

**Chapter II**  
**AGENDA**

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTORY NOTE .....	21
<b>**PART I. CONSIDERATION OF THE ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA</b> .....	21
<b>**PART II. THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA</b> .....	21
<b>PART III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (RULE 9)</b>	
Note .....	21
<b>A. Procedure of voting on adoption of the agenda</b> .....	22
1. Votes taken concerning individual items on the provisional agenda .....	22
<b>**2. Votes taken on proposals to determine or change the order of items</b> .....	24
<b>**3. Votes taken on the adoption of the agenda as a whole</b> .....	24
<b>B. Consideration of:</b>	
<b>**1. Requirements for the inclusion of an item in the agenda</b> .....	24
<b>**2. Effect of the inclusion of an item in the agenda</b> .....	24
<b>C. Other discussion on the adoption of the agenda</b> .....	24
<b>**1. Order of discussion of items on the agenda</b> .....	24
2. Scope of items and subitems on the agenda in relation to the scope of discussion .....	24
<b>**3. Phrasing of items on the agenda</b> .....	24
<b>**4. Postponement of consideration of items</b> .....	24
5. Precedence of the decision on adoption of the agenda .....	24
 <b>PART IV. THE AGENDA: MATTERS OF WHICH THE SECURITY COUNCIL IS SEIZED (RULES 10 AND 11)</b>	
Note .....	25
<b>**A. Rule 10</b> .....	25
<b>B. Rule 11</b> .....	26
1. Retention and deletion of items from the Secretary-General's Summary Statements on matters of which the Security Council is seized .....	26
2. Proceedings of the Security Council regarding the retention and deletion of items from the Agenda .....	28

## 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). No material has been entered under Part I, since the Council has not had occasion to consider any change in rules 6-12; nor was any material found for treatment under Part II dealing with the circulation of communications by the Secretary-General and the preparation and 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. No material has been entered under section A dealing with the procedure of the Council in voting on the adoption of the agenda as well as section B concerning discussion in the Council of the requirements for the inclusion of an item in the agenda and of the effects of such inclusion. 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 participation of a non-Member of the Council before the adoption of the agenda.

Part IV relates to the list of matters of which the Security Council is seized. No entry is presented under section A relating to rule 10. The tabulation in section B (rule 11) supplements the tabulation in the previous volume of the *Repertoire* and indicates the changes that have since occurred in the list of matters of which the Security Council is seized.

### Part I

#### **\*\*CONSIDERATION OF THE ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

### Part II

#### **\*\*THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA**

### 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, either with or without amendments.

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 has dealt in past volumes of the *Repertoire* with the procedure of the Council in voting on the

adoption of the agenda while section B has dealt with instances when objection had been raised to the adoption of the agenda either indicating the requirement for or the effect of the inclusion of an item in the agenda. There were no such instances during the period under review.

Under section C are treated other questions of procedure which are related to the adoption of the agenda such as the scope of items and subitems on the agenda in relation to the scope of discussion (Case 1), the postponement of consideration of items (Case 2), and the precedence of the decision on adoption of the agenda (Cases 3 and 4).

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

A. PROCEDURE OF VOTING ON ADOPTION  
OF THE AGENDA

1. Votes taken concerning individual items  
on the provisional agenda

CASE 1

At the 1651st meeting on 18 July 1972, the provisional agenda<sup>1</sup> read as follows:

"1. Adoption of agenda

"2. The Situation in the Middle East

"(a) Letter dated 5 July 1972 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10730).

"(b) Letter dated 5 July 1972 from the Chargé d'affaires *a.i.* of the Permanent Mission of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10731).

"3. The Situation in the Middle East

"Letter dated 17 July 1972 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10739)."

Before the adoption of the agenda the representative of Somalia objected to the inscription of the letter by the Permanent Representative of Israel and requested that the provisional agenda be amended so as to include only items 1 and 2. In making that request he stated that his understanding had been that the Council had been convened solely to consider the two communications addressed to the Council by the delegations of Syria and Lebanon and therefore the agenda ought to be devoted solely to consideration of the situation arising from the submission of the two communications. He also observed that the President had failed to consult with members of the Security Council, as was customary before acceding to the request of a Member State, in this instance Israel, to inscribe an item on the agenda.

