6. His delegation had therefore hoped that the General Assembly, with the support of the three Governments concerned, would be able to set the framework for a new conference. Unfortunately that had not been possible, and the delegations had been called upon to vote on various draft resolutions, none of which met the optimum requirements.

7. The draft resolution which came closest to meeting those requirements was the Iranian draft (A/C.1/L.228/Rev.2), which could properly be described as a compromise text, as it did not give preference to any one formula. While it regretted that that text would perhaps not have the support of the Greek Government, his delegation considered that it could provide a basis for a continuation of the search for a settlement. By voting in favour of that draft resolution, his delegation wished to indicate its view that the General Assembly should avoid declaring itself on the substance of the problem and should rely upon the Governments concerned, in consultation with the people of Cyprus, to continue their efforts to find a just solution.

8. While appreciating the motives which had inspired the sponsors of the ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.228/Rev.1), his delegation considered that it did not point the way to any solution and that, in the absence of agreement by all parties concerned, it would be unhelpful for the General Assembly to take sides.

9. Mr. ARAUJO (Colombia) said that, in view of the statements made by various representatives at the previous meeting and at the beginning of the present meeting, he felt it necessary to emphasize that his delegation's draft resolution (A/C.1/L.229) was not incompatible with any of the other draft resolutions before the Committee. On the contrary, it supplemented them.

10. The distinguishing feature of the Colombian draft resolution was that it expressed no judgement on the substance of the problem. Furthermore, it suggested that an observation group should be set up to promote the negotiations and, if appropriate, to assume the functions of a good offices committee. His country's proposal could, in fact, be harmonized with any one of the other proposals.

11. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) said that he was gratified to note a change in the tone of the debate, and he hoped that there would be a further rapprochement between the supporters of the Colombian draft resolution, those of the Iranian draft resolution and those of the ten-Power draft resolution, so that the Committee might be able to adopt unanimously a single text on the question of Cyprus.

12. Prince Aiy KHAN (Pakistan) emphasized the complexity of the question, which was partly due to the fact that three Governments and two communities with divergent views were involved. The discussion had
also brought out a second point, namely, that the rights and interests of the peoples of Cyprus must be regarded as paramount.

13. His delegation would vote against the Greek draft resolution (A/C.1/L.222) because its effect would be to subject the Turkish community to domination by the Greek community. Constitutional or international guarantees were hardly likely to safeguard the fundamental human rights of the Turkish population in view of the mistrust at present prevailing between the parties. The United Nations was not in a position to protect those rights, as the case of the Palestine refugees had shown. Furthermore the General Assembly would gain nothing by deciding on a definitive solution in favour either of unity or partition, because by endorsing the claims of one of the two communities, it would seriously jeopardize the chances of a rapprochement between them.

14. His delegation would also vote against the ten-power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.228/Rev.1). Although the revised version eliminated the possibility that the United Kingdom might be accused of pursuing an opportunistic policy by siding with the strong against the weak, it still predetermined the ultimate solution of the problem by ruling out partition completely. It would be wrong to eliminate a priori a solution which might be the only effective means of safeguarding the rights of the minority.

15. The possibilities of negotiation had not yet been exhausted. The most logical next step would be to try to reach agreement on the principle of a conference between the Governments concerned and the representatives of the inhabitants of Cyprus to discuss the terms of a final solution. In any case, the Assembly could not assume responsibility for working out such a solution unless it first had the indisputable basic facts. In that connexion, the Colombian proposal (A/C.1/L.225) might prove useful at a later stage, but it was premature for the moment.

16. The Iranian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.226/Rev.2) best met the needs of the situation. It expressed no preference for any particular solution, and did not prejudice the rights, interests and aspirations of any of the parties. His delegation would therefore vote for it.

17. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) said that the United States would vote for the Iranian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.226/Rev.2) since it believed that it would help to encourage the resumption of negotiations, which everyone agreed to be necessary. He could not understand why several delegations thought that, because a draft resolution did not contain certain provisions which they desired, it must be against their interests.

