

**Chapter I**

**PROVISIONAL RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL**

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTORY NOTE .....	3
<b>PART I. MEETINGS (RULES 1-5)</b>	
Note .....	3
**1. Consideration of the adoption or amendment of rules 1-5 .....	3
2. Special cases concerning the application of rules 1-5 .....	3
<b>PART II. REPRESENTATION AND CREDENTIALS (RULES 13-17)</b>	
Note .....	5
**1. Consideration of the adoption or amendment of rules 13-17 .....	5
2. Special cases concerning the application of rules 13-17 .....	5
<b>PART III. PRESIDENCY (RULES 18-20)</b>	
Note .....	6
**1. Consideration of the adoption or amendment of rules 18-20 .....	6
2. Special cases concerning the application of rules 18-20 .....	6
<b>PART IV. SECRETARIAT (RULES 21-26)</b>	
Note .....	9
**1. Consideration of the adoption or amendment of rules 21-26 .....	10
2. Special cases concerning the application of rules 21-26 .....	10
<b>PART V. CONDUCT OF BUSINESS (RULES 27-36)</b>	
Note .....	11
**1. Consideration of the adoption or amendment of rules 27-36 .....	12
2. Special cases concerning the application of rules 27-36 .....	12
<b>PART VII. LANGUAGES (RULES 41-47)</b>	
Note .....	18
1. Consideration of the adoption or amendment of rules 41-47 .....	18
2. Special cases concerning the application of rules 41-47 .....	19
<b>PART VIII. PUBLICITY OF MEETINGS, RECORDS (RULES 48-57)</b>	
Note .....	19
**1. Consideration of the adoption or amendment of rules 48-57 .....	19
**2. Special cases concerning the application of rules 48-57 .....	19
<b>**PART IX. APPENDIX TO PROVISIONAL RULES OF PROCEDURE .....</b>	<b>19</b>

## INTRODUCTORY NOTE

This chapter of the *Supplement* contains material relation to all the provisional rules of procedure with the exception of those rules which are dealt with in other chapters as follows: chapter II: Agenda (rules 6-12); chapter III: Participation in the proceedings of the Council (rules 37-39); chapter VII: Admission of new Members (rules 58-60); chapter VI: Relations

entered in this chapter follow the classification previously adopted for the *Repertoire*. The arrangement of each part is based on the successive chapters of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council.

During the period under review, the Security Council procedure on one occasion when rules 41, 42, 43 and 44 were amended to include Russian and Spanish among the working languages of the Security Council (Case 43). Case histories entered in respect to other rules are confined entirely to those proceedings of the Council in which a question has arisen regarding the

provide cumulative evidence of the practices established by the Council, but are indicative of special problems which have arisen in the proceedings of the Council under its provisional rules.

### Part I

#### MEETINGS (RULES 1-5)

##### NOTE

Part I deals with the practice concerning the convening of Council meetings and is concerned with interpretation of rules 1-5, which reflect the provisions of Arti-

During the period under review there were no special instances of the application of rules 1, 3 and 5.

##### \*\*1. CONSIDERATION OF THE ADOPTION OR AMENDMENT OF RULES 1-5

##### 2. SPECIAL CASES CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF RULES 1-5

At the 1601st meeting on 24 November 1971, in connection with the complaint by General the representative of the United Kingdom, speaking on a point of order, referred to his delegation's letter<sup>1</sup> requesting a meeting of the Council at 11.30 the following morning in connexion with the situation in Southern Rh-

"I know, Sir, that you have consulted all the the request to which I referred. It was my assumption in making that request that all members of the Council would wish to hear a full statement from me, as soon as I was in a position to make

designed to achieve a settlement of the Rhodesian problem which were signed in Salisbury yesterday. Indeed, throughout this last week in the United Nations, in numbers of Committees, we have continually had requests addressed to us for information

reason that I asked for a meeting of this Council to coincide as closely as possible with the time when the United Kingdom Parliament itself will be informed."

The representative of the United Kingdom then stated that in case there was any objection to the

as follows: it is proposed that we discuss an item being the situation in Southern Rhodesia. If that is the case, the Soviet delegation is ready to discuss this matter with you and with the other members

not considering convening a special meeting of the Security Council in order to listen to information or the results of the visit of a statesman of one country to one of that country's colonies. That is not how we understand the situation. There is no precedent for it and we should not create one. All sorts of visits take place, and all sorts of talks are to listen to information from one delegation or another as to the results of such visits.

<sup>1</sup> S/10396, OR, 26th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1971, p. 40.

