

Chapter V

**SUBSIDIARY ORGANS ESTABLISHED BY OR IN PURSUANCE OF SECURITY
COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS**

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTORY NOTE	67
PART I. OCCASIONS ON WHICH SUBSIDIARY ORGANS OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED OR PROPOSED	
Note	67
A. Involving, to facilitate their work, meetings at places away from the seat of the Organization	
1. Subsidiary organs established	68
** 2. Subsidiary organs proposed but not established	75
** B. Not involving, to facilitate their work, meetings at places away from the seat of the Organization	75
** PART II. CONSIDERATION OF PROCEDURES RELATIVE TO SUBSIDIARY ORGANS	75

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The material included in this chapter pertains to procedures of the Security Council in establishing or

Secretary-General pursuant to Council resolution, no implication is intended as to whether these bodies do or

Part I, "Occasions on which subsidiary organs of the Security Council have been established or proposed" includes two case histories in which the Council established the subsidiary organs and five case histories

were no instances during the period under review of consideration by the Council of procedures in relation to subsidiary organs.

Secretary-General to set up the subsidiary organs.

"The Security Council may establish such subsidiary organs for the discharge of its functions."

there has been no instance of submission of a proposal to establish a subsidiary organ which was not adopted.

RULE 28 OF THE PROVISIONAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Subsidiary organs were established or set up by the Sec

question

Part I

OCCASIONS ON WHICH SUBSIDIARY ORGANS OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED OR PROPOSED

NOTE

During the period under review the Security Council: (i) recommended the creation, with the consent of the Government of Cyprus, of a United Nations peace-keeping force in Cyprus, and authorized the

to determine the composition and size of the Force. In the case of the United Nations Mediator in Cyprus, the Council has defined his terms of reference. As regards the Security Council Mission to Cambodia and the Republic of Viet-Nam both its composition and terms of reference have been deter-

Secretary-General by the setting up of the UNFICYP; (ii) recommended that the Secretary-General designate in

Republic, the Council has defined his terms of refer-

United Nations Mediator in Cyprus; - (iii) established a Security Council Mission to the Kingdom of Cambodia and the Republic of Viet-Nam, in connexion with the complaint by Cambodia;³ (iv) invited the Secretary-Gen-

South Africa may also have been given explicit terms of reference by the Council.

Of the subsidiary organs established by the Council as outlined above, only the last mentioned did not involve activities at places away from the seat of the

no for the purpose of reporting to the Council on the situation;⁴ (v) established an Expert Committee of the Security Council on measures concerning the question of race conflict in South Africa;⁵ (vi) requested

Of the subsidiary organs established in connexion with the Security Council's discharge of responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and secu-

to ensure the supervision of the cease-fire and with-

Organization in Palestine (UNTSO) continued in exist-

the Secretary-General to appoint and convene

Of the Standing Committees of the Security Coun-

withdrawal.

employed by the Council during the period under review.

As to the UNFICYP, the Council, in defining its terms of reference, authorized the Secretary-General

Besides the organizational functions entrusted to the Secretary-General in connexion with the establishment

³ Case 3.

⁴ Case 4.

⁵ Case 5.

1, 2, 4, 6 and 7), the Security Council in connexion with the India-Pakistan question, faced with the out-

Secretary-General (i) to report within three days on

the implementation of the cease-fire resolution; (ii) to keep the Council informed; (iii) to provide assistance to ensure supervision of the cease-fire, to exert

resolution, to seek a peaceful solution, and to report to the Council thereon;¹⁰ and (iv) to report urgently on compliance with the resolution on complete and effective cease-fire and a prompt withdrawal of armed

with the two parties.¹²

In connexion with the question of race conflict in South Africa, the Secretary-General was requested (i) to follow closely the implementation of the resolution urging the Government of South Africa to renounce executions, end trials and grant amnesty to persons opposing the policies of apartheid, and report thereon to the Council;¹³ and (ii) to consider what

report thereon.¹⁴ In connexion with the situation in the Dominican Republic, the Secretary-General was (i) requested to convey to his representative in Santo

resolution requesting that the suspension of hostilities be transformed into a permanent cease-fire.¹⁷ In connexion

Territories in Africa under Portuguese administration, the Secretary-General was requested to

1965, to furnish necessary assistance and to report to the Council within a certain period. The reports from the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine continued to be submitted to the Se-

⁸ Decision of 4 September 1965 (S/RES/209 (1965)), *O.R.*, 20th year, Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1965, p. 14.