The representatives of the USSR, Yugoslavia, India, France, Guinea, Sudan, China and Italy were also opposed to the inclusion of the letter from the Permanent Representative of Israel in the agenda. The representatives of the United States and Panama, however, held that the provisional agenda before the Council was in order.

The President (Argentina) stated that in including Israel's request in the provisional agenda along with those of Syria and Lebanon he was merely following past practice of the Council of inscribing on the agenda requests or complaints from all Member States parties to a dispute. He cited several such precedents dating back to December 1968 and stated that his action was in conformity with rule 7 of the Council's provisional rules of Procedure. However, he observed that since the Council was the master of its own procedure, it could then and there decide which items on the agenda it wished to adopt or not to adopt; accordingly he would put to the vote, what appeared to be

the majority position, that item 3 of the provisional agenda be deleted.

After the vote, the President announced that the proposal to delete item 3 had been defeated as it fell short of securing nine affirmative votes. The representative of Somalia, supported by the representatives of India and Yugoslavia, then proposed that the Council proceed to the adoption of the provisional agenda by voting separately on each of the three items.

The representative of the United States objected to this proposal stating that the Council had already defeated a motion to delete item 3 and should not "again be asked to delete it through a separate parliamentary manoeuvre".

The President then stated that since the Council found itself in such a complex procedural situation the best course for it to follow would be to "adopt items 1 and 2 as the provisional agenda for today" and "meet with the shortest possible delay to deal separately" with Israel's request for a meeting "which is item 3 of the present provisional agenda".

The representative of the United States objected to the course outlined by the President reiterating that the move to delete item 3 of the provisional agenda had been defeated. However, he stated that his delegation, in a spirit of compromise, would propose that the entire agenda be adopted with the understanding that items 2 (a) and (b) would be discussed that day and item 3 at a subsequent meeting.

The President stated that the United States proposal raised certain difficulties because once the provisional agenda was adopted it would become a definite agenda and then nothing could stop any Member State participating in the Council's debate to refer to item 3 of the agenda. He then repeated his suggestion that the Council deal with items 1 and 2 at that day's meeting and deal with item 3 at a separate meeting.

The representative of the USSR stated that "it was quite clearly and unambiguously stated that we are approving items 1 and 2 of the provisional agenda for their consideration at today's meeting of the Security Council. Furthermore, it has been emphasized a number of times that relevant consultations will be held with the members of the Security Council and that the question of the further discussion of these items would be decided on the basis of those consultations. I think, Mr. President, that your ruling is quite unambiguous and quite correct and that we can now proceed to our discussion".

The representative of the United States stated: "I simply would like to request a vote on the provisional agenda as presented to the Council, if that motion is in order. I should like to see a vote taken on the provisional agenda as presented here ... . The only thing we have decided here is that we would not delete item 3. We did not decide on item 1, we did not decide on item 2; we took a vote on whether to delete item 3, and that proposal did not obtain 9 votes so item 3 is not deleted. That is the only thing we decided; we have not decided anything yet about items 1 and 2. Our proposal now, as the President has properly presented it, is that, having failed to delete item 3, we vote to see whether the provisional agenda as circulated is acceptable."

<sup>1</sup> S/Agenda/1651.

The President reminded the representative of the United States that if he insisted on a vote on the provisional agenda as a whole, he would be first obliged to put to the vote the prior request to vote on the agenda items one by one. He therefore appealed to the representative of the United States not to object to the President's proposal to "deal with agenda items 1 and 2 this afternoon leaving item 3 to be dealt with at another meeting".

The representative of the United States asked for a ruling as to whether the question of deleting item 3 from the agenda had been decided and whether a "separate vote on item 3 using different parliamentary procedure to accomplish the same end would be valid ... . It does not seem to me that there is any no man's land; either it is deleted or it is part of the agenda. We voted to delete it and it failed. I have asked for a ruling from the Chair as to whether we can vote again on this question of deletion of item 3".