"I should therefore like to make it quite clear that if we are talking about discussing the question of the situation in Southern Rhodesia exactly as formulated in the agenda of the Security Council, then we are prepared to discuss both the date on which that meeting should be held and the time, and we have no objections. I should like to say that on this point."

The representative of France stated that the request for a meeting by the delegation of the United Kingdom

of procedure of the Security Council and therefore he was in favour of commencing a meeting as soon as possible to hear the representative of the United Kingdom. The representatives of Nicaragua, the United States, Argentina, Burundi, Italy, Japan and Belgium also expressed their support for a meeting or requested

The representative of Somalia, after stating that the fourth report of the Security Council Committee on sanctions was awaiting discussion by the Council, suggested that since both that report and the United

After the President (France) had stated that consultations were going on regarding the request of the representative of the United Kingdom for a meeting, the representative of Argentina stated:

has spared the President the task of holding consultations because the majority of its members have

United Kingdom a statement which promises to be

problem of form, that is, the wording of the agenda, rule 7 of our rules of procedure states that: 'The provisional agenda for each meeting of the Security Council is drawn up by the Secretary-General and

must then approve, Mr. President. If you agree, the consultations have taken place and the only thing remaining is to decide when the meeting is to be

The representative of Argentina then formally requested the President to determine whether there was any objection by members of the Council to a meeting at 11.30 the next morning, with the agenda to be decided upon immediately following the adjournment of the present meeting.

The representative of Argentina, however, repeated his proposal that the President consult the members then and there to determine if there was any objection

The representative of the USSR declared that he could not understand why the Council had to decide

the question of the exact hour and minutes of the row's meeting at that particular moment and why consultations on that point could not be held after the conclusion of the current meeting, as was suggested by the President.

The President then asked the representative of Argentina if he would like to consult the members of the row's meeting before adjourning; if not he would hold consultations on that point immediately following the adjournment of the present meeting.

as the meeting took place the following morning he would not object to the modalities of consultations to determine the exact hour of that meeting.

Before adjourning the meeting, the President summarized the discussion to the effect that it had been agreed to hold a meeting the following morning and present meeting.<sup>2</sup>

Rule 4

President of the Security Council dated 20 April 1970,<sup>4</sup> that a meeting of the Security Council be convened, at a date convenient to members, to consider the question of initiating periodic meetings of the Security Charter.

paras 74-77 114-115; Italy, paras 101-102 135; Japan, para

USSR, paras. 72-73, 91-95, 111-113, 127, 132.  
<sup>3</sup> S/9824, OR, 25th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1970, p. 207.  
<sup>4</sup> S/9759, OR, 25th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1970, pp. 153-156. In his note, the President, having recalled that on 3 March 1970 the members of the Security Council had received formally on behalf of the delegation of Finland a memorandum on the question of initiating periodic meetings

sions which had taken place among the members of the Council, that consultations be undertaken with a view to having this question considered, in due course, by the Security Council. He said that in making this proposal he was acting in his

in which historical background of Article 29(2), including the attempts over the years by the three Secretaries-General, the General Assembly and individual members to activate Article 28(2), had been reviewed and certain suggestions put forth to serve as basis for the proposed consultations among the members of the Security Council. These suggestions were:

of the Charter and rule 4 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council; (3) that it be understood that periodic meetings would provide an opportunity for a general exchange of views on the international situation and not arise from any particular event or issue, and not be expected to lead to decisions, resolutions, etc., on substantive issues; that (4) the agenda of periodic meetings be drawn up by the Secretary-General in consultation with the members of the Security

the Secretary-General on the international situation, and that (5) periodic meetings normally be closed meetings, unless

At the 1544th meeting of the Security Council on 12 June 1970 following the adoption of the agenda, without objection, a statement, based on prior consultations among the members of the Security Council and expressing the consensus of that organ, was read out by the President (Nepal) and approved by the Council.<sup>5</sup>

*Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1970*, p. 10. See, also in this chapter, Cases 3 and 10 below.

In accordance with the decision taken at the 1544th meeting of the Security Council on 12 June 1970, the first periodic meeting of the Council was held in private on 21 October 1970 at the close of which a communiqué was issued by the Secretary-General in accordance with rule 55 of the provisional rules of procedure.

<sup>5</sup> See, *OR, 25th yr., Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1970*, p. 11.

