Chapter II

AGENDA

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTORY NOTE	29
**PART I. CONSIDERATION OF THE ADOPTION OR AMENDMENT OF RULES 6-12	29
PART II. THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA	29
Note	29
A. Rule 6: Circulation of communications by the Secretary-General	30
**B. Rule 7: Preparation of the provisional agenda	32
**C. Rule 8: Communication of the provisional agenda	32
PART III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (RULE 9)	33
Note	33
A. Procedure of voting on adoption of the agenda	33
**1. Votes taken concerning individual items on the provisional agenda	33
**2. Votes taken on proposals to determine or change the order of items	33
3. Votes taken on the adoption of the agenda as a whole	33
B. Consideration of:	
1. Requirements for the inclusion of an item in the agenda	34
**2. Effect of the inclusion of an item in the agenda	35
C. Other discussion on the adoption of the agenda	35
1. Order of discussion of items on the agenda	35
2. Scope of items and subitems on the agenda, in relation to the scope of discussion	35
3. Phrasing of items on the agenda	36
4. Postponement of consideration of items	37
**5. Precedence of the decision of adoption of the agenda	38
PART IV. THE AGENDA: MATTERS OF WHICH THE SECURITY COUNCIL IS SEIZED (RULES 10 AND 11)	38
Note	38
A. Rule 10	39
B. Rule 11	40
1. Retention and deletion of items from the Secretary-General's Summary Statements on matters of which the Security Council is seized	40
**2. Proceedings of the Security Council regarding the retention and deletion of items from the agenda	54

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The present chapter relates to material concerning rules 6 to 11, inclusive, of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council.

As in the previous volumes of the *Repertoire*, the material in the present chapter is presented directly under the rule of procedure to which it relates. The chapter is divided into four parts: part I, Consideration of the adoption or amendment of rules 6-12; part II, The provisional agenda; part III, Adoption of the agenda (rule 9); and part IV, The agenda: Matters of which the Security Council is seized (rules 10 and 11).

Part II provides information concerning the circulation of documents by the Secretary-General (rule 6); no material was found for treatment under the sub-headings "Rule 7: Preparation of the provisional agenda" and "Rule 8: Communication of the provisional agenda".

Part III contains material on the procedure and practice of the Security Council in connexion with the adoption of the agenda. Section A includes under sub-heading 3, three instances and one related case history concerning votes taken by the Council in adopting the agenda. One case history has been entered under section B concerning discussion in the Council of the requirements for the inclusion of an item in the agenda. No case history has been included under the sub-heading "Effects of the inclusion of an item in the agenda". Section C deals with other questions which have been discussed in connexion with the adoption of the agenda, such as the order of discussion of items, the scope of items in relation to the scope of the discussion, the phrasing of agenda items and the postponement of consideration of items.

Part IV relates to the list of matters of which the Security Council is seized. One entry is presented under section A. The tabulation in section B (rule 11) brings up to date the tabulation in the previous volumes of the *Repertoire* and includes items which have appeared in the Secretary-General's Summary Statements on matters of which the Security Council is seized during the period 1966 to 1968.

Part I

**CONSIDERATION OF THE ADOPTION OR AMENDMENT OF RULES 6-12

Part II

THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA

NOTE

The proceedings dealt with in this part concern the question of circulation of communications by the Secretary-General.

Under the provisions of rule 6, the Secretary-General is obliged to bring to the attention of members of the Security Council all communications from States, organs of the United Nations, or the Secretary-General, concerning any matter for the consideration of the Security Council. During the period under review, there were three instances in which the question of circulation of communications arose. In the first instance, the manner of presentation of reports of a subsidiary organ to the Security Council was the subject of discussion; in the other two cases, the subject of the exchange of views centred on the question as to how the Secretary-General was to handle communications originating from a political entity the nature of which—i.e., whether it constitutes a State or not—was a subject of controversy among Member States.[1]

In the S/series are also circulated communications from regional arrangements or agencies, which are received pursuant to Article 54 of the Charter.

---

[1] Certain communications from the same source have been circulated by the Secretary-General at the written request of a member of the Security Council; the letter requesting the circulation of such communications has been issued as an official document of the Council (S/document), the communication in question being enclosed in an annex to the letter. See, e.g., letter dated 10 March 1966 from the representative of Bulgaria requesting the Secretary-General that an application for membership in the United Nations from the German Democratic Republic together with a declaration and a memorandum in respect thereof be circulated as an official document, of the General Assembly and of the Security Council (S/7192, *OR, 21st yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1966*, pp. 233-240); also *note verbale* from the Permanent Mission of Bulgaria to the Secretary-General (S/7508, *OR, 21st yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1966*, pp. 139-143).

A. RULE 6: CIRCULATION OF COMMUNICATIONS BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

CASE 1

At the 1307th meeting on 14 October 1966, in connexion with the Palestine question, the President, speaking as the representative of the United Kingdom, stated that there was a dispute about the facts of the current situation between Israel and Syria. Therefore an investigation by the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization would be welcomed so that impartial evidence would be presented to the Security Council. He expressed the hope that the Secretary-General could arrange for a report to be made available quickly on the incidents which were the subject of the complaint before the Council.

At the 1308th meeting on 17 October 1966, the representative of the Netherlands stated that when he was President of the Security Council, he had an opportunity to acquaint himself with the practice of making available reports of the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine. In view of certain complications in the past, it had become a standing and well founded practice to make the reports of the UNTSO available to the Security Council only at its express wish or at the request of the President acting on behalf of the Council. The President, in his capacity as the representative of the United Kingdom, had expressed at the previous meeting a desire for such a report, and many representatives including the representative of Syria had expressed the same wish. In case this should not yet be sufficient from the formal point of view, the representative suggested that the President, on behalf of the Council, expressed the wish to receive from the Secretary-General a report from his representative on the spot, in order that the Council might have such a report available at the shortest possible time.

Subsequently, at the same meeting, the President (United Kingdom), requested, on behalf of the Security Council, the Secretary-General to provide the Council with a report on the events being discussed by it.

The Secretary-General replied that he had just received the report on the Chief of Staff of the UNTSO which would be submitted to the Security Council the next day.[1a]

CASE 2

In a *note verbale* [2] dated 15 March 1967 addressed to the Secretary-General, the Permanent Mission of the USSR stated that the United Nations Secretariat continued to take a different attitude to the issuance as official United Nations documents of notes and statements of, on the one hand, the Government of the German Democratic Republic and, on the other, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany. While the Secretariat circulated various documents of the Federal Republic of Germany without the slightest difficulty, it ignored statements of the German Democratic Republic addressed to the United Nations. When a communication was received from the latter, the Secretariat, without any grounds, refused to issue the document until a request for its issuance was received from a Member State. This had been the Secretariat's conduct, for example, with regard to the statement received from the Government of the German Democratic Republic [3] on the implementation of Security Council resolution 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966 concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia. Furthermore, the Secretariat had not included in the report (S/7781) on measures taken by States in pursuance of Security Council resolution 232 (1966), the above-mentioned statement on Southern Rhodesia by the Government of the German Democratic Republic despite the fact that the statement had been brought to the knowledge of all members of the Security Council on the instructions of the President of the Council. However, the report did include the statement by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany. What was more, in the addendum to the report presenting data on the trade of individual countries with Southern Rhodesia in 1965 and 1966 (S/7781/Add.1), the Secretariat again had taken a discriminatory and groundless position vis-à-vis the German Democratic Republic as manifested in the gross distortion of its official name.[4] The Secretariat had arbitrarily ignored the existence of the statement by the Government of the German Democratic Republic on a matter connected with the fight against the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia and had hastened to include in the aforesaid report, the letter from the Federal Republic of Germany, which, as everyone knows, was co-operating with the colonists and racists in Africa. Clearly, the Secretariat had not been guided in that case by the purport of the decisions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly, or by the interests of the affair, or by the principles of impartiality and equity. It was unnecessary to prove that this practice of the Secretariat was devoid of any legal foundation, groundless as far as the terms of the United Nations Charter were concerned, narrowly pro-Western and unobjective. In drawing attention to these important matters, the Permanent Mission of the USSR to the United Nations trusted that the Secretary-General would take steps to do away with this abnormal practice regarding the official issuance in the United Nations of documents emanating from the German Democratic Republic.

By *note verbale* [5] dated 2 May 1967, the Secretary-General informed the representative of the USSR that in interpreting resolution 232 (1966), both with respect to the information he was to collect and to include in his report on the implementation of the resolution, he had had full regard to operative paragraph 8 of that resolution, in which the Security Council "calls upon States Members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies to report to the Secretary-General the measures each has taken in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of the present resolution". In accordance

---

[1a] For texts of relevant statements, see:
1307th meeting: Syria, para 65; United Kingdom (President), para. 55;
1308th meeting: Argentina, para. 24; Japan, para. 36; Netherlands, para. 55; President (United Kingdom), para. 109; Secretary-General, para. 110; Uruguay, para. 100.

[2] S/7822, *OR, 22nd yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1967*, pp. 233-234.

[3] The statement was enclosed with a letter dated 27 February 1967 from the representative of Bulgaria to the Secretary-General (S/7794, *ibid.*, pp. 201-203), who requested that the letter and the statement be circulated as documents of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

[4] In the addendum (tables I, V, VII; *ibid.*, pp. 130, 134, 138), the term "Eastern Germany" was used.