⁹ Decision of 6 September 1965 (S/RES/210 (1965)), *ibid.*, p. 14.

¹⁰ Decision of 20 September 1965 (S/RES/211 (1965)), *ibid.*, p. 15.

¹¹ Decision of 5 November 1965 (S/RES/215 (1965)),

19th Year, Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1964, pp. 9-10.

¹³ Decision of 9 June 1964 (S/RES/190 (1964)), *ibid.*, p. 13.

¹⁴ Decision of 18 June 1964 (S/RES/191 (1964)), *ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

ibid., p. 19.

¹⁶ Decision taken at 1212th meeting, para. 208.

¹⁷ Decision of 22 May 1965 (S/RES/205 (1965)), *O.R.*, 20th year, Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1965, p. 11.

¹⁸ Decision of 19 May 1965 (S/RES/204 (1965)), *ibid.*

¹⁹ Decision of 23 November 1965 (S/RES/218 (1965)), *ibid.*, p. 19.

Security Council through the Secretary-General.²⁰ The Secretary-General also submitted to the Security Council

A. INVOLVING TO FACILITATE THEIR WORK OF THE ORGANIZATION

1. Subsidiary organs established

At the 1100th meeting on 2 March 1964, in connexion with the complaint by the Government of Cyprus, the representative of Brazil introduced a resolution²² jointly sponsored by Bolivia, Brazil, Ivory Coast, Morocco and Norway, which was adopted at the 1102nd meeting on 4 March 1964. That resolution (186 (1964)), provided that the Security Council:

ments of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The Commander of the Force shall be appointed by the Secretary-General and report to him. The Force

periodically to the Security Council on its operation;

"5. Recommends that the function of the Force

a recurrence of fighting and, as necessary, to contribute to the maintenance and restoration of law

²⁰ S/6061 and Add.1, *O.R.*, 19th year, Suppl. for Oct-Dec

²¹ S/6651, *O.R.*, 20th year, Suppl. for July-Sept. 1965, pp. 239-253.

S/6661, *O.R.*, 20th year, Suppl. for July-Sept. 1965, pp. 269-271.

S/6683, *O.R.*, 20th year, Suppl. for July-Sept. 1965, pp. 295-305.

S/6686, 1239th meeting: paras. 11-28; *O.R.*, 20th year, Suppl. for July-Sept. 1965, pp. 308-312.

S/6669 and Add.1, *O.R.*, 20th year, Suppl. for July-Sept. 1965, pp. 282-283.

S/6710 and Add.1-7, *O.R.*, 20th year, Suppl. for July

Sept. 1965, pp. 339-361.

²² S/5571, 1100th meeting: paras. 3-17.

²³ In his report dated 26 March 1964 (S/5593/Add.3, *O.R.*, 19th year, Suppl. for Jan-March 1964, pp. 122-123), on the

organization and operation of the Force, the Secretary-General referred to the function of the UNEICYP as follows:

which operates exclusively under the mandate given to it by the Security Council and, within that mandate, under instructions given by the Secretary-General. I would once again point out that the Force is an impartial, objective body which has no responsibility for political solutions and, indeed, which will not try to influence them.

from all parties, it is my hope that the United Nations Force may make a large contribution to the restoration

pertaining to it being met, in a manner to be agreed upon by them, by the Governments providing the contingents and by the Government of Cyprus. The Secretary-General may also suggest voluntary con-

tions of 4 and 13 March 1964. The Council adopted similar resolutions, reaffirming its previous resolutions, at its 1143rd meeting on 9 August 1964;²⁹ 1159th meeting on 25 September 1964;³⁰ 1180th meeting on

1965;³² 1224th meeting on 15 June 1965;³³ and 1270th meeting on 17 December 1965.³⁴

Composition and organization

At the 1102nd meeting on 4 March 1964 the representative of the USSR requested that a separate vote be taken on operative paragraph 4 which he

tion in accordance with well established practice concerning previous United Nations peace-keeping forces to "keep the Security Council, which would authorize

ted. He had received firm official assurances from three of the Governments which he had approached, namely the Governments of Canada, Ireland and Swe-

Subsequent to composition, size and command

Subsequently, operative paragraph 4 was adopted²⁶

which had either been met or, in his view, could be agreed with. There were also other promising prospects for troops. In such circumstances he was able to assure the Council that the Force would be established without further delay and that elements of it

draft resolution as a whole was adopted unanimously.