## Part II

### REPRESENTATION AND CREDENTIALS (RULES 13-17)

#### NOTE

the credentials of the representatives of members of the Security Council have been circulated to the

During the period under review, objections were raised on one instance to the credentials of a representative stated to be illegally occupying the seat of the true representative of a Member State. The Council, having heard the objections to the acceptance of the credentials and statements made in reply to those objections, proceeded with its conduct of business

#### \*\*1. CONSIDERATION OF THE ADOPTION OR AMENDMENT OF RULES 13-17

#### 2. SPECIAL CASES CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF RULES 13-17

##### Rule 13

##### CASE 4

in connection with the admission of new members, the representative of Somalia stated that he wished to place on record his Government's "strong objections to acceptance of the credentials of the representative who, since December 1962, has been occupying the seat reserved for the true representative of the Government of the State of China."

The representatives of France, Italy, Poland, Syria and the USSR supported the reservations expressed by the representative of Somalia on the question of the representation of China in the United Nations.

The representative of China, in his reply, observed that "any reservation or objection made by a Member State with respect to the credentials of the representative of another Member State does not in any way affect the legal status of that representative" and stated that the Security Council was not the proper forum for a debate on the question of China's representation.

credentials of the representative of China had been reported to the Council on 18 December 1962 and in the absence of any objection they were considered to

have been approved. Thus, the provisions of rule 15 of the provisional rules of procedure were fully satisfied.

of China. He then added:

"With regard to the broad question of Chinese representation in the United Nations, I would ask,

asked, now or in the future, to take action on that question. The Security Council, composed of only fifteen members—less than one eighth of the membership of the United Nations—is manifestly the wrong organ in which to deal with a political question of great moment that concerns every single Member of the Organization. That fact was recognized from the very beginning of the controversy over Chinese representation, when the General Assembly in 1950 adopted resolution 396 (V)."

The Council proceeded with its meeting, without, however, taking a decision on the question of representation.<sup>7</sup>

##### CASE 5

By a letter<sup>8</sup> dated 26 October 1971 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Secretary-

by the General Assembly on 25 October 1971 by which the Assembly had decided to restore all the rights of the People's Republic of China and to recognize the representatives of its Government as the only legitimate representative of China to the United Nations; and to "expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-Shek from the United Nations and all its related organizations."

In a report<sup>10</sup> dated 2 November 1971 to the President of the Security Council, concerning the credentials of the representative and deputy representative of the People's Republic of China on the Security Council, the Secretary-General stated that he had received from the Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs of that country, telegrams stating that Mr. Huang Hua and Mr. Chen Chu had been appointed, respectively, representative

<sup>7</sup> For texts of relevant statements, see: 1565th meeting;

<sup>8</sup> S/10378, mimeo.

<sup>9</sup> Resolution 2758 (XXVI)

<sup>10</sup> S/10382, mimeo.

and deputy representative of the People's Republic of China in the Security Council.

After drawing attention to General Assembly resolution 2758 (XXVI) of 25 October 1971, the Secretary-

At the 1599th meeting of the Security Council on 23 November 1971, prior to the adoption of the agenda relating to the complaint by Senegal, statements were made by members of the Council welcoming the repre-

sional credentials.

paras. 1-24.

### Part III

#### PRESIDENCY (RULES 18-20)

##### NOTE

Part III of this chapter is confined to proceedings of the Council in which the President of the Security Council presides.

During the period under review, there were no cases of special application or interpretation of rule 18 which deals with the monthly rotation of the presidency of the Council, and of rule 20, on the temporary cession of the chair. The material assembled in the section is concerned with rule 19 and covers instances in which the President has held consultations with Council members in-between the meetings of the Council with a view to reaching an agreement on measures to be adopted by the Council.<sup>12</sup> (Cases 6, 7, 8, 9, 11,

the consensus of the members in the course of a meeting (Cases 10, 13, 16), others in which the President has announced such consensus not in the course of a meeting but via notes circulated as Security Council documents<sup>13</sup> one instance in which the President suggested a procedure by which the Council would adjourn to allow for informal consultations on a draft resolution<sup>14</sup> before the Council (Case 15), and one instance in which the President having made a statement, which certain representatives believed had contravened an understanding requested to adhere to that understanding (Case 17).

Material relevant to the exercise by the President of his functions in connexion with the agenda is dealt with in the conduct of a meeting is reflected in the material included in part V of this chapter.

<sup>12</sup> During the period under review, the Security Council has continued to resort to informal consultations as a procedure for facilitating the reaching of its decisions. Agreements or consensus resulting from such consultations have, in some instances, been presented to the Council by the President in which the Council, at its formal meeting, would then approve without further debate. In other instances such agreements or consensus have been announced by the President in notes circulated as Security Council documents.