The President replied: "The ruling of the President in connexion with item 3 was to make known to the Council the result of the vote. The result was that deletion of item 3 was rejected. But in any case we have no agenda, and an agenda has to be adopted. That is what we have been considering ever since the Council meeting started at 10 minutes to 4. We had to start with the adoption of the agenda. There has been a request for a separate vote on the three items. So all I can do at this time is this, if the representative of the United States insists on his position on putting to a vote his objection to a separate vote. I would have to ask the Security Council to decide whether or not it wishes to have a separate vote on the agenda items. If the Security Council decided that we should have a separate vote on each agenda item, we would have to proceed in that way. This, it seems to me, is perfectly simple. I can take no decision on item 3 unless we have an agenda. An agenda has to be adopted. There is a request for a separate vote. The representative of the United States has the right to object to a separate vote. In that case I shall put it to the Council whether or not it wishes to have a separate vote. This is the position of your President". He added: "We have no agenda. When the provisional agenda was put to the Council there was a proposal to delete item 3. The result of the vote was 8 in favour, none against and 7 abstentions. Not having obtained the necessary majority, the proposal was defeated. In any case an agenda must be adopted. The provisional agenda is the one in document S/Agenda/1651. This provisional agenda can be adopted as a whole or it can be adopted in part. For it to be put to the vote, there is a request to have a separate vote on the items. Therefore item 3 will be put to the vote when it is its turn--first item 1, then item 2 and then item 3, because item 3 has not been adopted. It has to be adopted if it is to be included". He then asked the representative of the United States if he wished him to put the provisional agenda to the vote item by item or whether he agreed with the proposal made by the President.

The representative of the United States replied: "Given these two unhappy alternatives, but accepting fully the President's ruling, we would prefer the compromise proposed by the President as opposed to having yet another vote taken, whose outcome has been determined, on taking out item 3. If the question is which do I like best or which

do I like least, we would prefer to accept the compromise proposal as put forward by the President".

The President then stated: "It seems that we are coming to the end of the procedural debate. The provisional agenda for today, if it is adopted by the Council, will contain items 1 and 2. In regard to item 3, the Council will meet with the least possible delay. It is the intention of the President to start consultations at once to set a date for that meeting. In the event that item 2 of the present provisional agenda or item 3 to be dealt with at a separate meeting were to be the subject of debates going beyond a single meeting, the meetings held as a consequence would always be separate ones. That is to say, one set of meetings would cover the letters from the representatives of Syria and Lebanon, and another set of meetings would deal with the letter from the representative of Israel. May I assume that there is no objection to the adoption of the provisional agenda, items 1 and 2, on the understanding that the Council postpones until a date to be set, as early as possible, the consideration of agenda item 3? "

The representative of the USSR then stated: "I believe the Soviet delegation entirely agrees with your approach to this complex procedural issue. As you pointed out quite correctly, what we have to do now is adopt the agenda for today's meeting, comprising items 1 and 2, on which you have already given clarifications. As far as the remainder is concerned, you have already told us about that, and we have taken note of the clarifications you have given".

The President then reminded the Council that "even though adoption of the procedural agenda would cover items 1 and 2, I would wish there to be no confusion about my entire proposal: namely, that item 3 should be dealt with at a separate meeting, the date of which would be agreed on as early as possible. The agenda for today would consist of items 1 and 2".

The representative of the USSR stated: "In that case, Mr. President, to a certain extent, your statement about the need to hold consultations among members of the Security Council would no longer be valid, because practically all members of the Security Council have already stated their positions on this, and you have said that consultations would be held on item 3 of the provisional agenda--or, rather, on the letter which is mentioned here in the provisional agenda.

"Therefore, the Soviet delegation does not consider itself in any way bound by any prior decision being taken now in connexion with the third item of the agenda. As we understand it, we are now adopting the provisional agenda for today's meeting, comprising items 1 and 2. You will then hold consultations and, in accordance with the results of those consultations, a decision will be taken by you regarding the further work of the Security Council".

The President stated: "In clarification, may I say to the representative of the Soviet Union that the consultations to be held by the President on item 3 will consist of setting a date, because there has been a request submitted by a Member State to convene an urgent meeting, and that request must be acceded to by the Council. When we meet on the request for a meeting we shall then decide what to do. What we shall decide on in the consultations is the date to be set for dealing with item 3. I hope there will be no doubt about this".

The representative of the USSR stated: "The Soviet delegation, unfortunately, cannot by any means agree with such interpretation. Under that interpretation it would appear that, essentially, we would be adopting today's provisional agenda, consisting of three items, and the only matter which would be undecided would be the question of a date for a meeting to be held on item 3 of the agenda. That is not so; that prejudices the results of the consultations. I would ask this question. If the results of the consultations make it quite clear that 10, 11 or 12 members of the Security Council are against convening the Security Council to discuss this matter, what would happen in that case; how would we proceed then? So I see no alternative, if that interpretation is to be maintained, but to return to the proposal of the representative of India and proceed to separate votes on agenda items 1, 2 and 3."