At the 1103rd meeting on 13 March 1964, the

lution of 4 March 1964 and requested the Secretary-General "to press on with his efforts to implement" the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964, and requested Member States to co-operate with him to

In his report³⁷ dated 26 March 1964, the Secretary-General informed the Security Council that the Commander of the UNFICYP would assume command of it on 27 March at 05.00 hours, at which time the Force would become operational under the Council resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964. As of that

In his report dated 11 April 1964 (S/5653, O.R., 19th year, Suppl. for Apr.-June 1964, pp. 12-16), the Secretary-General stated:

"The terms of reference for UNFICYP are as set forth in paragraph 5 of the resolution adopted by the Security Council on 4 March 1964. The Secretary-General has instructed the Commander of the Force that the activities

sist of contingents or parts thereof, made available by the Governments of Canada, the United Kingdom, Finland, Sweden and Ireland.

In his report³⁸ dated 31 March 1964, the Secretary-General informed the Security Council that by an exchange of letters on the same date between himself

"91"

1139th meeting, para. 21

tary-General from time to time, as a matter of course, both general and detailed directives, relating always to the terms of reference, for his guidance in the discharge of his command. This practice which is usual for military forces

³¹ 1180th meeting, para. 176.
³² 1193rd meeting, para. 153.
³³ 1224th meeting, para. 145.
³⁴ 1270th meeting, para. 162.

Secretary-General stated:

"The Security Council, by paragraph 5 of its resolution of 4 March 1964, recommended that the functions of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) should be 'in the interest of preserving international peace and security, to use its best efforts to prevent a recurrence of fighting and, as necessary, to contribute to the maintenance

the adoption of the Council resolution of 4 March 1964.
³⁶ 1103rd meeting: paras. 4-6.
³⁷ S/5593/Add.3, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1964, pp. 132-133.
³⁸ S/5634, O.R., 19th year, Suppl. for Jan.-March 1964, pp. 171-182. In this report the Secretary-General proposed ad hoc arrangements defining certain of the conditions necessary for the effective discharge of the functions of the

In carrying out its function, the United Nations Force shall avoid any action designed to influence the political situation in Cyprus, except through contributing to a resto-

were fully agreed to, and accepted by the Government of Cyprus (annexes I and II).
³⁹ In the agreement the "United Nations Force in Cyprus"

in which political solutions may be sought."

²⁴ 1102nd meeting, paras. 6-10. For the statement see also chapter VIII, part II, p. 71.

²⁵ 1102nd meeting, paras. 20-21.

²⁶ 1102nd meeting, paras. 27-28.

²⁷ 1103rd meeting, paras. 95-156, S/RES/187 (1964)

O.R., 19th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, p. 4.

appointed by the Secretary-General in accordance with Council resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964, and all military personnel placed under his command. Under the agreement, the Government of Cyprus undertook to respect the exclusively international character of the UNFICYP as established by the Secretary-General in accordance with the Council resolution of 4 March 1964, and the international nature of its command and function.

had been concluded concerning the status of the UNFICYP.

In his report⁴⁰ dated 29 April 1964, the Secretary-General informed the Security Council on the operations of the UNFICYP and submitted "a comprehensive programme of action" for the Force.

In his report⁴¹ dated 2 May 1964 and 15 June

Force.

Area of operation

concerning the status of the UNFICYP, the "area of an areas throughout the territory of the Republic of Cyprus... where the Force is deployed in the performance of its functions, as defined in operative paragraph 5 of the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964."

Limitations concerning the use of force

In his report dated 11 April 1964⁴³ the Secretary-General stated concerning the use of force by UNFICYP:

ever, are to be employed only for self-defence, should this become necessary in the discharge of its function, in the interest of preserving international peace and security, of seeking to prevent a recurrence of the fighting, and contributing to the maintenance of law and order and a return to normal conditions."

In his report dated 15 June 1964⁴⁴ the Secretary-General informed the Council that a warning had been given to both sides that a repetition of incidents which endangered the lives of personnel of the Force would

sary after warning had been given.

That question was raised during consideration of a draft resolution proposing the extension of the duration of UNFICYP for another three months at the

June 1964. The representative of the United Kingdom stated that it was certainly right for the United Nations Force to be authorized to act vigorously considering the circumstances described by the Secretary-

recalled that his delegation had consistently opposed any expansion of the functions of the UNFICYP, in-

⁴⁰ S/5671, O.R., 19th year, Suppl. for April-June 1964, pp. 87-93.

⁴¹ April-June 1964, pp. 211-212. In the latter report dated

6,238 military and 173 policemen, and was composed of military contingents from Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand and Sweden.

⁴² S/5634, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1964, pp. 172-173.