<sup>13</sup> For texts of such notes, see S/8697/Add.1, OR, 24th yr., April-June 1970, p. 148; S/9803, *ibid.*, p. 184; S/9911, *ibid.*, Suppl. for July-Sept. 1970, p. 131; S/9951, *ibid.*, p. 147; S/9999, *ibid.*, Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1970, p. 53; S/10274, OR, 26th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1971, p. 40; S/10299, *ibid.*, Suppl., for July-Sept. 1971, pp. 56-57.

<sup>14</sup> S/10376, mimeo.

##### \*\*1. CONSIDERATION OF THE ADOPTION OR AMENDMENT OF RULES 18-20

##### 2. SPECIAL CASES CONCERNING THE APPLICATION

##### Rule 19

##### CASE 6

At the 1474th meeting on 10 June 1969, in connexion with the Cyprus Question, the President (Paraguay) stated that as a result of consultations a draft resolution had emerged and he asked the Deputy to the Under-Secretary-General to read it out. Under the draft resolution,<sup>15</sup> the Security Council would, *inter alia*, extend the stationing in Cyprus of the United

ending 15 December 1969.

The Council adopted the draft resolution unanimously.<sup>16</sup>

##### CASE 7

At the 1504th meeting on 26 August 1969, in connexion with the situation in the Middle East, the President (Spain) announced that as a result of consultations undertaken in the past few days, members of the Council had reached agreement on the text of a draft resolution<sup>17</sup> representing a consensus of the Council.

After noting that there was no objection to the draft resolution, the Council adopted the resolution.

##### CASE 8

At the 1506th meeting on 29 August 1969, in connexion with the letter dated 18 August 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representative of the United States<sup>18</sup> concerning the meeting

after consultations on the subject "I understand there is no objection to the establishment of a committee

<sup>15</sup> Text same as resolution 266 (1969) of 10 June 1969.

<sup>17</sup> S/9410. Text same as resolution 270 (1969) of 26 August 1969.

<sup>18</sup> For text of the President's statement, see 1504th meeting, paras. 2-3.

<sup>19</sup> S/9397, OR, 24th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1969, pp. 159-160.

and 1506th meetings.<sup>20</sup>

#### CASE 9

At the 1521st meeting on 11 December 1969, in (Zambia) noted<sup>21</sup> that the text of a draft resolution<sup>22</sup> had been circulated to members of the Council and informed

the third preambular paragraph.<sup>23</sup>

The Council adopted the draft resolution unanimously.<sup>24</sup>

#### CASE 10

of the Security Council, the President (Iraq) stated that after consultations among the members of the Security Council, he had been authorized to make the following statement<sup>25</sup> expressing the consensus of the

in accordance with Article 29, paragraph 2, of the Charter. They consider that the holding of periodic meetings, at which each member of the Council would be represented by a member of the Government or by some other specially designated representative

As to the date and other practical aspects of the

"It is understood that periodic meetings, the purpose of which would be to enable the Security Council to discharge more effectively its responsibilities under the Charter, would provide members with an opportunity for a general exchange of views

would normally be held in private, unless it were otherwise decided.

"The provisional agenda of periodic meetings would be discussed with the members of the Council and in accordance with the relevant provisions of the provisional rules of procedure."

#### CASE 11

At the 1552nd meeting on 9 September 1970, in connexion with the situation created by increasing

<sup>20</sup> For text of the President's statement, see 1506th meeting, para. 61. See also in this supplement, chapter V, Case 9.

<sup>21</sup> For the text of the President's statement, see 1521st meeting, paras. 2-4.

<sup>22</sup> S/9550, mimeo.

<sup>23</sup> S/9550/Rev. 1, mimeo. Text same as resolution 274 (1969).

<sup>24</sup> 1521st meeting, para. 72. See also in this supplement, chapter VIII, part II, p. 122.

<sup>25</sup> S/9835, OR, 25th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1970, p. 210.

sive consultations, members of the Council had agreed on the text of a draft resolution<sup>26</sup> representing a consensus of the Council.

After the President had read the text of the draft

#### CASE 12

At the outset of the 1557th meeting on 17 November 1970, the President (Syria) declared that during consultations that had taken place since the last meeting of the Council, a draft resolution<sup>27</sup> had been prepared which appeared to have the support of all members of the Council.