18. Mr. de la COLINA (Mexico) moved, under rule 119 of the rules of procedure, that the meeting should be suspended for forty-five minutes for an exchange of views between those delegations which were trying to reach agreement on a compromise text.

The motion was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.

The meeting was suspended at 3.50 p.m. and resumed at 4.50 p.m.

19. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) regretted that the United States delegation had not abided by its decision to remain neutral in the debate on Cyprus, as it had supported the Iranian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.226/Rev.2) and had abstained from voting on the motion for suspension of the meeting, which had been proposed to enable delegations to reach a compromise solution. It was true that, after the Iranian representative's statement (1008th meeting), the second revised version of his draft resolution had assumed another and purely procedural meaning. Nevertheless, he thought that he was entitled to ask whether the United States delegation was in favour of complete independence for Cyprus as a final aim and whether it was opposed to the partition of the island.

20. If the Iranian draft resolution was to be put to the vote, his delegation wished to present a number of amendments which would help to clarify its objective. He read the Greek amendments (A/C.1/L.230).

21. Mr. ZORLU (Turkey) thought that the United States representative had merely said that the parties concerned could not go to a conference without having their hands absolutely free and that accordingly the Committee should not take a decision on a question of substance. The Iranian draft resolution, unlike the draft resolution submitted by India and nine other Powers (A/C.1/L.228/Rev.1), left the door open to all possibilities. He considered that at the present stage of the debate it would serve no purpose to reopen a discussion of substance and did not think that it was quite fair of the Greek representative to take advantage of the opinion expressed by a representative to seek a declaration of principle, particularly as such declarations had already been made by the countries which had spoken in the debate.

22. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the meeting should be adjourned until 8.30 p.m.

23. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) asked whether the Greek representative could explain the reason for his amendments before the meeting adjourned.

24. Mr. ABDOH (Iran) moved that the meeting should be suspended for ten minutes so that the delegations concerned could agree on a text.

The motion was adopted by 63 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The meeting was suspended at 5.15 p.m. and resumed at 5.55 p.m.

25. Mr. ABDOH (Iran) asked that, in keeping with the terms of Article 73 b of the Charter of the United Nations, the French version of the fifth paragraph of the preamble of the Iranian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.226/Rev.2) should read as follows:

"Considérant qu’il convient de développer la capacité des Chypriotes de s’administrer eux-mêmes, conformément à la Charte...". 1/

A change also seemed to be indicated in the third Greek amendment (A/C.1/L.230), which was not in line with the wording of the Charter.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would take appropriate action on the Iranian representative's remarks.

1/ The revised French text of this paragraph was subsequently distributed as document A/C.1/L.226/Rev.2/Corr.1.
27. Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom) agreed that the French word "autonomie" could be translated into English as "self-government", but the French version of "self-government" in the Charter was the phrase used by the Iranian representative in the version he had just proposed.

28. Mr. AVEROFF-TOSSIZZA (Greece) said that, in order to meet the Iranian representative's views, he was ready to replace his amendment to the fifth paragraph of the preamble of the Iranian draft resolution by the words "Considérant qu'il convient de développer et d'établir l'autonomie de Chypre", but he did not attach great importance to that modification, which he was only suggesting by way of compromise.

29. Mr. ABDOH (Iran) said that he would like to hear the views of the members of the Committee before expressing an opinion on the new text proposed by the Greek representative.

30. Mr. ZORLU (Turkey) submitted sub-amendments 2/ to the Greek representative's amendments (A/C.1/L.230). He proposed, first, that a reference to the fact that the conference was to be between the three Governments directly concerned and the representatives of the Cypriots should be added after the words "Believing that a conference in the second Greek amendment and, secondly, that the third Greek amendment should be replaced by the following text: "Considérant qu'il convient de développer la capacité des Chypriotes de s'administrer eux-mêmes, conformément aux buts et principes de la Charte".

31. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the discussion should be adjourned until 8.30 p.m. so that delegations should have time to consider the proposed amendments.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

2/ Subsequently distributed as document A/C.1/L.231.