The President stated: "To reply to the representative of the Soviet Union, concerning what would happen. The President would consult members on the date to be fixed for the Council's meeting. In exercise of his responsibilities he would set that date on the basis of those consultations, and then, when the meeting was held, the 11 or 12 members opposing this, precisely when dealing with the provisional agenda, would object, and then the Council would officially decide that there was to be no meeting because 11 or 12 members object. That is my reply." The President then concluded as follows: "Coming back to the provisional agenda for today, comprising items 1 and 2 contained in document S/Agenda/1651, if there is no objection I shall consider the agenda adopted."<sup>2</sup>

The agenda, as adopted,<sup>3</sup> read as follows:

"The Situation in the Middle East

"(a) Letter dated 5 July 1972 from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10730)

"(b) Letter dated 5 July 1972 from the *Chargé d'affaires, a.i.*, of the Permanent Mission of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10731)"<sup>4</sup>

**\*\*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**

<sup>2</sup> For texts of relevant statements, see: 1651st meeting: President (Argentina), paras. 38, 39, 42, 44, 53, 54, 66, 73, 94, 105, 124, 126, 128, 130, 131, 133, 136, 138, 139; China, para. 22; France, paras. 18, 19; Guinea, para. 20; India, paras. 15, 16, 17, 68; Italy, paras. 25, 26; Panama, para. 28; Somalia, paras. 3, 4; Sudan, para. 21; USSR, paras. 8, 30, 31, 99, 132, 135, 137; United States, paras. 11, 23, 70, 92, 93, 101, 104, 118, 123, 129; Yugoslavia, paras. 10, 69.

<sup>3</sup> 1651st meeting, para. 139.

<sup>4</sup> Item 3 of the provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1651) pertaining to the Israeli letter was never taken up by the Council again.

**\*\*B. CONSIDERATION OF:**

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

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

**C. OTHER DISCUSSION OF THE ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

**\*\*1. Order of discussion of items on the agenda**

**2. Scope of items and subitems on the agenda in relation to the scope of discussion**

**CASE 2**

At the outset of the 1661st meeting on 10 September 1972, in connexion with the situation in the Middle East, the President (China) declared that a few minutes ago he had received a letter from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon<sup>5</sup> which was in the process of being circulated as a Security Council document. In the meantime he intended to amend the provisional agenda by including the document as a second subitem.

In the absence of any objection it was so decided and the agenda as amended<sup>6</sup> read as follows:

"Letter dated 9 September from the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10782)

"Letter dated 10 September from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10783)"

**\*\*3. Phrasing of items on the agenda**

**\*\*4. Postponement of consideration of items**

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

**CASE 3**

At the 1658th meeting on 10 August 1972, in connexion with the application of Bangladesh for admission to membership, the provisional agenda<sup>7</sup> read as follows:

"1. Adoption of the agenda

"2. Admission of new members:

Application of the People's Republic of Bangladesh for admission to membership in the United Nations—note by the Secretary-General (S/10759)."

<sup>5</sup> S/10783, *OR*, 27th yr., *Suppl. for July-September 1972*, p. 98.

<sup>6</sup> 1661st meeting, para. 2.

<sup>7</sup> S/Agenda/1658.

Speaking on the question of adoption of the agenda, the representative of Yugoslavia stated that his delegation would vote for the adoption of the agenda. The representative of Guinea proposed that before considering the question, the Security Council should send a three-member mission to Bangladesh to investigate the situation and report to the Council. The representative of Sudan supported that proposal.

The representative of the United Kingdom observed that the proposal of the representative of Guinea was a substantive one and not relevant to the question of adoption of the agenda. He declared that the Council should first adopt the agenda.

The President (Belgium) then stated:<sup>8</sup>

Since the proposal of the representative of Guinea was not a formal proposal—the representative of Guinea said that she was making a suggestion—and since proposals can be taken into account only after the agenda has been adopted, it is my opinion that the Council must first pronounce itself on the adoption of the agenda.

If no other member wishes to speak, the Council will proceed to vote on the adoption of the agenda.

The Council then proceeded to the vote on the adoption of the agenda. The agenda was adopted,<sup>9</sup> there being eleven votes in favour, one against with three members not participating.