After reading the text of the draft resolution, the

#### CASE 13

At the 1576th meeting on 26 August 1971, in con-

Mission to the Republic of Guinea to consult with authorities and to report on the situation immediately.

that the Special Mission would be appointed after the Council and the Secretary-General. As a result of

He then made the following statement:

the Special Mission called for in resolution 295 (1971) should be composed of two members of the Council instead of three. The Special Mission will proceed to Conakry to consult the Government

President announced<sup>28</sup> that he and the Secretary-General had decided that the Special Mission would be composed of Argentina and Syria and would be accompanied by the necessary staff from the Secretariat.<sup>29</sup>

#### CASE 14

At the 1471st meeting on 29 March 1969, in connexion with the situation in the Middle East, the Presi-

resolution sponsored by three delegations had been completed and would be circulated soon for the Council's consideration. However, he said, since the day

<sup>27</sup> For text of the President's statement, see 1552nd meeting, paras. 1, 4-12.

<sup>28</sup> S/9933/Rev. 1. Text same as resolution 286 (1970) of 9 September 1970.

<sup>29</sup> 1552nd meeting, para. 12.

<sup>30</sup> S/9980. Text same as resolution 288 (1970) of 17 November 1970.

paras. 1-3.

<sup>32</sup> S/10299, OR, 26th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1971, pp. 56-57.

of national mourning in the United States was to be observed on 31 March 1969, the sponsors, out of respect, had decided to postpone introduction of their draft resolution until after that day.

The President, after noting that no one then wished to take the floor, declared that the date of the next meeting would be set by the incoming President of the Council. He then adjourned the meeting.<sup>34</sup>

#### CASE 15

At the 1598th meeting on 20 October 1971, in (Nicaragua), after referring to a draft resolution sub-

meeting at some future date after consultation with

#### CASE 16

At the 1602nd meeting on 30 November 1971 the President (Poland) observed that in pursuance of patched a Special Mission to Guinea, consisting of the representatives of Argentina and Syria. He stated August to 2 September 1971 and had submitted its report to the Council.<sup>37</sup>

"It will be recalled that on 3 August the Council dispatched a Special Mission to the Republic of Guinea. The Special Mission, consisting of the representative of Syria, Ambassador George J. Tomch, and the deputy representative of Argentina,

consultations with officials of the Government of Guinea.

"In those consultations, the Guinean authorities operated fully with the Special Mission and successful achievement of its task.

"Upon its return to New York and in accordance with its terms of reference, the Special Mission submitted its report to the Security Council, circulated as document S/10309. The Security Council began its first examination of the report of the Special Mission at its 1586th meeting on 29 September 1971.

"It is evident from this report that there is continuing concern in Guinea regarding the possibility of renewed acts against that country's ter-

<sup>34</sup> For text of the President's statement, see 1471st meeting, paras. 2-6.

ritorial integrity and political independence similar to those which led to the events of November 1970. In this respect, the view has been expressed by the Government of Guinea that action should be taken by the Security Council to prevent Portugal from violating the territorial integrity and political independence of Guinea.

"It is also clear that the failure by Portugal to apply the principle of self-determination, including the right to independence, in Guinea (Bissau) is having an unsettling effect on conditions in the area.

appreciation of the report of the Special Mission of Guinea reiterates operative paragraph 1 of Security Council Resolution 1803 (1971) which states: 'The territorial integrity and political independence of the Republic of Guinea must be respected.'

#### CASE 17

At the 1621st meeting on 21 December 1971, in connexion with the situation in the India/Pakistan

been reached on an acceptable draft resolution sponsored by Argentina, Burundi, Japan, Nicaragua, Sierra Leone and Somalia." He then added:

"The proposed draft resolution is factual and is capable of commanding the support of all members around this table. It is non-partisan and to a considerable extent represents a consensus of the multiplicity of draft resolutions that have been presented to the Council or discussed in the corridors during the past two weeks. It has been voided

"The draft resolution before the Council this evening takes account of the realities of the existing situation. It calls upon both sides to the conflict to make the cessation of all hostilities durable and provides for withdrawals of all armed forces from the troubled zones. To this end it stresses the need

achieved unless the Geneva Conventions of 1949 are respected and meticulously observed.

"A point in this connexion is the rumoured retali-

where, we are aware that feelings are high and the danger of reprisals for sufferings meted out by the troops of the Pakistan Government since March is imminent.