[5] S/7891, *OR, 22nd yr., Suppl. for April-June 1967*, pp. 103-104.

with the Council's instructions, the information circulated by the Secretary-General and included in his report (S/7781 and Add.1 and 2)[6] was therefore from those States from which the Council had required such information. Nevertheless, it should be noted that, in addition, at the request of the representative of Bulgaria, the Secretary-General had circulated "a statement of the Government of the German Democratic Republic on the implementation of resolution 232 (1966) adopted by the Security Council on 16 December 1966, concerning the situation in Southern Rhodesia" (S/7794). The Secretary-General drew attention to this statement in an addendum to his report issued on 9 March 1967 (S/7781/Add.2), containing information received after the issue of his original report. So far as the general question of the circulation of communications was concerned, the policy of the Secretariat in this regard had been explained on numerous occasions in the past. The Secretary-General believed that it was beyond his competence, in the absence of explicit directives from the deliberative organ concerned, to determine the highly political and controversial question whether or not certain areas, the status of which was in dispute among Members of the United Nations, were States within the meaning of the "all States" or "States not Members of the United Nations", formulae which on occasion appeared in United Nations resolutions. The Permanent Representative of the USSR to the United Nations would recall, in this respect, the statement made by the Secretary-General at the 1258th plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 18 November 1963, where he had said, *inter alia*:

> "In conclusion, I must therefore state that if the 'any State' formula were to be adopted, I would be able to implement it only if the General Assembly provided me with the complete list of the States coming within that formula, other than those which are Members of the United Nations or the specialized agencies, or parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice."[7]

While these remarks had been made within the context of an agenda item on the question of extended participation in general multilateral treaties concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations, they had been intended to define the general rules applicable in other cases such as the present. As the Secretary-General believed, it was outside his competence to interpret formulae of the nature referred to above, he had no alternative but to continue the existing practice until the Security Council or the General Assembly direct to the contrary.

By *note verbale*[8] dated 16 May 1967, the Permanent Mission of the USSR informed the Secretary-General that it again deemed it necessary to stress that the USSR strongly opposed any attempts, including attempts made in the United Nations, to discriminate against the German Democratic Republic, a sovereign, independent State. In this connexion, the Permanent Mission of the USSR to the United Nations again drew the attention of the Secretary-General to the inadmissibility of continuing, in the United Nations Secretariat, the discriminatory approach to the issuance as official United Nations documents of the statements and notes emanating from the Government of the German Democratic Republic. It was unnecessary to prove that this practice of the United Nations Secretariat was devoid of any legal foundation, groundless as far as the terms of the United Nations Charter were concerned. As for the references in the Secretary-General's *note verbale* to the alleged necessity of special decisions of the Security Council or the General Assembly for the issuance as official United Nations documents of the statements and notes emanating from the German Democratic Republic, it should be noted that the United Nations Secretariat adopted this discriminatory approach towards the German Democratic Republic without any decisions of United Nations organs on the matter, that is to say, arbitrarily, solely because of an illegal practice established in the Secretariat in the past. The Secretariat, following this practice even at the present time, took on this question, a one-sided position which coincided with the positions of the Western Powers. The Mission of the USSR reiterated the trust that the Secretary-General would take steps to do away with this abnormal practice.

Case 3

At the 1445th meeting on 24 August 1968, in connexion with the situation in Czechoslovakia, the President (Brazil) stated that he wished to acquaint the members of the Security Council with the contents of an official note from the Permanent Mission of the USSR to the United Nations, addressed to him.

In the note,[9] the USSR Mission, referring to the letter of the United Nations Secretariat of 23 August 1968 forwarding the text of the telegram from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic of the same day, which contained his communication to the President of the Security Council, drew attention to the fact that this communication had not been so far distributed as an official document of the Council. It was expected that the telegram would be distributed without delay as such a document.

The President observed that the procedure adopted by him followed some of the precedents adopted in the past, since he had failed to receive any guidance from the rules of procedure which did not contain any provision in this regard.

The representative of the USSR read the text of the telegram[10] and stated that in conformity with the usual practice, a communication of a Minister for Foreign Affairs of a State, whether that State was or was not a Member of the United Nations, must be published as an official document of the Security Council, since it had a direct bearing on the matter before the Council. The telegram was sent to the Missions of the members of the Council with a covering note[11] which was not signed. Attached to it was a photostatic copy of the telegram of the Foreign Minister of the German Democratic

[6] *OR, 22nd yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1967*, pp. 74-178.

[7] *GAOR, 18th Session Plen.*, 1258th meeting, para. 101.

[8] S/7889, *OR, 23rd yr., Suppl. for April-June 1967*, pp. 98-99.

[9] 1445th meeting (PV), pp. 2-5.

[10] For the consideration of this communication, see, in this *Supplement*, chapter III, Cases 1 and 5.

[11] Its text read: "Please find attached a photograph of a cablegram dated 23 August 1968 addressed to the President of the Security Council. In accordance with the instructions given by the President of the Security Council, copies of this cablegram are being sent to all members of the Security Council for their information. 23 August 1968" 1445th meeting (PV), p. 11.

Republic. The question arose why this telegram was not circulated as an official document of the Security Council.

The President noted that the copies of the telegram had been distributed according to his instructions. He was, however, ready to comply with any course acceptable to members of the Council.

The representative of Hungary noted that the President had distributed the telegram as an unofficial document, taking into consideration its late arrival. But in a regular way of distributing documents, nothing prevented him from distributing it later as an official document. It would be interesting to know what were the precedents concerning a document on an issue before the Council not being distributed as its document because it had come from a State not a Member of the United Nations.

The representative of the United Kingdom observed that the objection to the document was clear, since it was not a communication from a State as it purported to be. Therefore, the action of the President was correct.

The representative of the United States expressed the view that there was no ambiguity about the situation under the Charter and rule 6 of the rules of procedure. Both Article 32 and rule 6 were applicable only to States, and the régime in the USSR zone in Germany was neither a State nor entitled in any way to speak for the German people.

The representative of the USSR, quoting the text of rule 6, noted that the telegram from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic had not yet been brought to the attention of the members of the Council. It was therefore necessary to correct such a situation.

The representative of Canada said that the so-called Government of the so-called German Democratic Republic had no right to represent any part of the German people. It would be therefore quite inappropriate to circulate the communication in question as an official document of the Security Council.

The President stated that since the point of precedents was raised, he would like to recall that on 9 June 1967, a cable was sent from the same source as the communication in question to the President of the Security Council on the subject of the Middle East question, asking that it be distributed to the members of the Security Council. It had been circulated as a third-person note, exactly as the President had done yesterday, at the directive of the President of the Council on 14 June 1967. The Council had not in that case modified or revoked that President's decision; and the decision had stood. On the other hand, one of the elements which guided the President in his decision of yesterday, was the contents of document S/7891 [12] referring to a *note verbale* dated 2 May 1967 from the Secretary-General to the permanent representative of the USSR regarding the implementation of Security Council resolution 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966 on the situation in Southern Rhodesia. After having read the *note verbale*, the President said that on the question of the distribution of the telegram in question, he did not insist on the practice that was followed, and was willing to take any course of action which might be approved by the Security Council.

The representative of Hungary contended that the Secretariat had supplied the President with only one case in which a document of a non-Member State had not been distributed. That was in June 1967, and the document again had come from the German Democratic Republic. Indirectly this meant that all the documents of other non-Member States, when there had been some issue on which they had felt it necessary to communicate with the Security Council, had been distributed as its official documents. This was, therefore, a discrimination against the German Democratic Republic. Moreover, there was another difference between this case and the case which took place in June 1967. During the current debate, reference to the German Democratic Republic was made on a number of occasions, and to a certain extent it was a party to the issue. Therefore, the 1967 statement had been of a different nature from the statement distributed the day before. The two points should be taken into consideration by the President concerning the distribution as an official document of the telegram he received.[13]

The representative of the USSR proposed that the representative of the German Democratic Republic be invited to participate in the discussion. After the rejection of the proposal, the Security Council proceeded with the consideration of the item on its agenda.[14]

**B. RULE 7: PREPARATION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA

**C. RULE 8. COMMUNICATION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA

---

[12] See, in this chapter, Case 1[a] above.

[13] For texts of relevant statements, see:
1445th meeting (PV): President (Brazil), pp. 2, 3-5, 11, 72-81; Canada, p. 36; Hungary, pp. 12, 81, 87; USSR, pp. 6-10, 11, 33-35; United Kingdom, p. 16; United States, p. 17.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 92, see also in chapter III, Case 1.

Part III

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (RULE 9)

NOTE

Under rule 9, the first item on the provisional agenda for each meeting of the Security Council is the adoption of the agenda. Unless an objection has been raised, the Council usually adopts the provisional agenda without vote,[15] either with or without amendments.[16]

As in previous volumes of the *Repertoire*, part III is devoted to the proceedings of the Council on those occasions when objection has been raised to the adoption of the agenda or other discussion on the adoption of the agenda has taken place.

Section A deals with the procedure of the Council in voting on the adoption of the agenda.

Section B deals with one instance when objection had been raised to the adoption of the agenda on grounds related to the substance of the item on the provisional agenda; the case history is related to procedural aspects of the discussion at the stage of the adoption of the agenda.

Under Section C are treated other questions of procedure relating to the adoption of the agenda, such as the order of discussion of items on the agenda (Case 1), the scope of items and sub-items on the agenda in relation to the scope of discussion (Cases 2 and 3), the phrasing of items on the agenda (Cases 4, 5 and 6) and the postponement of consideration of items (Case 7).

During the period under review, participation in the discussion of the adoption of the agenda has been limited to Council members.[17]

A. PROCEDURE OF VOTING ON ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

**1. Votes taken concerning individual items on the provisional agenda

**2. Votes taken on proposals to determine or change the order of items

3. Votes taken on the adoption of the agenda as a whole

During the period under review, after objections had been raised on the adoption of the agenda as a whole, the Security Council voted upon and adopted the agenda in the following instances:

1273rd meeting, 2 February 1966.[18]
1388th meeting, 26 January 1968.[19]
1441st meeting, 21 August 1968.[20]

CASE 4

At the 1441st meeting on 21 August 1968, in connexion with the situation in Czechoslovakia, the representative of the United States requested, in the light of the USSR objections (see in this chapter, case 3) to the adoption of the agenda, that the question of the adoption of the agenda be put to a formal vote.

After the conclusion of the discussion on the adoption of the agenda, the President (Brazil) stated that since objections had been raised to the adoption of the agenda, he intended to ask the Council to vote on the adoption of the agenda.