#### CASE 4

At the 1703rd meeting on 30 March 1973, prior to the adoption of the agenda, in connexion with consideration of

<sup>8</sup> For texts of relevant statements, see: 1658th meeting: President (Belgium), para. 20; Guinea, paras. 14, 15; Sudan, para. 16; United Kingdom, para. 17.

<sup>9</sup> 1658th meeting, para. 21.

measures for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security in Latin America, statements were made by representatives on the occasion of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

The President (Panama) also made a statement in the course of which he criticized at length what he called “discrimination” practised in the Panama Canal Zone by the United States. After the statement by the President, the representative of the United States on a point of order stated:

Are we on the record? In other words, am I correct in understanding that, without our having adopted an agenda, this morning’s proceedings at this point constitute part of a meeting of the Security Council? We feel that if the remarks just made by Ambassador Boyd are to appear in the verbatim record they should be clearly represented as the views of the representative of Panama, because in our view they are not befitting the high office of the President of the Security Council.

The President replied as follows:<sup>10</sup>

In reply to the representative of the United States I would say, first, that it is true that we have not yet taken up consideration of the agenda, but are at the moment paying a tribute that was planned and organized in agreement with the Secretary-General and the Chairman of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*.

With regard to the United States representative’s second point, I trust that in the verbatim record the distinction will be clear between the statement that I made on behalf of the Security Council, which was contained in the paper that I read out at the beginning, and the statement that I made when I spoke as representative of Panama.

<sup>10</sup> For texts of relevant statements, see 1703rd meeting: President (Panama), para. 70; United States, para. 69.

## 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.

In the previous volumes of the *Repertoire*, 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 or its specific decisions have revealed a continuing concern with the matter.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup> 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: resolution 321 (1972) of 23 October 1972, para. 6, adopted in connexion with the complaint by Senegal; resolution 322 (1972) of 22 November 1972, para. 5, in connexion with the question concerning the situation in Territories

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.<sup>12</sup>

The tabulation appearing in section B.1 supplements the tabulation in the previous volume of the *Repertoire* and indicates the changes that have since occurred in the list of matters of which the Security Council is seized.

#### \*\*A. RULE 10

under Portuguese administration; resolutions 326 (1973) of 2 February 1973, para. 11 and 328 (1973) of 10 March 1973, para. 10, in connexion with the complaint by Zambia; resolutions 357 (1974) of 14 August 1974, para. 4 and 360 (1974) of 16 August 1974, para. 5, in connexion with the situation in Cyprus and resolution 366 (1974) of 17 December 1974, para. 6, in connexion with the situation in Namibia.

<sup>12</sup> See, for example, 1662nd meeting, para. 214.

## 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 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, the *Supplement*, 1964-1965, pp. 29-41, the *Supplement*, 1966-1968, pp. 40-54 and the *Supplement*, 1969-1971, pp. 27-29. Part 1 indicates items added to the list of matters of which the Security Council is seized during the period 1972-1974, part 2 indicates items appearing on previous lists concerning which new information was included in the summary statements during that period, and part 3 indicates items which were deleted from the list during the same period. The titles used are those occurring in the Summary Statements except for some abridgements.