⁴³ S/5653, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1964, pp. 12-14.

1964, p. 219, para. 31.

cluding the use of force to restore order. That would

affairs of the Republic of Cyprus. The representative of the United States observed that the mandate of the Force permitted it to take firm action whenever necessary, as had been reported by the Secretary-General.⁴⁵

In his report dated 10 September 1964, the Secre-

indicated that he intended to proceed on certain assumptions, which included (a) complete freedom of movement in Cyprus, (b) the right to remove positions and fortified installations that endangered peace

Secretary-General concerning the actions that the

and prevent a recurrence of fighting were explicitly endorsed by the representatives of Brazil, France, Ivory Coast, Morocco and Norway. The representatives of the USSR and Czechoslovakia opposed any broadening of the functions of the Force.

resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964.⁴⁸

Duration of the mandate of the Force

Paragraph 6 of the Security Council resolution of

United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus would be "for a period of three months". By resolutions unanimously adopted at the 1139th meeting on 20 June 1964,⁴⁹ at the 1159th meeting on 25 September 1964,⁵⁰ at the 1180th meeting on 18 December 1964,⁵¹ at the 1193rd meeting on 19 March 1965,⁵² at the 1224th meeting on 15 June 1965,⁵³ and at the 1270th meeting on 17 December 1965,⁵⁴ the Security Council extended the mandate of the Force, in five instances for periods of three months, in one instance⁵⁵ for a period of six months.

para. 41; United Kingdom, paras. 66, 77; 1138th meeting: France, para. 100; Turkey,* para. 74; USSR, paras. 39-45; United States, paras. 82-83; 1139th meeting: China, para. 18; Czechoslovakia, paras. 12-13.

⁴⁸ S/5950, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1964, pp. 336-337.

⁴⁹ Other objections were reiterated on several occasions during consideration of extensions of the mandate of the Force. See: 1155th meeting: Czechoslovakia, para. 64; 1153rd meeting: USSR, paras. 96-102, 106-108; 1180th meeting: paras. 137-138; 1192nd meeting, paras. 3-9; 1224th meeting: paras. 137-142; 1252nd meeting: paras. 124-127.

Cyprus,* paras. 14-15, 17-19, 22; Turkey,* paras. 104-105, 128-129; 1153rd meeting: United Kingdom, paras. 24, 27-28, 34; USSR, paras. 102-111; United States, paras. 42, 44; 1154th meeting: China, para. 26; Norway, paras. 14-15; 1155th meeting: Brazil, paras. 9-10; Czechoslovakia, para. 64; France,

paras. 3-8; Ivory Coast, paras. 13-15; Morocco, para. 17;

Decisions of the Security Council 1964, p. 5.

⁵⁰ S/RES/194 (1964) *ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

⁵¹ S/RES/201 (1965).

⁵² S/RES/206 (1965).

⁵³ S/RES/219 (1965).

⁵⁴ 1224th meeting, para. 145 S/6440.

⁵⁵ By his reports dated 15 June 1964 (S/5764 and Add.1, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1964, pp. 211-244),

Suppl. for July-Sept. 1964, pp. 280-341), 12 December 1964

United Nations Mediator in Cyprus

Establishment

At the 1100th meeting on 2 March 1964, in con-

fronting Cyprus, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, having in mind the well-being of the people of Cyprus as a whole and the preservation of international peace and security." The draft resolution requested the Secretary-General to report periodically to the Secretary-General on his

United Nations.

At the 1102nd meeting on 4 March 1964,⁵⁸ the joint draft resolution submitted by Bolivia, Brazil, Ivory Coast, Morocco and Norway was adopted un-

At the 1103rd meeting on 13 March 1964, the Council adopted⁵⁹ a draft resolution jointly sponsored

1964, and requested the Secretary-General to press on with his efforts to implement the Security Council

At the 1139th meeting on 20 June 1964, the Council adopted⁶⁰ a draft resolution reaffirming its resolutions of 4 and 13 March 1964.

Similar resolutions, reaffirming its previous resolutions were subsequently adopted by the Council at its 1143rd meeting on 9 August 1964;⁶¹ 1159th meeting on 25 September 1964;⁶² 1180th meeting on 18 December 1964;⁶³ 1193rd meeting on 19 March 1965;⁶⁴ 1224th meeting on 15 June 1965;⁶⁵ and 1270th meeting on 17 December 1965.⁶⁶

(S/6102, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1964, pp. 221-310), 11 March 1965 (S/6228 and Add.1, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1965, pp. 106-174), 10 June 1965 (S/6267 and Add.1, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1965, pp. 247-290), and 17 December 1965 (S/7001, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1965, pp. 438-486), the Secretary-General informed the Security Council of his reasons for proposing the extension of the mandate of the Force. In four instances the

six months.