The representative of the USSR observed that he had stated that there were no grounds for discussion of the matter in the Security Council, but he did not insist on a vote being taken.

The President pointed out that when objections were raised to the adoption of the agenda, the normal way for the Security Council to proceed would be to put the agenda to the vote. Since the objections had not been withdrawn, it was his intention to proceed to the vote.

The representative of the USSR agreed on this existing practice, and remarked that when a member of the Council who had raised objections, did not insist on a vote, a vote became unnecessary. The one who objected explained his position in his statement and this was sufficient.

The representative of the United States reiterated that the Council should express its views by taking a vote on the adoption of the agenda.

The President stated that he was confronted with objections to the adoption of the agenda and to a vote on its adoption and with a formal motion to the effect that the Security Council proceeded to the vote. Under such circumstances, the normal procedure was to take a vote on the adoption of the agenda.

The representative of the USSR said that he had no objection to the vote, but did not insist on the vote being taken. The President stated that since there were no

[15] On two instances, the Council proceeded to adjourn the meeting without the discussion on the adoption of the provisional agenda having been completed: at its 1271st and 1272nd meetings on 1 February 1966, when the provisional agenda included the letter dated 31 January 1966 from the Permanent Representative of the United states, concerning the situation in Viet-Nam. At its 1429th meeting on 5 June 1968, when the provisional agenda related to the situation in the Middle East (II), after expressions of tribute had been made by the Council members to a statesman on whose life an attempt had been made that morning, the Council decided to suspend its work as a mark of sympathy.

[16] For an instance of adoption of the agenda, as amended, see Case 10.

[17] On one occasion however, after the provisional agenda had been adopted, without objection, the representative of Jordan, not a member of the Council, who had been invited to participate in the discussion, raised objections to the phrasing of the adopted agenda, drawing the Council's attention to the fact that the usual title "Question of Palestine" did not appear on the provisional agenda. For statements by the representatives of Jordan, USSR, Bulgaria and Mali, see 1345th meeting (PV), pp. 42, 56 and 1346th meeting, pp. 23, 76.

[18] 1273rd meeting, para. 27, in connexion with the situation in Viet-Nam.

[19] 1388th meeting (PV), pp. 17-20, in connexion with the complaint of the United States (Pueblo incident).

[20] 1441st meeting (PV), pp. 58-60, in connexion with the situation in Czechoslovakia.

objections to the vote on the adoption of the agenda, the Council would proceed to the vote.[20a]

Decision: the agenda was adopted.[20b]

B. CONSIDERATION OF:

1. Requirements for the inclusion of an item in the agenda

CASE 5

At the 1441st meeting on 21 August 1968, the Security Council included in its provisional agenda the following item:

"2. Letter dated 21 August 1968 from the representatives of Canada, Denmark, France, Paraguay, the United Kingdom and the United States addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8758)."

The President (Brazil), after the meeting was called to order, recognized the representative of the USSR on a point of order, who read a letter of the USSR delegation addressed to the President of the Security Council. With reference to the request contained in document (S/8758) that a meeting of the Security Council be convened to consider the question of the current situation in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, it was stated in the letter that the USSR resolutely opposed the consideration of that question by the Security Council. The events in Czechoslovakia were a matter of concern for the Czechoslovak State and the States of the socialist community, linked among themselves by appropriate mutual obligations.

The representative of the United States declared that there was not the slightest doubt that the request of the six Member States that the serious situation in Czechoslovakia be inscribed on the agenda of the Security Council, was proper and should be promptly effected if the Council was to live up to the responsibilities given to it by the Charter.

The representative of the USSR, speaking on the point of order, said that the USSR delegation had opposed not only the inclusion of the item proposed by the six Member States in the agenda of the Council, but even the convening of the Council, since the problem was outside its purview.

The representative of the United States stated that the Security Council had a responsibility to condemn the violation of the Charter and to call upon the USSR and its allies to withdraw its forces immediately from Czechoslovakia, and requested that the question of the adoption of the agenda be put to the formal vote.

The representative of Canada contended that all Member States of the United Nations, and particularly members of the Security Council who were charged under Article 24 with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, must uphold certain principles which were the foundation of the Charter. One of these principles was the sovereign equality of all Member States. Another was that all Member States shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. The representative further quoted the first operative paragraph [21] of General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX), "Declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States for the protection of their independence and sovereignty", and stated that the consideration of the matter before the Council should be pursued as a matter of urgency.

The representative of the United Kingdom pointed out that the armed invasion of Czechoslovakia carried out by the USSR and other States, stood condemned by the Charter, by the Government of Czechoslovakia and by the text of the Warsaw Treaty; in its article 1, the parties undertook to refrain in their international relations, from the threat or use of force, and to settle their international disputes by peaceful means. For these reasons, the matter should be inscribed on the agenda of the Security Council.

The representatives of Denmark and Paraguay supported the proposal concerning the adoption of the agenda.

The representative of the USSR stated that the armed forces of the Socialist States had entered the territory of Czechoslovakia as a result of a request of its Government. Moreover, the USSR Government had in its possession irrefutable data concerning ties between the internal reaction in Czechoslovakia and those outside who were interested in pulling Czechoslovakia out of the Socialist Community of States. The decision of the Socialist States to give assistance to the Czechoslovak people was therefore fully in accordance with the right of peoples to individual and collective self-defence, the right provided for in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. The measures taken by the Socialist States were in full conformity with the Charter and with the treaties of alliance concluded among those States. The events which took place in Czechoslovakia were a matter for the Czechoslovak people and the States of the Socialist Community alone. Neither the Czechoslovak Government nor the Government of any other Socialist State had appealed to the Security Council; none of them asked for a meeting of the Security Council, not only because they regarded it unnecessary in the current circumstances but also because they considered the matter as being outside the competence of the Council.[22]

Decision: The agenda was adopted [23] by 13 votes in favour, 2 against.

[20a] For texts of relevant statements, see:
1441st meeting (PV): President (Brazil), pp. 53-55, 56, 57, 58, 60; USSR, pp. 56, 57; United States, pp. 56, 57.

[20b] 1441st meeting (PV), pp. 58-60. Similar objections to the adoption of the agenda were raised by the representative of the USSR at the 1444th meeting on 23 August 1968. However, the agenda was adopted without a vote being taken.
For texts of relevant statements, see:
1441st meeting (PV), pp. 11, 12, 13-16; United States, pp. 12, 16.

[21] This paragraph provides: "No State has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. Consequently, armed intervention and all other forms of interference or attempted threats against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements, are condemned."

[22] For texts of relevant statements, see:
1441st meeting (PV): President (Brazil), pp. 2-11; Canada, pp. 23, 26; Denmark, p. 31; Paraguay, pp. 53, 55; USSR, pp. 16, 32, 41, 48-50, 52; United Kingdom, pp. 26-28; United States, p. 11.

[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 58-60.

**2. Effect of the inclusion of an item in the agenda

C. OTHER DISCUSSION ON THE ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1. Order of discussion of items on the agenda

CASE 6

At the 1288th meeting on 25 July 1966, item 2 of the provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1288/Rev.1) read as follows:

"2. The Palestine question:

(*a*) Letter dated 21 July 1966 from the Permanent Representative of Syria to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7419);

(*b*) Letter dated 22 July 1966 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7423)."

Before the adoption of the agenda, the representative of Jordan objected to the inscription of the "complaint" by Israel. Originally, Syria had requested a Council meeting, and a date had been set for the consideration of the matter. A provisional agenda had been drawn up (S/Agenda/1288) which referred solely to the Syrian complaint. Israel had subsequently submitted what were intended to be counter charges, which should not be placed on an equal level with the Syrian case, since they were designed to divert the attention of the Council from the real issue.

The representatives of the USSR and Bulgaria supported these objections. The latter suggested that item 2(*a*) should be discussed first and separately while he had no objections to the Council subsequently discussing item 2(*b*).

The representative of the United Kingdom observed that according to the Council's practice, communications from both sides in disputes which were submitted to the Council should appear on the same agenda, and be dealt with simultaneously. He, therefore, proposed the adoption of the provisional agenda as it stood.

The representative of Jordan denying the existence of an established practice in this respect, mentioned other instances when the Council had examined first item (*a*) and later item (*b*). He referred to such precedents in the Council's practice.[24]

The President (Nigeria) recognized that past practice of the Council was not conclusive. However, since the reservations made to the adoption of the agenda had not involved formal proposals for amending it, the Council might agree that the provisional agenda be adopted as drafted, and that the question be later discussed as to how to proceed on the consideration of both items. He stated that he did not agree with the idea of giving equal footing to the two requests. In point of fact, request (*a*) stood before request (*b*), so that the two requests were not on an equal footing. He could not make a ruling for the Council, but he suggested that when its members discussed the programme of their work, they might then deal with that problem.[25] The agenda was adopted, upon that understanding, and since there were no objections, without a vote.[26]

2. Scope of items and sub-items on the agenda in relation to the scope of discussion

CASE 7

At the 1343rd meeting on 29 May 1967, in connexion with the situation in the Middle East (I), before the adoption of the agenda, the President (China) drew the Council's attention to the fact that in addition to item 2 of the provisional agenda on which discussion had been adjourned at the previous meeting, items 3 and 4 had been added to the provisional agenda of the current meeting. Since there were no objections, he declared the agenda as adopted.[27] Subsequently, the President stated that normally items were discussed in the order in which they were listed in the agenda. Since items 2, 3 and 4 appeared to be more or less interrelated, he inquired from the Council members how they wished to proceed with the discussion.

The representative of the United States suggested that all the items be considered together, since they were related to the same subject.[28]

The President then announced that there being no objections, the Council would proceed in that manner.[29]

CASE 8

At the 1460th meeting on 29 December 1968, the provisional agenda read as follows:

"The Situation in the Middle East:

"Letter dated 29 December 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8945)

"Letter dated 29 December 1968 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8946)"

After the adoption of the agenda,[30] the representative of the USSR observed that due to the urgent nature of the request for convening the Council, he had not wished to initiate a procedural discussion, and had reluctantly accepted the adoption of the agenda. However, he reserved his right to return to this matter later, [31] since the second sub-item on the provisional agenda did not have a direct relationship to the situation in the Middle East, inasmuch as the events to which it was related had taken place in Athens.