## 1. ITEMS ADDED TO THE LIST OF MATTERS OF WHICH THE SECURITY COUNCIL IS SEIZED DURING THE PERIOD 1972-1974

<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in Summary Statement</i>	<i>Last action of the Council as of 31 December 1974</i>	<i>Final entry in Summary Statement as of 31 December 1974</i>
Request of the Organization of African Unity concerning the holding of meetings of the Council in an African capital	1625th meeting, 11 Jan. 1972	S/10513, 18 Jan. 1972	Adopted resolution 308 (1972) 1626th meeting, 19 Jan. 1972	
Consideration of questions relating to Africa with which the Security Council is currently seized	1628th meeting, 28 Jan. 1972	S/10531, 1 Feb. 1972	Adopted statement of consensus expressing gratitude to host country 1639th meeting, 4 Feb. 1972	
Request of Panama concerning the holding of meetings of the Council in Panama City	1684th meeting, 16 Jan. 1973	S/10855/Add.3, 24 Jan. 1973	Adopted resolution 325 (1973) 1686th meeting, 26 Jan. 1973	S/10855/Add.4, 31 January 1973
Consideration of measures for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security in Latin America	1695th meeting, 15 March 1973	S/10855/Add.11, 22 March 1973	Adopted resolution 330 (1973) 1704th meeting, 21 March 1973	
Admission of New Members: Bangladesh	1658th meeting, 10 August 1972	S/10762, 14 August 1972	Recommended 1776th meeting, 10 June 1974	S/11185/Add.23, 17 June 1974
German Democratic Republic	1729th meeting, 21 June 1973	S/10855/Add.25, 27 June 1973	Recommended 1730th meeting, 22 June 1973	S/10855/Add.25, 27 June 1973
Federal Republic of Germany	1729th meeting, 21 June 1973	S/10855/Add.25, 27 June 1973	Recommended 1730th meeting, 22 June 1973	S/10855/Add.25, 27 June 1973
Bahamas	1731st meeting, 17 July 1973	S/10855/Add.29, 30 July 1974	Recommended 1732nd meeting, 18 July 1974	S/10855/Add.29, 30 July 1973
Grenada	1777th meeting, 17 June 1974	S/11185/Add.24, 26 June 1974	Recommended 1778th meeting, 21 June 1974	S/11185/Add.24, 26 June 1974
Guinea-Bissau	1790th meeting, 8 August 1974	S/11185/Add.31, 13 August 1974	Recommended 1791st meeting, 12 August 1974	S/11185/Add.31, 13 August 1974
Election of the International Court of Justice	1671st meeting, 31 October 1972	S/10770/Add.11, 7 November 1972	Recommended five candidates to fill vacancies 1671st meeting, 31 October 1972	S/10770/Add.1, 7 November 1972
Complaint by Cuba	1741st meeting, 17 September 1973	S/10855/Add.38, 25 September 1973	The Council adjourned without fixing a date for the next meeting 1742nd meeting, 18 September 1973	
Letter dated 8 November 1973 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council concerning the appointment of the commander of United Nations Emergency Force	1755th meeting, 12 November 1973	S/10855/Add.46, 19 November 1973	Decided to authorize the President to address a reply to the Secretary-General transmitting the Council's consent to the appointment of General Siilasvuo as UNEP Force Commander	



<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in Summary Statement</i>	<i>Last action of the Council as of 31 December 1974</i>	<i>Final entry in Summary Statement as of 31 December 1974</i>
Arrangements for the proposed peace conference in the Middle East	1760th meeting, 15 December 1973	S/10855/Add.50, 18 December 1973	Adopted Ten-Power draft resolution (resolution 344 (1973)) 1760th meeting, 15 December 1973	
Inclusion of Chinese among the working languages of the Security Council	1761st meeting, 17 January 1974	S/11185/Add.2, 22 January 1974	Decided to include Chinese among the working languages of the Security Council and to amend accordingly the relevant provisions of chapters VIII and IX of the provisional rules of procedure 1761st meeting, 17 January 1974	
Complaint by Iraq concerning incidents on its frontier with Iran	1762nd meeting, 15 February 1974	S/11185/Add.6, 20 February 1974	Adopted resolution 348 (1974) 1770th meeting, 28 May 1974	
The Situation in Cyprus	1779th meeting, 16 July 1974	S/11185/Add.28, 24 July 1974	Adopted resolution 364 (1974) 1810th meeting, 13 December 1974	
Relationship between the United Nations and South Africa	1796th meeting, 18 October 1974	S/11185/Add.41, 24 October 1974	Rejected draft resolution S/11543 1808th meeting, 30 October 1974	

2. ITEMS WHICH APPEARED IN PREVIOUS VOLUMES OF THE REPERTOIRE ON WHICH NEW ACTION BY THE SECURITY COUNCIL WAS REPORTED IN SUMMARY STATEMENT ISSUED DURING THE PERIOD 1972-1974