"The draft resolution also calls for concerted efforts from the international community for the rehabilitation of the millions of refugees who would better serve their land by returning to their ancestral homes.

achievement of a fruitful solution to the problem confronting the India/Pakistan subcontinent since

efforts. The way in which this could be achieved

<sup>37</sup> S/10309/Rev. 1, OR, 26th year, Special Supplement No. 4



would be by the speedy adoption of the draft resolution now before the Council."

With regard to the President's statement, the repre-

"I have listened with close attention to the state-

standing of my delegation that first the co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document S/10465 would present that draft resolution and make introductory statements. Consequently, I take it that the statement

of an interpretative character on the draft resolution before us and that you have made that statement perhaps in your capacity as the representative of Sierra Leone.

"We are considering a matter of utmost gravity and therefore we have to weigh every word that is uttered because the proceedings of this Council are a part of the Charter and any interpretation which does not

sponsors have to say in regard to the draft resolution."

Following the statement by the representative of

Pakistan, the representative of Somalia, one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, stated:

"The agreement reached between me, on behalf of the co-sponsors and the two parties was that the draft resolution would first be put to a vote by you,

been taken, my delegation, on behalf of the co-sponsors, would make an interpretative statement on certain of its aspects. I trust that you will proceed accordingly."

The President replied as follows:

"In accordance with the usual custom, I have only tried to appeal to members to proceed on this matter with all seriousness and to see that something is done. If Ambassador Farah had not made his statement, I had intended to suggest that the draft resolution now be put to the vote and that, after the voting, members be given an opportunity to make statements in explanation of their votes and then

<sup>40</sup> For texts of relevant statements, see: 1621st meeting: President (Sierra Leone) paras. 3-8, 13; Pakistan, paras. 10-11; Somalia, para. 12.

Part IV

SECRETARIAT (RULES 21-26)

NOTE

meetings of the Security Council.

Within the period under review, the Secretary-General has been requested or authorized (i) to study, together with the representative of the United States, the matter concerning a threat received by the repre-

meeting in consultation with the members of the Council and in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter; (ii) to transmit to the General Assembly the text of a resolution adopted by the Security Council;<sup>43</sup> (iv) to give every assistance to any of the parties to a dispute established by

<sup>43</sup> Statement by the President (USSR) in connexion with the question of initiating periodic meetings of the Security Council, 1544th meeting, para. 2.

<sup>44</sup> Statement by the President (Spain) in connexion with admission of new members, 1554th meeting, para. 177.

<sup>45</sup> In connexion with the situation in Namibia, resolution 276 (1970) of 30 January 1970, para. 8; resolution 283 (1970) of 29 July 1970, para. 16.

appoint a special mission after consultations with the Council; (iii) to transmit to the General Assembly the text of a resolution adopted by the Council to which South Africa was a party and which, other

to the Territory of Namibia;<sup>46</sup> (vii) to transmit the text of a resolution adopted by the Council to the International Court of Justice;<sup>47</sup> (viii) to dispatch a special mission to the spot composed of members of

to investigate, carry out an inquiry into the facts brought to light and, if necessary, to render assistance to the parties; (ix) if necessary, a special representative to lend his good offices to certain parties for the solution of humanitarian problems resulting from the dispute.<sup>48</sup>

In a number of instances, the Secretary-General has also been requested to follow the implementation of

280 (1970) of 23 November 1970, para. 4; resolution 285

283 (1970) of 29 July 1970, para. 9.

<sup>47</sup> In connexion with the situation in Namibia, resolution 284 (1970) of 20 July 1970, para. 2.

<sup>48</sup> In connexion with the complaint by Senegal, resolution 294 (1971) of 15 July 1971, para. 4.

<sup>49</sup> In connexion with the situation in India/Pakistan sub-continent, resolution 307 (1971) of 21 December 1971, para. 6.

deemed appropriate.

requested by Resolutions or during meetings of the Security Council to submit reports on developments relating

In response to such requests or at his own initiative, the Secretary-General has on a number of occasions submitted oral reports to the Council.

During the period under review there has been no case of special application or interpretation of rules 23 and 24.