⁵⁷ S/5571, 1100th meeting: paras. 5-21.

⁵⁸ S/5571, 1102nd meeting: para. 28.

⁵⁹ 1103rd meeting: para. 156.

⁶⁰ 1139th meeting: para. 21.

⁶¹ 1159th meeting: para. 24.

⁶² 1180th meeting: para. 176.

⁶³ 1193rd meeting: para. 153.

⁶⁴ 1224th meeting: para. 145.

⁶⁵ 1270th meeting: para. 162.

Composition and reports

General informed the Security Council that, having received the agreement of the Governments of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom, he had on 25 March 1964 designated Mr. Sakari S. Tuomioja

In a statement⁶⁸ before the Council at its 1144th meeting on 9 September 1964, the Secretary-General announced the death of Mr. Tuomioja, which had occurred on that date in Helsinki.

In his report⁶⁹ dated 10 September 1964, the Secretary-General informed the Council that Mr. Tuomioja had kept him informed of his activities, plans and thinking on the Cyprus question, but had not submitted a formal report on his mediation effort. It was

with the four parties principally concerned, and having found that they all considered it important that a new mediator be designated without delay, the Secretary-General was taking the necessary steps toward this

At the 1151st meeting on 16 September 1964, the

pointment of Mr. Galo Plaza as United Nations Mediator in Cyprus.

In his report⁷¹ dated 12 December 1964, the Secretary-General gave the Council an account of the series of consultations conducted by the Mediator during the period up to that date, and stated that the Mediator would continue his efforts to find the grounds for an agreed solution in the context of the Council

to the Council and other parties directly concerned

ties concerning that report were communicated to the Secretary-General and subsequently transmitted⁷³ to the members of the Council. Noting that in their observations, the Government of Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership had objected to certain sections of the Mediator's report on the grounds that the report contained matters which went beyond the terms

in his report⁷⁴ of 10 December 1965 stated that he had informed the representative of Turkey⁷⁵ by letter dated 1 April 1965 that he had found nothing in the Mediator's report which could be considered as going beyond or being in any respect incompatible with the functions of the Mediator, and could therefore not accept the view that the Mediator's function had come to an end upon the publication of his report. At the same time he drew the attention of the Council to

⁶⁷ S/5625, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1964

⁷⁰ 1151st meeting: paras. 5-6.

⁷¹ S/6102, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1964, p. 282.

⁷² S/6253, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1965, pp. 199-252.

⁷³ S/6267 and Add.1, S/6270 and S/6280, O.R., 20th yr.

and pp. 25-26.

⁷⁴ S/7001, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1965, pp. 438-486.

⁷⁵ S/6267, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for Apr.-June 1965, pp. 2-4.

the fact that under prevailing circumstances the Mediator frequently the search for a peaceful solution and an agreed settlement of the Cyprus problem had been at a standstill. Nevertheless, upon his request the Me-

provisions of the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964. On 31 December 1965 the Secretary-General transmitted to the Council an exchange of letters⁷⁶ with the Mediator in which the Secretary-General had noted with regret the decision of Mr. Galo Plaza to resign as United Nations Mediator in Cyprus. Since the resignation of Mr. Galo Plaza no new mediator had been designated.

In his report⁷⁷ dated 10 March 1966, the Secretary-General stated that his subsequent efforts towards achieving consummation of the mediation function had

the three Governments most directly concerned. He further reported that following informal consultations with the parties concerned, he had sent on 2 March 1966 to his Special Representative in Cyprus, Mr. Carlos Bernardes instructions⁷⁸ broadening his mandate. As he had informed the Council by his note of 4 March 1966, the broader activity thus envisaged

provided for in the Council resolution of 4 March 1964.

CASE 3

Security Council Mission to the Kingdom of Cambodia and the Republic of Viet-Nam

Establishment

At the 1125th meeting on 3 June 1964, in connexion with the complaint by Cambodia, the representative of Morocco introduced⁷⁹ a draft resolution jointly sponsored by the Ivory Coast and Morocco. Under operative paragraph 5 of the proposed text, the Security Council would decide "to send three of its members to the two countries [the Kingdom of Cambodia and the Republic of Viet-Nam] and to the places where the most recent incidents have occurred, in order to consider such measures as may prevent any recurrence of such incidents", and to "report to the Security Council within forty-five days".

