected a mistake that he had made earlier in the meeting in referring to Mr. Kuçuk, who for quite some time now has not been the leader of the Turkish Cypriot community and the Vice-President of Cyprus. For anybody who is interested in the problem of Cyprus, it was to Mr. Denktaş that he should have referred. He has corrected himself and I thank him for that.

120. Mr. CARAYANNIS (Greece): I really think that we need not prolong this discussion further, as the hour is very late. If the real problem is for Mr. Denktaş to be heard—and I apologize for mentioning Mr. Kuçuk by mistake—then the only straight way, and the simple way, to do it is to allocate the matter to the plenary Assembly, and the plenary Assembly will have every opportunity to send it to any committee. That committee may have as many meetings as it wishes to hear Mr. Denktaş and those who may wish to reply to Mr. Denktaş. If there are many replies, then obviously there will be more than one meeting. The discussion can then take place in the plenary Assembly. The main question is to have the general debate and the discussion of the draft resolutions here in the plenary Assembly and not in the committee. But the easiest way is to allocate the item to the plenary Assembly and the plenary Assembly, in its wisdom, will certainly take a decision—and I shall be ready to vote for it—to send the item to a committee so that Mr. Denktaş can be heard.

121. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Cuba on a point of order.

122. Mr. ALARCÓN (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Our delegation has come to the rostrum at this time not to deal with the question of Cyprus, a question which we consider to be of the utmost urgency and on which we shall speak in due course, but because we are concerned that we might be starting a debate on Cyprus when the General Assembly has made such good progress on settling the matter before it, namely, the adoption of the agenda and the allocation of items.

123. In the opinion of my delegation, after the statement made by the representative of Mexico the situation was very clear. It was quite obvious that we had already approved the inclusion in the agenda of the question of Cyprus, and it was also obvious that we had already decided by acclamation, as you yourself reminded us, Mr. President, that the item was to be allocated to the plenary Assembly. The subsequent discussion, in our opinion, has indicated two things: first, the importance and

urgency of the item, which was recognized by the entire General Assembly when it unanimously included it in the agenda, and secondly, the fact that different views are held with respect to how the discussion and consideration of the item should be organized by the General Assembly. This could obviously give rise to later discussions as well, but it does not seem to us that the second point is really before the General Assembly at this initial stage, when we are adopting the agenda and allocating items.

124. It seems to us, therefore, that the only thing remaining for us to do is to continue with the allocation of items, having already decided, first, to include the question of Cyprus, and secondly, to allocate it directly to the plenary Assembly. In due course, when the plenary Assembly meets to consider this item, it is most likely that, like any United Nations body that considers items, it will have various proposals or suggestions before it on how the debate should be organized. One of the proposals might be to the effect that, before discussing the substance of the question, the plenary Assembly should request a committee to consider it or should invite a certain personality to address it. But the decision we had to take this morning concerned the allocation of items, and we have already done that. We decided unanimously to have the item allocated directly to the plenary Assembly.

125. My delegation deplores the fact that difficulties arose even with regard to the wish of the delegation of Turkey to speak when we were discussing the allocation of items. We regret this because we might have had a more orderly debate if the delegation of Turkey had been able to speak at that time. But the fact remains that the decision was taken, and it also remains true that the fact that the decision was taken in no way affects the position which the delegation of Turkey and other delegations have expressed with regard to this question, since the plenary Assembly itself can consider these arguments and take the decision that they have suggested. However, to decide this matter now, in our opinion, creates two problems. First, the Assembly would be reversing a decision that it had already taken not only at the same session, but at the same meeting, on the same morning. We believe that that would require a two-thirds majority vote in accordance with rule 81 of the rules of procedure. Furthermore, this is leading us into a discussion now of the question of Cyprus, which is not on our order of business for today. That is an item for later discussion.

126. So my delegation cordially appeals to all members of the General Assembly to return to where we were, namely, to the allocation of items. We were, if I am not mistaken, about to start the discussion on the allocation of items for the Second Committee, which shows that we progressed beyond the Cyprus question some time ago. We also appeal to the Assembly to respond to the helpful and generous appeal of the representative of Saudi Arabia, and we appeal to you, Mr. President, the Secretary-General and all those who are able to reconcile the different positions, to assist the parties so that by the time we start our consideration of the Cyprus question, we will be in a better position to take up the item

and will encounter fewer difficulties than we have met with today.

127. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, first of all, may I express to you the congratulations of the delegation of Tunisia, before my Minister for Foreign Affairs formally extends our congratulations to you.

128. I do not wish to complicate your task or the task of the General Assembly; but it appears to me that we have had a most important discussion here, having gone far beyond questions of procedure. The representative of Greece made a proposal, which was accepted by the representative of Turkey. I believe that we should seize this opportunity to endeavour to work in a more positive manner and in a more specific way. Therefore, I should like to support the proposal made to the effect that Mr. Denktaş, the representative of the Turkish Cypriot minority, be allowed to participate in the discussion of the Cyprus question when it comes before the General Assembly.

129. I would venture to hope, Mr. President, that, under your dynamic and enlightened presidency, the United Nations can take up the problem in a more practical and, I would say, effective way.

130. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) (*interpretation from French*): When I asked to speak, I was going to make almost the same proposal as that made by the representative of Tunisia. May I therefore avail myself of this opportunity, Mr. President, since you have given me the floor, to support his proposal. Earlier the representative of Turkey communicated his concern to us and the representative of Greece replied that he would have no difficulty personally in agreeing to listen to a representative of the Turkish Cypriot community when the question of Cyprus is discussed in the General Assembly. Therefore, I believe, we have the solution to the problem and, as the representative of Tunisia has said, we can affirm that in due course the debate will be held in such a way that every point of view will be represented.

131. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): The Assembly seems to be making very heavy weather of this particular item. I would suggest, with due respect to the Assembly, that we are getting ourselves into a difficulty because we are trying in this Assembly to decide some intricate procedural matters which are not really open to us to decide in this way. There are at least four points that have arisen this morning, Mr. President, which are going to require detailed procedural examination and on which detailed decisions will have to be made by yourself as President of the Assembly.

132. First of all, there is the one that has been raised by the representative of Cyprus and, to a certain extent, by the representative of Greece, namely, whether the apparent decision—I use the word “apparent” deliberately—of this Assembly that this item should be included in the agenda of the plenary Assembly is one which now has to stand and whether it can only be reversed by looking at rule 81. So that is one procedural matter of difficulty.

133. Secondly, Mr. President, if you were to rule that, despite the apparent acceptance by the As-

sembly of the decision that the item should be discussed in the plenary Assembly, the representative of Turkey was nevertheless entitled to make the point he made to start off with, then again there is a detailed procedural matter for you to decide, namely, whether or not in those circumstances rule 15 applies. And if rule 15 does not apply, does there have to be a two-thirds majority under that rule or not?

134. It would seem to me that these are pre-eminently difficult matters of procedure for the Chair to decide. May I therefore support the efforts that have been made this morning by the representatives of Saudi Arabia and Mexico and I think also the representative of Cuba, namely, that further discussion of these detailed procedural matters should now stop. It does seem to me that we are getting ourselves into some extremely deep water. It is not a question open to discussion and I do not think it would be right—would it?—for the Assembly now, today, to decide on the way in which a debate that might take place in the Assembly in perhaps three or four weeks’ time should be conducted and who should or should not speak in that debate. I do not know what the position is going to be in four weeks’ time, with great respect, and neither does anybody else in this room.

135. What I would therefore suggest is that we take very careful note, as indeed my delegation does, of the fears which have been expressed by the representative of Turkey here today, namely, his concern that the views of the Turkish minority in Cyprus would not receive due weight and expression. We should take careful note, I think, of those fears and also of what has been said here today. It may be that there is a possibility for procedural compromise between the parties. But, with great respect, I do not think that this discussion is really advancing things very much at this moment. And again, I do not think that to continue it for perhaps another hour or so in the way in which it has been conducted in the last hour or so is going to advance matters very much. Therefore—if I need to put myself within the rules of procedure—may I, following the example of the representative of Saudi Arabia, make a formal proposal, under rule 74 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, that the debate on this item be adjourned.

136. Mr. OLCAY (Turkey): I apologize for having spoken so often but I have two points to make. One concerns the material error which has been made this morning. This has to be recognized as such and therefore should not be introduced into the debate. That material error was that the Secretariat did not convey to the President my request to speak. Therefore I do not think this can be invoked to solve the principal problem.

137. The second point is one which I wish to make to the representative of the United Kingdom who in his speech inadvertently used the word “minority” regarding the Turkish Cypriots. The treaties of which his Government is also a signatory clearly indicate that there is a Turkish community in Cyprus, not a Turkish minority. The Turkish community may be in a minority but it is equal with the majority, and this has been indicated in the use of the word “community”. I just wanted to make this correction.

138. Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan): We have spent a good deal of time on what seems like a procedural wrangle and I share the doubts expressed here by Mr. Richard, our colleague from the United Kingdom, about the usefulness of such a debate. It certainly seems an inauspicious way to start the discussion on helping the parties involved in Cyprus to reach agreement. I thought we were getting out of the maze of technicalities and I think that is the only path to pursue. Therefore, while I do not altogether agree with the reasons which Mr. Richard put forward for proposing an adjournment of this debate, I certainly agree with the proposal itself. I think any further discussion is not likely to clarify the issues. We saw the parties directly concerned—the representative of Turkey and the representative of Greece—manifest here a spirit of compromise, and I think that is what we need to encourage.

139. When we adjourn, Sir, you will undoubtedly take the opportunity of consulting with the parties directly concerned in order to find a solution acceptable to them and not in violation of the rules. I see this as an entirely possible course of action, and I commend it. I think that if we go on here about whether or not a decision was taken, whether it was apparent or real, which rule applies, and so on, we shall really be moving away from the path which has been indicated so clearly here by the representatives of Greece and Turkey.

140. Since I have the floor, I should like to address a word of explanation to the leader of the delegation of the Republic of Cyprus. The reason I mentioned only Turkey and Greece in my previous intervention was that they were the two speakers who had preceded me and I was referring to their arguments here. We have the warmest feelings and wish the best for all the peoples of Cyprus and we are certainly aware of the fact that Cyprus is the main party in this issue.

141. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): It seemed to me to be useful to let the debate on this question proceed in order to find a solution as quickly as possible, with the General Assembly being at least a moral witness.

142. I feel that little by little we have been moving much closer to a compromise and if I did not heed the very timely appeal of our friend the representative of Saudi Arabia, Mr. Barody, who moved the adjournment, it was precisely because it was my impression that a compromise was beginning to emerge among the parties directly concerned. I would therefore ask the representative of the United Kingdom not to insist on his proposal concerning the application of rule 74. However, I will give him satisfaction on the second part of his statement by adjourning the meeting until 3.30 p.m.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.