**\*\*1. CONSIDERATION OF THE ADOPTION**

**OF AMENDMENT OF RULES 21-26**

**2. SPECIAL CASES CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF RULES 21-26**

**Rule 21**

**CASE 18**

before proceeding to the discussion of the item on the agenda pertaining to the situation in the Middle East, the President (USSR) called upon the Secretary-General to make a statement. The Secretary-General stated:

"At the 1509th meeting of the Security Council, on 11 September you, Mr. President, drew my

representatives of Member States of the United Nations, and asked me to study the matter, together with the representative of the United States, so that the necessary measures could be taken.

been in contact with the Permanent Representative

protection is being provided to the delegations concerned on a round-the-clock basis. Should further protection be required, I am advised that the United

intention to keep up my contacts with the Permanent Representative, and I shall keep the Council informed of developments."<sup>52</sup>

<sup>50</sup> In connexion with the situation in Namibia, resolution 264 (1969) of 20 March 1969, para. 9; resolution 269 (1969)

resolution 271 (1969) of 15 September 1969, para. 7; resolution 298 (1971) of 25 September 1971, para. 5; in connexion of 12 March 1970, para. 20; in connexion with the question

resolution 290 (1970) of 8 December 1970, para. 11; in connexion with the complaint by Senegal, resolution 302 (1971) of 24 November 1971, para. 8; in connexion with the situation

meeting, para. 6; 1540th meeting, para. 84; 1551st meeting, paras. 11-14.

In a note dated 28 March 1970<sup>53</sup> the Secretary

to requests by the Governments of Iran and the United Kingdom, and after extended consultations with the

in a matter pertaining to Bahrain on the basis of mutually agreed terms of reference which envisaged an

minutes taken by the Security Council. Under the plan, the Secretary-General was to send a personal representative to ascertain the wishes of the people of Bahrain regarding their status. His Personal Representative was to submit his findings in the form of a report to the Secretary-General who would transmit them to the Security Council for its consideration and endorsement. He also pointed out that actions such as this had become customary in United Nations practice and had proved to be a valuable means of relieving and preventing tension by a quiet approach in certain situations which could only be prolonged and aggravated by premature disclosure and public debate. By a letter dated 4 April 1970,<sup>54</sup> addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the

Secretary-General in which the USSR, in referring to the latter's initiative on the question of Bahrain took exception to the statement by the Secretary-General that such actions had become customary in United

under the United Nations Charter, decisions involving

Council.

By a letter dated 6 April 1970,<sup>55</sup> to the President of the Security Council, the Secretary-General transmitted his reply to the USSR letter in which he acknowledged that he found himself at variance with some aspects of the views of the USSR. When the

United Nations approached him directly asking for the exercise of his good offices on a delicate matter in which they shared the hope for an early amicable

members individually be examined the proposals care-

impinged upon the authority of the Security Council or any other organ of the United Nations, he felt obligated to assist Member States in the manner requested. To do otherwise, in his opinion, would thwart a commendable effort by Member States to abide by

engaged only in fact-finding the results of which would

<sup>54</sup> S/9737, OR, 25th yr., Suppl. for Apr.-June 1970, p. 143;

For the position of the Secretary-General regarding the question of prior consultation with the Security Council in the exercise of his good offices, see also the following commu-

CASE 20

ber, 1970 in connexion with the complaint by Guinea

asked if the Secretary-General had received any replies in response to the General Assembly resolution 2973

message to the Secretary-General, which the Permanent

On behalf of the Secretary-General, I wish to inform the members of the Security Council that immediately after the adoption by the General Assembly on 7 December of resolution 2793 (XXVI),

Security Council of the situation so that steps might be taken to convene the meeting. Later that afternoon, the Secretary-General stated that he had received also

document A/8567 and S/10440.

"The Government of India has responded by letter of 12 December 1971, which is published as document A/8580 and S/10445. The document is being processed and will be ready for distribution at about 9.00 p.m."<sup>58</sup>

statement of external forces described by the Government as Portuguese took place in Conakry" and that the resident representative had personally seen four ships disembark, and fighters flying over the city. The Secretary-General further informed the Council that he had received a second message from the President of Guinea that evening requesting him to convene an urgent meeting of the Security Council and that he had sent a cabled reply informing the President of

Rule 22  
CASE 21

24th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1969, p. 109; letter dated 7 March 1969 from the Secretary-General to the President of the

Council was about to meet. He assured the President of Guinea that any decision taken by the Council should

of India and Pakistan to take measures for an immediate cease fire and withdrawal of their armed forces from the resolution.

37988. See also 1558th meeting, para. 19. In the message, the President of Guinea asserted that Guinea had requested immediate intervention by UNO and other States troops.

Part V

CONDUCT OF BUSINESS (RULES 27-36)

NOTE

Part V sets out the cases bearing on rules 27 to 36. Cases relating to rules 37 to 39 are contained in chapter III, "Participation in the proceedings of the Security Council." Chapter V, which deals with the subsidiary organs of the Council, should be consulted in connexion with rule 28. During the period under review, there were 22 resolutions.