---

[24] *Repertoire Supplement 1956-1958*, chapter II, part III, p. 36.

[25] For texts of relevant statements, see:
1288th meeting: President (Nigeria), paras. 41-43, 45; Bulgaria, paras. 24, 25; Jordan, paras. 8-14, 31-34; USSR, paras. 15-18, 35-39; United Kingdom, paras. 26-30.

[26] 1288th meeting, para. 45.

[27] 1343rd meeting, para. 2.

[28] For texts of relevant statements, see:
1343rd meeting: President (China), paras. 7, 8; United States, para. 9.

[29] 1343rd meeting: para. 10.

[30] 1460th meeting (PV): p. 2.

[31] For the later statements of the USSR, see 1462nd meeting, p. 76.

The representative of Canada requested to be assured that in adopting the agenda, the Council members had done so without prejudice to the positions that they, or the parties concerned, might take on the substance of the matter.

The President (Ethiopia) stated that it was his understanding that Council members, in their statements, might refer to any part of the agenda as it stood.[32]

3. Phrasing of items on the agenda

CASE 9

At the 1305th meeting on 14 October 1966, in connexion with the Palestine question, the provisional agenda included the following item:

"2. The Palestine question:

Letter dated 12 October 1966 from the Permanent Representatives of Israel to the United Nations, addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7540)."

During the discussion on the adoption of the agenda, the representative of Jordan stated that there was need for an amendment in the provisional agenda. It was a well established practice in the Security Council to present items for discussion on the agenda without prejudging the issues. The text of the letter of Israel should be examined carefully before being accepted as the basis for the Council's agenda. He took exception to the reference to it in the provisional agenda, since it referred to acts of aggression, threats and open incitement to war, which were all findings and conclusions. These were nothing but allegations, and the agenda to be adopted by the Council should reflect reality and any complaints made in an impartial manner. The representative then formally moved that item 2 of the provisional agenda should read as follows: "The Palestine question: Allegations contained in the letter dated 12 October 1966 . . .", leaving the remainder of the text as it was.

The representative of New Zealand observed that the phrasing of the provisional agenda followed the traditionally neutral wording, with no statement of the substance of the matter whatsoever.

The representative of Jordan noted that the letter of Israel was unusual in that it did not embody references to facts or events, but contained rather two charges, a condemnation and acts of aggression which were not proved or defined. The Council could not refer to a letter of such kind unless it referred to it as a charge or charges. On the other hand, the provisional agenda continued to be under the jurisdiction of its President until the Council took action. He could, therefore, proceed to make the necessary changes in order to make it more acceptable to the Council members.

The President (United Kingdom) stated that the provisional agenda had been drawn up in accordance with the usual custom and in the usual manner, and that he would therefore seek the decision of the Council on whether it should be adopted. He inquired of the representative of Jordan whether he wished the matter to be put to a vote.

The representative of the United States observed that at this stage, the Security Council, which possessed no authority to censor a communication from any Member, passed no judgement about the merits of the letter.

The representative of Uruguay pointed out that the use of a legal term in a document by one of the parties in no way committed the Council as a whole or any of its members.

The representative of Nigeria maintained that having regard to all the precedents, and to the fact that using the word "letter" in the provisional agenda did not commit the Council to its contents, but merely submitted its text for consideration, appealed to the representative of Jordan not to press to a vote the issue of the wording which he had raised.

In the view of the representative of Bulgaria, the Council was duty bound to take account of the objections raised to the phrasing of the agenda item, which could rather start with the words "Complaint contained in the letter dated 12 October 1966 . . .". The Council would be then dealing with a complaint and not with a letter containing language objectionable to certain Council members.

The representative of Uganda expressed the view that it was an established fact that whatever was asserted by a complainant, was and should be taken as nothing more than allegations until the complainant had proved his case. In the previous complaints before the Council, the wording had always been the same as this: "Letter dated . . . from . . .". There was no need therefore for an alteration in this particular case.

The representative of Jordan agreed with the amendment suggested by the representative of Bulgaria. However, if the text of the agenda item approved by the President did not, in his view, prejudge, prejudice or affect the substance of the question, he would not insist on having the matter put to a vote. It should, in any case, be borne in mind that adopting the agenda was not an automatic formula, and the Council had to be very careful about the terms, phraseology and meaning of the agenda item.

The representative of the Netherlands stated that the wording of the agenda chosen by the Secretariat and supported by the President, was in conformity with the constant practice of the Council. In "Summary statement by the Secretary-General on matters of which the Security Council is seized" were listed about seventy-three items and in thirty-two cases the agenda was worded: "Letter dated . . . from the representative of . . .". It appeared that this had been the practice adopted since 1954, because earlier wordings had given rise to difficulty. The representative then moved that the Security Council should adopt the agenda as it stood.

The President reiterated his view that the provisional agenda had been formulated in accordance with standard practice, and stressed that there was no question whatsoever, by accepting the usual wording of the agenda, of accepting any allegation or any complaint put forward in the substance of the communications addressed to the Council, and which would be the subject of the Council's discussion. There was no implication, therefore, that in accepting the agenda, the representative of Jordan,

[32] For texts of relevant statements, see:
1460th meeting (PV): President (Ethiopia), pp. 2, 6; Canada, p. 6; USSR, pp. 2-5.

or any other Council member, accepted the contents of the letter of the representative of Israel.

In view of the clarification made by the President, the representative of Jordan considered that there was no need to vote on the motion for the adoption of the agenda which had been submitted by the representative of the Netherlands.[33a]

The agenda was adopted without a vote.[33]

CASE 10

At the 1448th meeting on 8 September 1968, the provisional agenda read as follows:

"The Situation in the Middle East:

"Letter dated 2 September 1968 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8794)

"Letter dated 8 September 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8805)

"Letter dated 8 September 1968 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8806)."

Before the adoption of the agenda, the representative of Algeria remarked, on a point of order, that the Council was meeting to consider the situation arising from the events of 8 September in the Suez Canal area, pursuant to the request of the representative of the United Arab Republic.

The President (Canada) stated, in reply, that in formulating the agenda, he had followed the precedent of keeping the item under the general heading "Situation in the Middle East", and had added the letter from the representative of the United Arab Republic as an item under that heading.

The representative of the USSR supported the view of the representative of Algeria that the Council was meeting to consider a new question.

The President replied that in formulating the agenda he had followed the provisions of rule 10 and past practice of the Security Council. He noted that if the representative of the USSR would like to make a formal motion regarding the order of the listing of the items on the agenda, the President could consult the Council thereon.

After the representative of the USSR reaffirmed his view that the Council had met that day to consider a new question, the President stated that he had taken note of the remark of the representative of the USSR and, in the absence of further remarks, declared the agenda adopted.[34]

4. Postponement of consideration of items

CASE 11

At the end of the 1304th meeting on 13 October 1966, at which the Council dealt with the complaint of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, a discussion took place concerning the future work of the Council. The President (United Kingdom) stated that after some preliminary consultations, two meetings had been scheduled for the next day: one in the morning, to consider a complaint by Israel, and the other, in the afternoon, to deal with the admission of New Members. He therefore proposed that the discussion concerning the Congo should be continued either on that same afternoon or the next day, after concluding the consideration of the admission of New Members. Objections to this suggestion were raised by the representatives of Nigeria, Uganda, the USSR, Jordan, Bulgaria and Mali, who expressed the view that the discussion on the Congolese question should be resumed with the minimum possible delay. That same afternoon, the meeting could not be held since there were consultations under way. Therefore, the Council should resume the consideration of the Congolese question in the morning of the next day. The President further pointed out that while the Council should not turn its attention to other questions until it had completed consideration of the matter before it, it could, being master of its own procedure, make any changes on its scheduled meetings that might be required by emerging circumstances. It was, however, recognized that a decision on the matter fell under the President's prerogatives. The representatives of the United States, New Zealand and France supported the proposal of the President.

The President further observed that the meeting on the Palestine question had been scheduled for the next day, after consultation with the Council members, due to the fact that an urgent request for such a meeting had been made. He had convoked that meeting in exercise of his authority as President of the Council, and such a decision having been taken, it should stand. Since the debate on admission of New Members, in the afternoon meeting of the next day, was not likely to take any length of time, he would decide that after that meeting the Council should proceed with the discussion on the Congolese item, which was therefore being postponed until then.[35]

At the 1305th meeting on 14 October 1966, the Council had before it as its provisional agenda a complaint by Israel.[36] During the discussion, the representative of the USSR reiterated his earlier objections to the interruption of the discussion of the Congolese question, which he considered to be an acute problem affecting many African countries while, after studying the relevant facts and documents, he had failed to see the alleged urgency of Israel's complaint which would have it take precedence over the consideration of the complaint of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It was, therefore, all the more

[33a] For texts of relevant statements, see:
1305th meeting: President (United Kingdom), paras. 26, 119; Bulgaria, para. 64; Jordan, paras. 10-15, 79-80, 127; Netherlands, paras. 90-92; New Zealand, para. 21; Nigeria, paras. 57-58; Uganda, paras. 69-70; United States, paras. 36-38; Uruguay, para. 50.

[33] 1305th meeting: para. 131.

[34] For texts of relevant statements, see:
1448th meeting (PV): President (Canada), pp. 2-5; Algeria, p. 2; USSR., pp. 3-5.

[35] For texts of relevant statements, see:
1304th meeting: President (United Kingdom), paras. 124, 129, 130, 135, 151-154; Bulgaria, para. 142; France, paras. 149, 150; Jordan, para. 141; Mali, para. 145; New Zealand, paras. 143, 144; Nigeria, paras. 126, 127; Uganda, paras. 132-134; USSR, paras. 136-140; United States, para. 131.