At the 1126th meeting on 4 June 1964, the joint draft resolution submitted by Ivory Coast and Morocco was adopted unanimously by the Council.⁸⁰

in a note⁸¹ of 5 June 1964 that he had appointed Bra-
Subsequently, the three Governments designated their representatives to serve as Members of the Mission.⁸²

Council its report⁸³ on 27 July 1964. During the period covered by this Supplement the report of the Mission had not been submitted. At the time of the submission of its report, the Mission had fulfilled its mandate.

CASE 4

Representative of the Secretary-General in the Dominican Republic

Establishment

lution⁸⁴ jointly sponsored by Ivory Coast, Jordan and Malaysia, under which the Council would decide to invite the Secretary-General "to send, as an urgent measure, a representative to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of reporting to the Security Council on the present situation". The Council would further call upon "all concerned in the Dominican Republic

General in the carrying out of his task".

In submitting the proposed text to the Council, the representative of Jordan stated⁸⁵ that the joint draft resolution was intended "as an urgent measure on the part of the Security Council with regard to the present developments in the Dominican Republic, and in order to enable the Council to obtain a clear report from the appropriate organs of the United Nations on the situation in the Dominican Republic".

At the same meeting the joint draft resolution submitted by Ivory Coast, Jordan and Malaysia was adopted unanimously by the Council.⁸⁶

Composition

The Secretary-General reported on 15 May to the Council⁸⁷ that he had appointed Mr. José Antonio Mayobre as his Representative in the Dominican Republic, and that pending his arrival in Santo Domingo an advance party, led by the Military Adviser of the Secretary-General, had been dispatched to Santo Domingo.

At the 1212th meeting on 19 May 1965, the Secretary-General informed the Council⁸⁸ that his Representative in the Dominican Republic had arrived in Santo Domingo on 18 May. Reports by the Secretary-

based on information communicated by his Represen-

tions Mission in the Dominican Republic.⁸⁹

⁷⁶ S/7054, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1965, pp. 542-544.

⁷⁷ S/7191, O.R., 21st yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1966.

⁸¹ S/5749, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Apr.-June 1964, p. 200.

⁸² S/5832, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1964, p. 103.

issues of either a purely local or broader nature. (S/7180).

⁷⁹ S/5735, 1125th meeting; paras. 8-26.

⁸⁰ 1126th meeting; para. 49, S/RES/189 (1964), O.R., 19th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1964, p. 11.

⁸⁴ S/6558.

⁸⁸ 1212th meeting; paras. 78-87.

⁸⁹ For reference to reports during the period covered by this supplement, see below, chapter VIII, part II, p. 151, foot-note 470 and p. 153, foot-note 488.

Terms of reference

The Secretary-General, in his report⁹⁰ of 3 June 1965 to the Council, stated that in the Dominican Re-

paragraph 2 of the Security Council resolution of 14 May 1965". He added that "This mandate does not include investigations of complaints, a task which would require a much larger team of observers, investigation equipment".

In the course of further consideration of the question, references to the limited mandate of the Representative of the Secretary-General in the Dominican Republic were made at several meetings of the Council. At the 1221st meeting on 7 June 1965 sugges-

General's representative should be provided "with a team of aides and observers to enable him to carry out the tasks of supervising the implementation of the cease-fire and also of investigating complaints and acts of violence, since these matters are completely related to the cease-fire". Similar suggestions were made at

France and at the 1232nd meeting on 9 June 1965.

ing of the mandate to include investigation of complaints, suggested a limited increase of the personnel assisting the Representative of the Secretary-General in the performance of his tasks. Reservations concurred by the United States, the United Kingdom and Bolivia.⁹⁸

In his report before the Council⁹⁹ on 11 June 1965,

ties required by my Representative is under constant review". He added that "the present mandate involves observation and reporting" and that, in his view, that did not include "the actual investigation of com-

Council".

At the 1227th meeting on 18 June 1965, the President (Netherlands), in summing up the discussion, stated¹⁰⁰ that there was "unanimity of view that the representative of the Secretary-General is, under the terms of the Security Council's resolutions 203 (1965) of 14 May and 205 (1965) of 22 May, entitled and required to report to the Security Council, (a) on the situation in the Dominican Republic and (b) on the

that there was a consensus in the Council that the

plementation of the cease-fire entitles him to receive and collect information as he has done heretofore". However, there was no consensus in the Council to the effect of giving him "the more elaborate mandate of

expand the staff of his representative as the situation requires in the judgement of the Secretary-General". There was, likewise, no objection to providing the Representative of the Secretary-General in the Dominican Republic with more effective and efficient means of communication with the United Nations headquarters.