Complaints by Senegal	1027th meeting, 17 April 1963	S/5291, 22 April 1963	Adopted resolution 321 (1972) 1669th meeting, 23 October 1972	
Question concerning the Situation in Territories under Portuguese administration	1040th meeting, 22 July 1963	S/5377, 30 July 1963	Adopted resolution 322 (1972) 1677th meeting, 22 November 1972	
Situation in Southern Rhodesia	1064th meeting, 9 September 1963	S/5429, 16 September 1963	Adopted resolution 333 (1973) and rejected draft resolution S/10928 1716th meeting, 22 May 1973	
Letter dated 26 December 1963 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus addressed to the President of the General Assembly	1085th meeting, 27 December 1963	S/5500, 31 December 1963	Adopted resolution 349 (1974) 1771st meeting, 29 May 1974	ST11185/Add.21, 4 June 1974
Situation in the Middle East	1341st meeting, 24 May 1967	S/7913, 29 May 1967	Adopted resolution 363 (1974) 1809th meeting, 29 November 1974	
Situation in Namibia	1387th meeting, 25 January 1968	S/8367, 30 January 1968	Adopted resolution 366 (1974) 1811th meeting, 17 December 1974	
Complaint by Zambia	1486th meeting, 18 July 1969	S/9346, 22 July 1969	Adopted resolution 328 (1973) and 329 (1973) 1694th meeting, 10 March 1973	

3. ITEMS WHICH WERE DELETED FROM THE LIST OF MATTERS OF WHICH THE SECURITY COUNCIL  
IS SEIZED DURING THE PERIOD 1972-1974

<i>Item</i>	<i>First inclusion in the agenda</i>	<i>First entry in Summary Statement</i>	<i>Last action of the Council as of 31 December 1974</i>	<i>Final entry in Summary Statement as of 31 December 1974</i>
Letter dated 26 December 1963 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the President of the Security Council	1085th meeting, 27 December 1963	S/5500, 31 December 1963	Adopted resolution 349 (1974), 1771st meeting, 29 May 1974	S/11185/Add.21, 4 June 1974
The Indonesian question	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	S/10855, 2 January 1973
<b>Admission of New Members:</b>				
Bangladesh	1658th meeting, 10 August 1972	S/10762, 14 August 1972	Recommended 1776th meeting, 10 June 1974	S/11185/Add.23, 17 June 1974
German Democratic Republic	1729th meeting, 21 June 1973,	S/10855/Add.25, 27 June 1973	Recommended 1730th meeting, 22 June 1974	S/10855/Add.25, 27 June 1973
Federal Republic of Germany	1729th meeting, 21 June 1973	S/10855/Add.25, 27 June 1973	Recommended 1730th meeting, 22 June 1973	S/10855/Add.25, 27 June 1973
Bahamas	1731st meeting, 17 July 1973	S/10855/Add.29, 30 July 1974	Recommended 1732nd meeting, 18 July 1973	S/10855/Add.29, 30 July 1973
Grenada	1777th meeting, 17 June 1974	S/11185/Add.24, 26 June 1974	Recommended 1778th meeting, 21 June 1974	S/11185/Add.24, 26 June 1974
Guinea-Bissau	1790th meeting, 8 August 1974	S/11185/Add.31, 13 August 1974	Recommended 1791st meeting, 12 August 1974	S/11185/Add.31, 13 August 1974
Election of members of the International Court of Justice	1671st meeting 31 October 1972	S/10770/Add.1, 7 November 1972	Recommended five candidates to fill vacancies 1671st meeting, 31 October 1972	S/10770/Add.1, 7 November 1972
Request of Panama concerning the holding of meetings of the Council in Panama City	1684th meeting, 16 January 1973	S/10855/Add.3, 24 January 1973	Adopted resolution 325 (1973), 1686th meeting, 26 January 1973	S/10855/Add.4 31 January 1974

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

CASE 5

At the 1810th meeting on 13 December 1974, in connexion with the Situation in Cyprus, the President (Australia) before adjourning the meeting, made the following statement:

You have noted that the provisional agenda for this meeting, prepared in accordance with rule 7 of the provisional rules of procedure, which was adopted by the Council at the outset of our meeting, contained the agenda item "The situation in Cyprus", which was inscribed on the Council's agenda consistently since the 1779th meeting on 16 July whenever the Council discussed matters

affecting Cyprus. Under this item we have just now further extended the mandate of UNFICYP, which was last extended by resolution 349 (1974), at that time under an item which was entitled "Letter dated 26 December 1963 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the President of the Security Council". It is thus clear that the item of today has superseded the item under which this matter was formerly considered, and with the Council's agreement, I would request the Secretary-General to delete from the list of items of which the Security Council is seized the former item "Letter dated 26 December 1963 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the President of the Security Council". I hope I have made myself clear. If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>13</sup> For text of the President's statement, see 1810th meeting, concluding statement by the President.