[36] S/7540, *OR, 21st yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1966*, pp. 28-29.

strange that the President had taken the unilateral decision to convene the Council immediately on that complaint despite the fact that the members of the Council were divided on the subject, and that it was not clear which was the majority view.

The representative of New Zealand observed that there were many examples in the practice of the Council of the precedent that, because of a similar urgency, matters had been dealt with in parallel fashion. That precedent was being applied in the question before the Council, and the President was fully authorized to propose it in accordance with the provisional rules of procedure of the Council.

The representative of the United States noting that the Security Council, by virtue of its responsibility under the Charter, had often before it simultaneously many problems of urgency, emphasized that the President's authority had not been challenged, and that he had, as other Council's Presidents, accommodated himself to the exigencies of the situation.

In supporting also the position of the President, the representative of Uruguay held that in respect of the powers of the President, the Council had to abide by the provisions of rules 1, 2, 7, 8 and 9 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council. The President, in his view, had acted in accordance with the powers vested in him, as well as following the precedents which had been previously mentioned. It was clear that he had exercised his authority in conformity with the Charter.

The representative of Nigeria agreed that in regard to the sequence of items on the agenda, final responsibility rested with the President of the Council.

The representative of Bulgaria clarified that being aware of the responsibilities and authority of the President of the Council, he had only appealed to him, at the previous meeting, to reconsider his decision on the future meetings of the Council.

The representative of Uganda, while admitting that the provisional rules of procedure of the Council gave the President absolute discretion as regards the convening of Council meetings, wondered whether, when there was already an issue before the Council, the President had the power to superimpose another item on the agenda, deciding which item should take priority without consulting the Council's members and gaining their support.

The representative of the Netherlands observed that there had been many cases when the Council was debating a particular item and decided to debate another question that came up urgently, interrupting the debate on the former item. There was no implication at all in such a procedure that the interrupted debate had less urgency or was of less importance. He subsequently moved that the Council should adopt the agenda as it stood.

The President recalled that he had previously stated that, as a matter of principle, he considered that when a meeting of the Council was requested on a question which was said to be urgent, then such a meeting should be convened without delay, except when there was a special or everriding reason to the contrary. For that reason, having consulted all the Council members, he had previously decided that there would be a morning meeting on that date to consider the complaint by Israel, and that, as arranged, the afternoon meeting should deal with the admission of new Members. In taking such a decision, the President had acted in accordance with his right and duty under the provisional rules of procedure of the Council. He had also provided that, after the question of admission of new Members, the Council would resume its discussion of the Congo item. After a statement by the representative of the Netherlands, that he would not insist on the agenda being voted upon, the President declared the agenda adopted without a vote.[37-39]

**5. Precedence of the decision of adoption of the agenda

[37-39] For texts of relevant statements, see:
1305th meeting: President (United Kingdom), paras. 120-126; Bulgaria, paras. 59-62; Netherlands, paras. 87-89; New Zealand, paras. 18-19; Nigeria, para 55; Uganda, paras. 65-67; Uruguay, paras. 40-47; USSR, paras. 2-8; United States, paras. 32-33, 35.

Part IV

THE AGENDA: MATTERS OF WHICH THE SECURITY COUNCIL IS SEIZED (RULES 10 AND 11)

NOTE

Rule 10 of the provisional rules of procedure was designed to enable the Security Council to continue, at its next meeting, the consideration of an item of unfinished business without subjecting that item to renewed debate in connexion with the adoption of the agenda. In practice, however, the provisional agenda has not contained all items of unfinished business. The case history inserted in section A (Case 10) is related to an instance when a member of the Council queried the President for his failure to include a letter on the provisional agenda.

In the volume of the *Repertoire* covering the period 1946-1951, it was noted that items on the agenda of the Council have remained on the Secretary-General's Summary Statement of matters of which the Security Council is seized when the tenor of the Council's discussion has revealed a continuing concern with the matter.[40]

[40] The following resolutions contained provisions according to which the Security Council decided to maintain the item on the agenda or to remain seized of the matter: resolutions 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966, oper. para. 13; and 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968, oper. para. 23, adopted in connexion with the situation ir Southern Rhodesia; resolution 244 (1967) of 22 December 1967 oper. para. 6, adopted in connexion with the complaint by Cyprus; and resolutions 245 (1968) of 25 January 1968, oper. para. 5; and 246 (1968) of 14 March 1968, oper. para. 7, adopted in connexion with the question of South West Africa.

During the period under review, additional evidence supporting such retention has been provided when the President of the Council has announced, upon conclusion of the debate, that the Council remained seized of a question.[41]

The tabulation appearing in section B.1 brings up to date those appearing in previous volumes of the *Repertoire*.

A. RULE 10

CASE 12

At the 1365th meeting on 8 July 1967, in connexion with the situation in the Middle East (I), the revised provisional agenda included the following items:

"2. Letter dated 23 May 1967 from the Permanent Representatives of Canada and Denmark addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7902)

"3. Complaint of the representative of the United Arab Republic in a letter to the President of the Security Council dated 27 May 1967 entitled:

'Israeli aggressive policy, its repeated aggression threatening peace and security in the Middle East and endangering international peace and security' (S/7907)

"4. Letter dated 29 May 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7910)

"5. Letter dated 9 June 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the President of the Security Council concerning an item entitled:

'Cessation of military action by Israel and withdrawal of the Israeli forces from those parts of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria which they have seized as the result of an aggression' (S/7967)".

At the beginning of the meeting, the President (Ethiopia) explained that the meeting had been called as a result of consultations with Council members, after he had received communications from the representatives of the United Arab Republic (S/8043) and of Israel (S/8044) requesting an urgent meeting of the Security Council.

The representative of the USSR raised objections to the adoption of the agenda on the grounds that the meeting had been convened as a direct consequence of the appeal from the representative of the United Arab Republic that the Council examine the violation by Israeli forces of the cease-fire order. The representative of the USSR enquired, therefore, what the reason was that the provisional agenda made no reference to that appeal which was the substance of the matter concerning which the Council meeting had been convened. The agenda should, in his view, consist of only one item: the letter dated 8 July 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Republic, document S/8043.

The President stated that he had approved the provisional agenda in accordance with rule 7 of the Council's rules of procedure, including in it the items that were before the Council, out of which arose the two communications, one from the United Arab Republic and the other from Israel, which had led to the convening of the meeting. In his initial statement, the President had informed the Council members that those two communications were before the Council in just the same way as the other items, and were inseparably related to the provisional agenda of the current meeting. However, the matter of approving the agenda was up to the Council.

The representative of the USSR observed that the situation to which the agenda was related, had a very long history, and the Council had devoted many meetings to it. There was no need to include in the agenda a long enumeration of items. The agenda should rather be drafted having regard to the aforementioned appeal of the United Arab Republic, which had been the reason for convening urgently the meeting.

The President stated that the discussion of the two communications he had mentioned, dated 8 July 1967, within the context of the items included in the revised provisional agenda, of which the Council had not as yet disposed, would be the best way of dealing with the matter. The Council members could, of course, decide whether to change, add or subtract from the enumeration of items proposed in the agenda.

The representative of the United States, in approving the President's action in preparing the provisional agenda, drew the Council's attention to the fact that in connexion with the same Middle East situation, several emergency meetings had been convened with an agenda prepared in an identical form to that of the provisional agenda before the current meeting.

The President clarified that the two communications dated 8 July 1967, received from the Governments of the United Arab Republic and of Israel, were obviously before the Council, and had been distributed to its members as documents S/8043 and S/8044, respectively.

The representative of Bulgaria remarked that in none of the various communications which appeared in the revised provisional agenda, was there any question of violation of the cease-fire, especially of the specific violation to which the appeal by the United Arab Republic made reference. Also the letter sent by the representative of Israel on the same date referred to a violation of the cease-fire.

The representative of Denmark, referring to rule 10, agreed with the President's procedural action. He further referred to a letter dated 10 June 1967 from the Perma-

---

[41] For the statements of the President, see:
1383rd meeting (PV), p. 71, in connexion with the complaint by Cyprus;
1412th meeting (PV), p. 66, in connexion with the situation in the Middle East (II);
1445th meeting (PV), p. 123, in connexion with the situation in Czechoslovakia. Subsequently, by letter (S/8785, *O.R., 23rd yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1968*, p. 152) dated 27 August 1968, addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Acting Permanent Representative of Czechoslovakia requested the President that in view of the agreement which had been reached in the USSR-Czechoslovak talks held in Moscow from 23 to 26 August 1968, the Czechoslovak item submitted by letter (S/8758), dated 21 August 1968 from the representatives of Canada, Denmark, France, Paraguay, the United Kingdom and the United States, be withdrawn from the Council's agenda. He also drew the attention of the President of the Council to the fact that Czechoslovakia had not requested the inclusion of that item in the agenda of the Council. No action was taken by the Council on this request.

nent Representative of the USSR requesting the Council to consider a violation of its decisions calling for the cessation of military activities. Such a letter had not been included in the agenda while the Council discussed the matter, without objection, under an agenda identical to the one before the current meeting.

The representative of the USSR stated that the provisional agenda as drafted, contained only the last group of items covered by the second paragraph of rule 7, that is, "matters which the Security Council has previously decided to defer". However, in accordance with its provision that "items which have been brought to the attention of the representatives on the Security Council", the letter (S/8043) must be included in the agenda. He recalled further that in the instance that had just been mentioned, there was no particular necessity to have the letter in question included in the agenda. That could not be understood as constituting a precedent.

The representative of India, although of the view that procedure, at times, might affect substance, said that because of the need of dealing urgently with the alleged grave violations of the cease-fire, the Council could decide to change the provisional agenda by adding the documents S/8043 and S/8044 in reference.

The President stated that, there being no objection to the motion of the representative of India, both letters contained in documents S/8043 and S/8044 would be inscribed on the agenda.[42]

The agenda, as amended, was adopted, without a vote.[43]

---

[43] 1365th meeting (PV): President (Ethiopia), pp. 2-6, 7-11, 16, 17, 22, 32; Bulgaria, pp. 22-27; Denmark, pp. 27-30; India, p. 32; USSR, pp. 6, 11-15, 21, 22, 31, 32; United States, pp. 17-21.