Termination

In his report dated 14 October 1966¹⁰¹ the Secretary-General stated that in view of the developments in the Dominican Republic he had initiated arrangements in the Dominican Republic.

CASE 5

Expert Committee of the Security Council on Measures Concerning the Question of Race Conflict in South Africa

At the 1133rd meeting on 16 June 1964, in con-

draft resolution jointly sponsored by Bolivia and Norway. Under operative paragraph 8 of the proposed text, the Council would establish an Expert Committee to conduct a study of the situation in South Africa and practical study, and report to the Security Council as to the feasibility, effectiveness and implications of measures which could, as appropriate, be taken by

Committee to request all Member States to submit their views on such measures not later than 30 November 1964 and the Committee was requested "to complete its report not later than three months there-

At the 1133rd meeting on 16 June 1964, the joint draft resolution submitted by Bolivia and Norway was adopted by 8 votes in favour, none against and 3 abstentions.¹⁰²

Composition

In submitting the joint draft resolution at the 1133rd meeting on 16 June 1964, the representative of Norway explained¹⁰³ that the composition of the

expert committee were thus Bolivia, Brazil, China, Czechoslovakia, France,¹⁰⁵ Ivory Coast, Morocco, Norway, USSR, United Kingdom and United States.

¹⁰¹ S/7552.

¹⁰² S/5769, 1133rd meeting: paras. 2-13.

¹⁰³ 1135th meeting: para. 43; S/5773, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Apr.-June 1964, pp. 249-251.

¹⁰⁴ 1132nd meeting: para. 10.

¹⁰⁵ France did not participate in the meetings of the Committee.

⁹⁰ S/6408.

⁹¹ 1221st meeting: paras. 27-31.

⁹² 1221st meeting: paras. 55-56.

⁹³ 1221st meeting: para. 62.

⁹⁴ 1222nd meeting: paras. 88-91.

⁹⁵ 1222nd meeting: paras. 114-116.

⁹⁶ 1221st meeting, paras. 106-108.

⁹⁷ 1222nd meeting, paras. 8-12.

⁹⁸ 1222nd meeting, para. 120.

⁹⁹ S/6408, 1225rd meeting, paras. 5, 6.

¹⁰⁰ 1227th meeting, paras. 16-25.

Termination

its report¹⁰⁷ on 27 February 1965. During the period covered by this Supplement the report of the Expert

With the submission of its report, the Committee has

CASE 6

United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in

and was expected to arrive on the next day. Pending

the appointment of a civilian Chief of UNIPOM

both operations. The

UNIPOM and had in general received a positive

connexion with the India-Pakistan question, the representative of the Netherlands introduced^{106a} a draft resolution under which the Security Council would *inter alia* "request the Secretary-General to provide the necessary assistance to ensure the supervision of the cease-fire and withdrawal of all armed personnel" demanded by the Council. The Secretary-General was also requested to exert every possible effort to give effect to the resolution and to seek a peaceful solution. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted by 10 in favour, none against and one abstention.

In his report¹⁰⁷ dated 21 September 1965, the Secretary-General gave an account of the action he had taken to give effect to Security Council resolution 211 (1965) of 20 September 1965. In a supplementary report¹⁰⁸ of 23 September 1965, the Secretary-General further stated that he had taken immediate steps to provide a group of observers for the supervision of the cease-fire which was accepted by both Governments. However, in view of the difference in origin and function between the United Nations Military Observer Group in Pakistan (UNMOGIP) and the new group of observers, he had "decided to organize the observers whose function it is to supervise the cease-fire and withdrawals as an organization separate from UNMOGIP, entitled United Nations India-Pakistan

Observation Mission (UNIPOM)."

Composition

In his report¹¹⁰ dated 23 September 1965, the Secretary-General informed the Council that he had asked the Chief Officer of UNMOGIP to delegate a group of UNMOGIP observers to supervise the cease-fire in the area of conflict outside the cease-fire line in Kashmir, and that twelve observers under his deputy, who were due to arrive on both the Indian and Pakistani

tions.

On the question of compliance with withdrawal provisions of Security Council resolution 211 (1965), the Secretary-General informed the Council of his efforts in that matter and stated that the expected withdrawals had not taken place and there was no indication that they were likely to take place soon unless some new effort were made.