[43] 1365th meeting (PV), p. 32.

B. RULE 11

1. Retention and deletion of items from the Secretary-General's Summary Statements on matters of which the Security Council is seized

This tabulation, which supplements those appearing in the *Repertoire, 1946-1951*, the *Supplement, 1952-1955*, pp. 33-40, the *Supplement, 1956-1958*, pp. 38-45, the *Supplement, 1959-1963*, pp. 49-61, and the *Supplement, 1964-1965*, pp. 29-41, covers matters appearing in the Secretary-General's Summary Statements during the period 1966-1968. The items included are (1) those of which the Security Council was seized at the close of the period covered by the earlier tabulations, and (2) items of which the Council has been seized since that time. Items are listed in the order in which they have appeared in the Summary Statement. Items to the end of 1963 are numbered to conform with the numberings in the earlier tabulation. The titles used are those occurring in the Summary Statement except for some abridgements.

Item	*First inclusion in the agenda*	*First entry in Summary Statement*	*Last action of the Council as of 31 December 1968*	*Final entry in Summary Statement as of 31 December 1968*
1. The Iranian question	3rd meeting, 28 January 1946	S/45, 23 April 1946	Adopted Netherlands proposal to adjourn discussion and resume it at the request of any member 43rd meeting, 22 May 1946[a]	
3. Statute and Rules of Procedure of Military Staff Committee	1st meeting, 17 January 1946	S/45, 23 April 1946	Referred report of Military Staff Committee to Committee of Experts 23rd meeting, 16 February 1946	
4. Special Agreements under Article 43 of the Charter	1st meeting, 17 January 1946	S/45, 23 April 1946	Discussed report of Military Staff Committee 157th meeting, 15 July 1947	
5. Rules of procedure of the Security Council	1st meeting, 17 January 1946	S/45, 23 April 1946	Amended rules 468th meeting, 28 February 1950	
14. The general regulation and reduction of armaments	88th meeting, 31 December 1946	S/238,[b] 3 January 1947	Dissolved Commission for Conventional Armaments in accordance with recommendation in General Assembly resolution 502 (VI) 571st meeting, 30 January 1952	

[a] See *Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council, 1946-1951*, Case 56, pp. 92-93.

[b] Combined in S/279 of 14 February 1947 in accordance with the Security Council's decision to deal with the two items together.

Item	First inclusion in the agenda	First entry in Summary Statement	Last action of the Council as of 31 December 1968	Final entry in Summary Statement as of 31 December 1968
Information on armed forces of United Nations (General Assembly resolutions 41 (1) and 42 (1))	89th meeting, 7 January 1947	S/246,[b] 10 January 1947		
19. Appointment of a Governor of the Free Territory of Trieste	143rd meeting, 20 June 1947	S/382, 20 June 1947	Postponed discussion of the item 647th meeting, 14 December 1953	
20. The Egyptian question	159th meeting, 17 July 1947	S/425, 18 July 1947	Rejected Chinese draft resolution 201st meeting, 10 September 1947[c]	
21. The Indonesian question (II)	171st meeting, 31 July 1947	S/461, 1 August 1947	Failed to adopt Canadian draft resolution and rejected Ukrainian SSR draft resolution 456th meeting, 13 December 1949[d]	
22. Voting procedure in the Security Council	197th meeting, 27 August 1947	S/533, 29 August 1947	Presidential statement concerning outcome of meetings of five permanent members in accordance with General Assembly resolution of 14 April 1949, 195th plenary session 452nd meeting, 18 October 1949	
24. Procedure in application of Articles 87 and 88 of the Charter with regard to the Pacific Islands under strategic Trusteeship of the United States	220th meeting, 15 November 1947	S/603, 15 November 1947	Adopted resolution concerning procedure to be employed in application of Articles 87 and 88 of the Charter to strategic areas under Trusteeship 415th meeting, 7 March 1949	
25. Applications for membership,[e] Republic of Korea	409th meeting, 15 February 1949	S/1244, 7 February 1949	Not recommended 423rd meeting, 8 April 1949	See items 62, 77 and 85 below
Letter of 11 February 1949 from the representative of the USSR concerning application by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea	409th meeting, 15 February 1949	S/1257, 14 February 1949	Rejected USSR proposal to refer application to Committee on Admission of New Members 410th meeting, 16 February 1949	
26. The Palestine question	222nd meeting, 9 December 1947	S/623, 12 December 1947	Failed to adopt United Kingdom-United States draft resolution (S/6113) 1182nd meeting, 21 December 1964	
27. The India-Pakistan question[f]	226th meeting, 6 January 1948	S/641, 9 January 1948	Adopted joint draft resolution (S/6876) 1251st meeting, 5 November 1965	

[c] See *Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council, 1946-1951*, Case 59, pp. 95-96.

[d] See *Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council, 1946-1951*, Case 61, p. 97.

[e] Listed under this heading are only those applications which failed to obtain recommendations as others were admitted by the Council's later actions as of 31 December 1963.

[f] The India-Pakistan question: This item was entitled the Kashmir question in S/641. This was changed to the Kashmir and Jammu question in S/653 of 17 January 1948. The present title, India-Pakistan question, first appears in S/675, of 13 February 1948.

Item	First inclusion in the agenda	First entry in Summary Statement	Last action of the Council as of 31 December 1968	Final entry in Summary Statement as of 31 December 1968
28. The Czechoslovak question	268th meeting, 17 March 1948	S/700, 22 March 1948	Discussed Argentine draft resolution (S/782) 305th meeting, 26 May 1948	
30. Question of the Free Territory of Trieste	344th meeting, 4 August 1948	S/959, 10 August 1948	Rejected draft resolutions submitted by Yugoslavia and by the Ukrainian SSR 354th meeting, 19 August 1948	
31. The Hyderabad question	357th meeting, 16 September 1948	S/1010, 22 September 1948	Heard statements by the representatives of India and Pakistan 425th and 426th meetings, 19 and 24 May 1949[g]	
33. Identic Notifications dated 29 September 1948	362nd meeting, 5 October 1948	S/1029, 9 October 1948	Rejected joint draft resolution (S/1048) 372nd meeting, 25 October 1948	
38. International Control of Atomic Energy[h]	444th meeting, 15 September 1949	S/1394,[i] 21 September 1949	Adopted Canadian draft resolution as amended, and rejected USSR draft resolution (S/1391/Rev.1) 447th meeting, 16 September 1949	
43. Complaint of armed invasion of Taiwan (Formosa)	492nd meeting, 29 August 1950	S/1774, 7 September 1950	Rejected draft resolutions (S/1757 and S/1921) 530th meeting, 30 November 1950	
44. Complaint of bombing by air forces of the territory of China	493rd meeting, 31 August 1950	S/1774, 7 September 1950	Failed to adopt United States draft resolution (S/1752) and rejected USSR draft resolution (S/1745/Rev.1) 501st meeting, 12 September 1950	
48. Complaint of failure by the Iranian Government to comply with provisional measures indicated by the International Court of Justice in the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company case	559th meeting, 1 October 1951	S/2364, 2 October 1951	Adopted French motion to adjourn the debate until the International Court had ruled on its own competence 565th meeting, 19 October 1951	
50. New applications for membership. Viet-Nam (S/2466)	594th meeting, 2 September 1952	S/2770, 8 September 1952	Not recommended 603rd meeting, 19 September 1952	
Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam (S/2466)	594th meeting, 2 September 1952	S/2770, 8 September 1952	Not recommended 603rd meeting, 19 September 1952	
51. Question of appeal to States to accede to and ratify the Geneva Protocol of 1925 for the prohibition of the use of bacterial weapons	577th meeting, 18 June 1952	S/2679, 23 June 1952	Rejected USSR draft resolution 583rd meeting, 26 June 1952	

[g] See *Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council, 1946-1951*, Case 60, pp. 96-97.

[h] The agenda item at the 444th through 447th meetings of the Security Council was entitled "Letter dated 29 July 1949 from the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1377)".

[i] An earlier summary statement, S/1388 of 12 September 1949, referred under the same heading to a Canadian draft resolution (S/1386) circulated in anticipation of the discussion of the question at a forthcoming meeting.

Item	First inclusion in the agenda	First entry in Summary Statement	Last action of the Council as of 31 December 1968	Final entry in Summary Statement as of 31 December 1968
52. Question of request for investigation of alleged bacterial warfare	581st meeting, 23 June 1952	S/2687, 1 July 1952	Rejected USSR draft resolution 585th meeting, 1 July 1952 Failed to adopt United States draft resolution 587th meeting, 3 July 1952 Failed to adopt United States draft resolution 590th meeting, 9 July 1952	
56. Letter dated 29 May 1954 from the acting Permanent Representative of Thailand to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/3220)	672nd meeting, 3 June 1954	S/3224, 8 June 1954	Failed to adopt Thailand draft resolution (S/3229) 674th meeting, 18 June 1954	
57. Cablegram dated 19 June 1954 from the Minister of External Relations of Guatemala addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/3232)	675th meeting, 20 June 1954	S/3257, 29 June 1954	Failed to adopt Brazilian-Colombian draft resolution (S/3236/Rev.1) Adopted French draft resolution (S/3237) 675th meeting, 20 June 1954[j]	
59. Letter dated 8 September 1954 from the representative of the United States addressed to the President of the Security Council	679th meeting, 10 September 1954	S/3289, 13 September 1954	Adjourned to meet again upon request of any delegation 680th meeting, 10 September 1954	
61. Letter dated 28 January 1955 from the representative of New Zealand addressed to the President of the Security Council concerning the question of hostilities in the area of certain islands off the coast of the mainland of China Letter dated 30 January 1955 from the representative of the USSR addressed to the President of the Security Council concerning the question of acts of aggression by the United States against the People's Republic of China in the area of Taiwan and other islands of China	689th meeting, 31 January 1955	S/3359, 7 February 1955	Postponed consideration of matters contained in the letter from the representative of New Zealand 691st meeting, 14 February 1955 Rejected USSR motion to consider the next item on the agenda 691st meeting, 14 February 1955	
62. Applications for membership [k]	703rd meeting, 13 December 1955	S/3515, 15 December 1955	Not recommended 704th meeting, 13 December 1955	See items 77 and 85 below

[j] At the 676th meeting on 25 June 1954, the Council failed to adopt the agenda. For case history, see the *Supplement, 1952-1955*, Cases 22 and 23, pp. 33, 40.

[k] Under this agenda heading, the applications remaining on the list are only those which failed to obtain recommendation.

Item	First inclusion in the agenda	First entry in Summary Statement	Last action of the Council as of 31 December 1968	Final entry in Summary Statement as of 31 December 1968
Reconsideration. Republic of Korea, Viet-Nam				
68. Letter dated 23 September 1956 from the representatives of France and the United Kingdom addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/3654)	734th meeting, 26 September 1956	S/3661, 1 October 1956	After adopting the first part of the joint draft resolution (S/3671), the Council rejected the second part as amended by Iran 743rd meeting, 13 October 1956	
69. Letter dated 24 September 1956 from the representative of Egypt addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/3656)	734th meeting, 26 September 1956	S/3661, 1 October 1956	Rejected a motion to discuss this item simultaneously with the preceding one submitted by France and the United Kingdom 734th meeting, 26 September 1956	
70. Letter dated 27 October 1956 from the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/3690)	746th meeting, 28 October 1956	S/3738, 6 November 1956	Adopted United States draft resolution (S/3733) to call an emergency special session of the General Assembly 754th meeting, 4 November 1956	
71. Letter dated 25 October 1956 from the representative of France addressed to the Secretary-General (S/3689 and Corr.1)	747th meeting, 29 October 1956	S/3738, 6 November 1956	Adjourned its discussion to a further date 747th meeting, 29 October 1956	
72. Letter dated 30 October 1956 from the representative of Egypt addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/3712)	750th meeting, 30 October 1956	S/3738, 6 November 1956	Adopted Yugoslav draft resolution (S/3719) 751st meeting, 31 October 1956	
77 Admission of new Members Republic of Korea	789th meeting, 9 September 1957	S/3888, 17 September 1957	Not recommended 790th meeting, 9 September 1957	See item 85 below
Viet-Nam	789th meeting, 9 September 1957	S/3888, 17 September 1957	Not recommended 790th meeting, 9 September 1957	See item 85 below
78. The Tunisian question (I): Letter dated 13 February 1958 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the President of the Security Council concerning: "Complaint by Tunisia in respect of an act of aggression committed against it by France on 8 February 1958 at Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef"	811th meeting, 18 February 1958	S/3967, 26 February 1958	Adjourned the meeting under rule 33 811th meeting, 18 February 1958	

Item	First inclusion in the agenda	First entry in Summary Statement	Last action of the Council as of 31 December 1968	Final entry in Summary Statement as of 31 December 1968
Letter dated 14 February 1958 from the permanent representative of France to the President of the Security Council concerning: "Situation resulting from the aid furnished by Tunisia to rebels enabling them to conduct operations from Tunisian territory directed against the integrity of French territory and the safety of the persons and property of French nationals"				
79. Letter dated 20 February 1958 from the representative of the Sudan addressed to the Secretary-General	812th meeting, 21 February 1958	S/3967, 26 February 1958	Decided that the next meeting, if necessary, would be called after consultation among members and the parties concerned 812th meeting, 21 February 1958	
80. Complaint of the representative of the USSR	813th meeting, 21 April 1958	S/3996, 28 April 1958	Failed to adopt United States draft resolution (S/3995), as amended by Sweden, and rejected USSR draft resolution (S/3997) 817th meeting, 2 May 1958	
82. The Tunisian question (II):	819th meeting, 2 June 1958	S/4021, 9 June 1958	Statements made by the representatives of France and Tunisia concerning the agreement reached by their Governments 826th meeting, 18 June 1958	
Letter dated 29 May from the representative of Tunisia to the President of the Security Council concerning: "Complaint by Tunisia in respect of acts of armed aggression committed against it since May 1958 by the French military forces stationed in its territory and in Algeria"				
Letter dated 29 May from the representative of France to the President of the Security Council concerning: (*a*) "The complaint brought by France against Tunisia on 14 February 1958 (document S/3954)" (*b*) "The situation arising out of the disruption by Tunisia, of the *modus vivendi* which had been established since February 1958 with regard to the				

Item	First inclusion in the agenda	First entry in Summary Statement	Last action of the Council as of 31 December 1968	Final entry in Summary Statement as of 31 December 1968
stationing of French troops at certain points in Tunisian Territory"				
85. Admission of new Members Republic of Korea	842nd meeting, 9 December 1958	S/4135, 16 December 1958	Not recommended 843rd meeting, 9 December 1958	
Viet-Nam	842nd meeting, 9 December 1958	S/4135, 16 December 1958	Not recommended 843rd meeting, 9 December 1958	
86. Report by the Secretary-General on the letter received from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Royal Government of Laos, transmitted by a note from the Permanent Mission of Laos to the United Nations, 4 September 1959 (S/4212, S/4213, S/4214)	847th meeting 7 September 1959	S/4220, 21 September 1959	Adopted joint draft resolution (S/4214) 848th meeting, 7 September 1959	
89. Letter dated 25 March 1960 from the representatives of Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic and Yemen addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/4279 and Add.1)	851st meeting, 30 March 1960	S/4301, 4 April 1960	Adopted Ecuadorian draft resolution (S/4299) 856th meeting, 1 April 1960	
90. Cable dated 18 May 1960 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/4314, S/4315)	857th meeting, 23 May 1960	S/4329, 31 May 1960	Rejected USSR draft resolution (S/4321) 860th meeting, 26 May 1960	
91. Letter dated 23 May 1960 from the representatives of Argentina, Ceylon, Ecuador and Tunisia addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/4323)	861st meeting, 26 May 1960	S/4329, 31 May 1960	Adopted revised four-Power draft resolution (S/4323/Rev.2) 863rd meeting, 27 May 1960	
96. Letter dated 13 July 1960 from the Secretary-General address-	873rd meeting, 13/14 July 1960	S/4391, 18 July 1960	Adopted resolution (S/5002) 982nd meeting, 24 November 1961	

Item	First inclusion in the agenda	First entry in Summary Statement	Last action of the Council as of 31 December 1968	Final entry in Summary Statement as of 31 December 1968
ed to the President of the Security Council (S/4381)				
97. Letter dated 11 July 1960 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cuba addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/4378)	874th meeting, 18 July 1960	S/4408, 25 July 1960	Adopted joint draft resolution (S/4392) 876th meeting, 19 July 1960	
105. Letter dated 31 December 1960 from the Minister for External Relations of Cuba to the President of the Security Council (S/4605)	921st meeting, 4 January 1961	S/4617, 13 January 1961	President stated that the sponsors of the Chile-Ecuador joint draft resolution did not wish to press for a vote 923rd meeting, 5 January 1961	
106. Letter dated 20 February 1961 from the representative of Liberia addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/4738)	944th meeting, 10 March 1961	S/4765, 14 March 1961	Failed to adopt joint draft resolution (S/4769) 946th meeting, 15 March 1961	
Letter dated 26 May 1961 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen and Yugoslavia		S/4837, 12 June 1961	Adopted joint draft resolution (S/4835) as amended 956th meeting, 9 June 1961	
107. Complaint by the Government of Kuwait in respect of the situation arising from the threat by Iraq to the territorial independence of Kuwait, which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security (S/4845, S/4844)	957th meeting, 2 July 1961	S/4858, 10 July 1961	Failed to adopt United Kingdom draft resolution (S/4855) 960th meeting, 7 July 1961	
108. Complaint by the Government of the Republic of Iraq in	957th meeting, 2 July 1961	S/4858, 10 July 1961	Failed to adopt United Arab Republic draft resolution (S/4856)	

Item	First inclusion in the agenda	First entry in Summary Statement	Last action of the Council as of 31 December 1968	Final entry in Summary Statement as of 31 December 1968
respect of the situation arising out of the armed threat by the United Kingdom to the independence and security of Iraq, which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security (S/4847)			960th meeting, 7 July 1961	
109. Telegram dated 20 July 1961 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Tunisia (S/4861). Letter dated 20 July 1961 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/4862)	961st meeting, 21 July 1961	S/4867, 24 July 1961	Rejected two joint draft resolutions (S/4903, S/4904) and Turkish draft resolution (S/4905) 966th meeting, 29 July 1961	
112. Letter dated 21 November 1961 from the Permanent Representative of Cuba addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/4992)	980th meeting, 22 November 1961	S/5008, 30 November 1961	Decided to retain the item on the agenda 983rd meeting, 28 November 1961	
114. Letter dated 18 December 1961 from the Permanent Representative of Portugal to the President of the Security Council (S/5030)	987th meeting, 18 December 1961	S/5042, 28 December 1961	Rejected joint draft resolution (S/5032) and failed to adopt joint draft resolution (S/5033) 988th meeting, 18 December 1961	
117. Letter dated 22 October 1962 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/5181); letter dated 22 October 1962 from the Permanent Representative of Cuba addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/5183); letter dated 23 October 1962 from the Deputy Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/5186)	1022nd meeting, 23 October 1962	S/5201, 31 October 1962	Adjournment of meeting pending outcome of Secretary-General's appeal 1025th meeting, 25 October 1962	
119. Letter dated 10 April 1963 from the *Chargé d'affaires* a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Senegal addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/5279 and Corr.1)	1027th meeting, 17 April 1963	S/5291, 22 April 1963	Adopted joint draft resolution (S/5292) 1033rd meeting, 24 April 1963	