Duration of mandate

In a report dated 15 December 1965,¹¹² the Secretary-General drew the attention of the Council to the fact that the first three-month period of the cease-fire demanded by Security Council resolution 211 of 20 September would elapse on 22 December 1965. He explained that while some degree of quiet had been established along the cease-fire line, the situation was such that tension persisted between the parties at numerous points and incidents continued. Noting that both India and Pakistan had informed him of their desire that the United Nations continue its observer function after 22 December, the Secretary-General indicated his intention under the circumstances to continue the United Nations activities relating to the cease-fire and withdrawal provisions of the Security Council resolution. In that connexion a

In a report dated 30 December 1965,¹¹³ the Secretary-General informed the Council that the Chief of Army Staff of the Indian Army had informed the Chief Officer of UNIPOM of his intention to order a

26 December. On 22 December the Chief of General Staff of Pakistan had agreed to take similar action. On 17 February 1966, the Secretary-General re-

ment and withdrawal of their troops and on the ground

¹⁰⁷ S/6699, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1965, pp. 329-331.

¹⁰⁸ S/6699/Add.3, O.R., 20th yr., Supplement for July-Sept. 1965, pp. 335-336.

contended that the action of the Secretary-General in connexion with the Observation Mission departed from the United Nations Charter, and asserted that only the Security Council was competent to adopt appropriate measures connected with observers of the United Nations; 1247th meeting: para. 243; 1251st meeting, paras. 83-88. See also chapter VIII, part II, p. 107 and foot-note 58.

¹¹⁰ S/6699/Add.3, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1965, pp. 335-336.

¹¹¹ "Specific agreement urgently to provide observers has been received so far from the Governments of Brazil, Canada, Ethiopia, Iceland, Nigeria, and ..."

¹¹² S/6699/Add.11, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for Oct-Dec. 1965, pp. 14-15.

¹¹³ S/6710/Add.14, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for Oct-Dec. 1965, pp. 117-124.

¹¹⁴ S/6719/Add.5, O.R., 21st yr., Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1966.

¹¹⁵ A corrigendum to S/6719/Add.5, issued on 18 February 1966, stating that the withdrawal date should be amended to read "25 January 1966" appears to be at variance with the withdrawal date stated in S/6719/Add.6.

On 26 February 1966 the Secretary-General reported that the withdrawal of troops by India and Pakistan had been completed on schedule on 25 February 1966. The first three-month period of the cease-fire demanded by the Secretary-General had elapsed on 22 December. The situation remained such

CASE 7

Representative of the Secretary-General in the matter of withdrawal of troops by India and Pakistan

Establishment

At the 1251st meeting on 5 November 1965, in

Bolivia, Ivory Coast, Malaysia, Netherlands and Uruguay reaffirming its resolution 211 (1965) of 20 September 1965 in all its parts and demanding that the representatives of the Governments of India and Pakistan meet with a "suitable representative of the Secretary-General, to be appointed without delay after consultation with both parties, for the purpose of formulating an agreed plan and schedule for the withdrawals by both parties".

Composition and terms of reference

On 25 November 1965, the Secretary-General informed the Council that after consultations with both parties he had appointed a personal representa-

on 25 November 1965. He then advised the Council of assurances by both parties that they would receive and co-operate with his representative.

Duration of mandate

In a report¹²⁰ dated 15 December 1965, the Secretary-General informed the Council that whereas the

¹²⁰ S/6719/Add.6, *ibid.*; also S/6699/Add.12, *O.R.*, 21st yr., Suppl. for Jan. Mar. 1966.

mission of his personal representative.

On 17 February 1966, the Secretary-General reported¹²¹ to the Security Council that in a series of joint meetings of the military representatives of India and Pakistan, convened under the auspices of the Secretary-General's representative, agreement had been

reached on the withdrawal of their troops. The contemplated withdrawal was to be completed by 25 February 1966. Should disagreements arise which could not be resolved by the two parties, the good offices of the Secretary-General's representative would be requested and his decision would be final and binding.

Termination

On 23 February 1966, the Secretary-General reported¹²² to the Council that the first stages of the withdrawals had been completed on 20 February and it was expected that the entire operation would be completed by 25 February. Barring any untoward developments, the responsibilities of the Secretary-

of troops from India and Pakistan had been completed on schedule on 25 February 1966.

**** 2. Subsidiary organs proposed but not established**

**** B. NOT INVOLVING, TO FACILITATE THEIR WORK, MEETINGS AT PLACES AWAY FROM THE SEAT**

Part II

**** CONSIDERATION OF PROCEDURES RELATIVE TO SUBSIDIARY ORGANS**