Item	First inclusion in the agenda	First entry in Summary Statement	Last action of the Council as of 31 December 1968	Final entry in Summary Statement as of 31 December 1968
121. Telegram dated 5 May 1963 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Haiti addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/5302)	1035th meeting, 8 May 1963	S/5313, 13 May 1963	Postponed indefinitely 1036th meeting, 9 May 1963	
122. Reports by the Secretary-General to the Security Council concerning developments relating to Yemen (S/5298, S/5321, S/5323, S/5325)	1037th meeting, 10 June 1963	S/5334, 17 June 1963	Adopted joint draft resolution (S/5330) 1039th meeting, 11 June 1963	
123. Letter dated 11 July 1963 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Tanganyika, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic and Upper Volta (S/5347)	1040th meeting, 22 July 1963	S/5377, 30 July 1963	Adopted joint draft resolution (S/6953/Rev.1) 1268th meeting, 23 November 1965	
124. Letter dated 11 July 1963 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Tanganyika, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic and Upper Volta (S/5348)	1040th meeting, 22 July 1963	S/5377, 30 July 1963	Adopted joint draft resolution (S/5769) 1135th meeting, 18 June 1964	
125. Letter dated 2 August 1963 from the representatives of Ghana, Guinea, Morocco and the United Arab Republic, addressed	1064th meeting, 9 September 1963	S/5429, 16 September 1963	Adopted draft resolution submitted by the President (S/8601) 1428th meeting, 29 May 1968	

Item	First inclusion in the agenda	First entry in Summary Statement	Last action of the Council as of 31 December 1968	Final entry in Summary Statement as of 31 December 1968
to the President of the Security Council (S/5382); and letter dated 30 August from the *Chargé d'affaires* of the Permanent Mission of the Congo (Brazzaville) addressed to the President of the Security Council on behalf of the representatives of Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Tanganyika, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda and Upper Volta (S/5409)				
128. Letter dated 26 December 1963 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/5488)	1085th meeting, 27 December 1963	S/5500, 31 December 1963	Adopted draft resolution submitted by the President (resolution 261 (1968)) 1459th meeting, 10 December 1968	
129. Letter dated 10 January 1964 from the Permanent Representative of Panama addressed to the President of the Security Council	1086th meeting, 10 January 1964	S/5513, 13 January 1964	Adopted the Brazilian proposal that the President be authorized to address an appeal to the Governments of the United States and of Panama 1086th meeting, 10 January 1964	
130. Letter dated 1 April 1964 from the Deputy Permanent Representative of Yemen, *Chargé d'affaires* a.i., addressed to the President of the Security Council	1106th meeting, 2 April 1964	S/5645, 6 April 1964	Adopted joint draft resolution (S/5649) 1111th meeting, 9 April 1964	
131. Complaint concerning acts of aggression against the territory and civilian population of Cambodia	1118th meeting, 19 May 1964	S/5716, 25 May 1964	Adopted joint draft resolution (S/5735) 1126th meeting, 4 June 1964	
132. Letter dated 4 August 1964 from the Permanent Representative of the United States addressed to the President of the Security Council	1140th meeting, 5 August 1964	S/5891, 13 August 1964	Adopted the proposal of France that President hold consultations with members of the Council in order to reach a general understanding 1141st meeting, 7 August 1964	
133. Letter dated 3 September 1964 from the	1144th meeting, 9 September 1964	S/5967, 14 September 1964	Failed to adopt Norwegian draft resolution (S/5973)	

Item	First inclusion in the agenda	First entry in Summary Statement	Last action of the Council as of 31 December 1968	Final entry in Summary Statement as of 31 December 1968
Permanent Representative of Malaysia addressed to the President of the Security Council			1152nd meeting, 17 September 1964	
134. Letter dated 5 September 1964 from the Permanent Representative of Greece addressed to the President of the Security Council, and letter dated 8 September 1964 from the Permanent Representative of Greece addressed to the President of the Security Council	1146th meeting, 11 September 1964	S/5967, 14 September 1964	Decided that the time of the next meeting would be determined after consultations between the President and members of the Council 1147th meeting, 11 September 1964	
135. Letter dated 6 September 1964 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey addressed to the President of the Security Council	1146th meeting, 11 September 1964	S/5967, 14 September 1964	Decided that the time of the next meeting would be determined after consultations between the President and members of the Council 1147th meeting, 11 September 1964	
137. Letter dated 1 December 1964, addressed to the President of the Security Council, from the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Congo (Brazzaville), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Somalia, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia and Zambia (S/6076 and Add.1-5)	1170th meeting, 9 December 1964	S/6107, 14 December 1964	Adopted joint draft resolution as amended (S/6129) 1189th meeting, 30 December 1964	
Letter dated 9 December 1964 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/6096)				
139. Letter dated 1 May 1965 from the Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the President of the Security Council	1196th meeting, 3 May 1965	S/6342, 10 May 1965	Adopted joint draft resolution (S/6355) 1208th meeting, 14 May 1965 Adopted French draft resolution (S/6376) 1217th meeting, 22 May 1965	
141. Letter dated 31 January 1966 from the Permanent Representative of the United	1271st meeting, 1 February 1966	S/7117, 7 February 1966	Adjourned the meeting 1273rd meeting, 2 February 1966	

Item	First inclusion in the agenda	First entry in Summary Statement	Last action of the Council as of 31 December 1968	Final entry in Summary Statement as of 31 December 1968
States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council				
142. Admission of new Members Guyana	1287th meeting, 21 June 1966	S/7380, 27 June 1966	Recommended 1278th meeting, 21 June 1966	S/7380, 27 June 1966
143. Letter dated 2 August 1966 from the Deputy Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7442)	1296th meeting, 4 August 1966	S/7452, 8 August 1966	Adjourned the meeting 1300th meeting, 16 August 1966	
144. Letter dated 21 Septem- 1966 from the Acting Permanent Representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo addressed to the President of the Security Council	1302nd meeting, 3 October 1966	S/7523, 4 October 1966	Adopted joint draft resolution (S/7539) 1306th meeting, 14 October 1966	
145. Admission of new Members Botswana,	1306th meeting, 14 October 1966	S/7564, 24 October 1966	Recommended 1306th meeting, 14 October 1966	S/7564, 24 October 1966
Lesotho	1306th meeting, 14 October 1966	S/7564, 24 October 1966	Recommended 1306th meeting, 14 October 1966	S/7564, 24 October 1966
146. Election of Members of the International Court of Justice	1315th meeting, 2 November 1966	S/7577, 7 November 1966	Recommended five candidates to fill vacancies 1315th and 1318th meetings, 2 and 3 November 1966	S/7577, 7 November 1966
147. Admission of new Members Barbados	1330th meeting, 7 December 1966		Recommended 1330th meeting, 7 December 1966	
148. Letter dated 23 May 1967 from the Permanent Representatives of Canada and Denmark addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/7902) (The Middle East situation)	1341st meeting, 24 May 1967	S/7913, 29 May 1967	Adopted draft resolution submitted by President (resolution 262 (1968)) 1462nd meeting, 31 December 1968	
149. Letter dated 6 July 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8036)	1363rd meeting, 6 July 1967	S/8048, 10 July 1967	Adopted joint draft resolution (S/8050) 1367th meeting, 10 July 1967	S/8066, 17 July 1967
150. Complaints by the Democratic Republic of the Congo:	1372nd meeting, 8 November 1967	S/8242, 14 November 1967	Adopted draft resolution submitted by President (resolution 241 (1967)) 1378th meeting, 15 November 1967	
Letter dated 3 November 1967 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo addressed to				

Item	First inclusion in the agenda	First entry in Summary Statement	Last action of the Council as of 31 December 1968	Final entry in Summary Statement as of 31 December 1968
the President of the Security Council (S/8218)				
151. Admission of new Members Southern Yemen	1384th meeting, 12 December 1967	S/8301, 18 December 1967	Recommended 1384th meeting, 12 December 1967	S/8301, 18 December 1967
152. The question of South West Africa Letter dated 24 January 1968 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the Representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia (S/8355) Letter dated 23 January 1968 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the President of the United Nations Council for South West Africa (S/8353)	1387th meeting, 25 January 1968	S/8367, 30 January 1968	Adopted draft resolution submitted by the Council (resolution 246 (1968)) 1397th meeting, 14 March 1968	
153. Letter dated 25 January 1968 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8360)	1388th meeting, 26 January 1968	S/8367, 30 January 1968	Adjourned the meeting 1389th meeting, 27 January 1968	
154. Admission of new Members Mauritius	1414th meeting, 18 April 1968	S/8555, 23 April 1968	Recommended 1414th meeting, 18 April 1968	S/8555, 23 April 1968
55. Letter dated 21 May 1968 from the Permanent Representative *Ad Interim* of Haiti addressed to the Presi-	1427th meeting, 27 May 1968	S/8612, 3 June 1968	Adjourned the meeting 1427th meeting, 27 May 1968	

Item	First inclusion in the agenda	First entry in Summary Statement	Last action of the Council as of 31 December 1968	Final entry in Summary Statement as of 31 December 1968
dent of the Security Council (S/8593)				
156. Letter dated 12 June 1968 from the Permanent Representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8630)	1430th meeting, 17 June 1968	S/8652, 25 June 1968	Adopted 3-Power draft resolution (S/8631) 1433rd meeting, 19 June 1968	
157. Letter dated 21 August 1968 from the representatives of Canada, Denmark, France, Paraguay, the United Kingdom and the United States of America addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8758)	1441st meeting, 21 August 1968	S/8778, 26 August 1968	Adjourned the meeting 1445th meeting, 24 August 1968	
158. Admission of new Members: Swaziland	1450th meeting, 11 September 1968	S/8815, 16 September 1968	Recommended 1450th meeting, 11 September 1968	S/8815, 16 September 1968
Equatorial Guinea	1458th meeting, 6 November 1968	S/8896, 11 November 1968	Recommended 1458th meeting, 6 November 1968	S/8896, 11 November 1968

**2. Proceedings of the Security Council regarding the retention and deletion of items from the agenda