2. Rule 30

The extent to which the President would rule on a point of order (Cases 26-28). There have been a number of instances during the period under review in which representatives, having requested to be recognized on a point of order, made statements on matters on which no ruling was required. Such instances were

As in the previous volumes of the *Repertoire*, the cases assembled in this part are indicative of the special

3. Rule 31

The requirement of written submission for proposed resolutions, amendments, and

practice of the Security Council. They relate to such matters as the following: point

4. Rule 32

5. Rule 33

The order of intervention in the debate (Cases 22-24).

On suspension and adjournment of meetings (Cases 37-42).

## 6. Rule 26

On the order of voting on two amendments to the same draft resolution (Case 43).

## 2. SPECIAL CASES CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF RULES 27-36

## CASE 22

At the 1516th meeting on 4 December 1969, in connexion with the Complaint by Senegal, the representative of Portugal\* in the course of his statement

whether he wished to reply, the representative of Sen-

At the 1517th meeting on 5 December 1969, in

tugal\* stated that he would do so at a later stage.<sup>64</sup>

## Case 24

At the 1608th meeting on 6 December 1971, in

continent, the President (Sierra Leone) recalled rule 27 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure and added:

"Accordingly, will those who wish to take the floor kindly add their names to the list of speakers

called upon in the order of their inscription. We cannot conduct orderly debates if representatives who indicate that they wish to raise points of order instead make substantive statements or proceed to exercise their right of reply."<sup>65</sup>

## CASE 25

At the outset of the 1546th meeting on 20 July

in South Africa, the President (Nicaragua) informed the members of the Council that the Secretary-General had invited them to a ceremony commemorating the 20th anniversary of the flight of Apollo 11 to the moon at 5.00 that afternoon and that if the list of speakers had not been completed by that time he would, with the consent of the Council, suspend the meeting for half an hour to enable Council members to attend that ceremony.

The meeting was suspended at 5.05 p.m. after the representatives of the United Kingdom and Ghana\* had made their statements. Before concluding his statement the representative of Ghana stated:

"Mr. President, I had wanted to make some

<sup>61</sup> For text of relevant statements, see: 1516th meeting: President (Zambia), para. 94; Portugal, paras. 88-93; Senegal, paras. 95-98.

<sup>62</sup> For text of relevant statements, see: 1517th meeting: President (Zambia), para. 6; Portugal, para. 7; Senegal, para. 5.

<sup>63</sup> For text of the President's statement, see: 1608th meeting, paras. 212-213.

United Kingdom but I am deeply conscious that perhaps in doing so I might be upsetting your own programme for the afternoon. If you will allow me perhaps I could stop here and take the floor

of Ghana to continue his statement, he replied:

"I thank you, Mr. President, for calling on me but there have been some consultations between delegations that wish to speak at this afternoon's meeting and my own delegation and I have agreed

continue if you wish me to do so, but I should not

The President then declared:

representative of Ghana, and I now call on the representative of Sierra Leone, although the representative

11007."

## b. Rule 58

## CASE 26

At the 1537th meeting on 12 May 1970, in connexion with the situation in the Middle East, the representative of Spain submitted a draft resolution<sup>65</sup> and requested that it be put to the vote immediately

and stated that if no one wished to speak on the subject he would put the proposal to the vote. At that point the representative of Israel asked for the floor and the President recognized him. However, the representative of Syria intervened on a point of order, stating that the Council was then engaged in the procedural part of the debate, namely, the proposal of the representative of Spain to proceed to a vote immediately on his delegation's draft resolution and that the floor

take the floor.<sup>66</sup>

The President after observing that the debate had not been closed when he had given the floor to the representative of Israel ruled that the representative of

to the vote.

Further discussion ensued in which the representative of the United States and the United Kingdom argued in favour of allowing the representative of Israel to make a statement. The representative of the USSR, however, formally proposed that the Council proceed immediately to the vote on the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Spain. The Council

was then given the floor.

<sup>64</sup> For texts of relevant statements, see: 1546th meeting, President (Nicaragua), paras. 4-5, 82, 84; Ghana, paras. 80, 83.

<sup>65</sup> S/9800, adopted without change as resolution 279 (1970) of 12 May 1970.

<sup>66</sup> See chapter III, Case 8.

Following the statement by the representative of Israel,\* the representative of the United States formally proposed an amendment<sup>67</sup> to the draft resolution whereupon the representative of the Soviet Union formally proposed an amendment<sup>68</sup> to that amendment. The President, invoking rule 36 of the provisional rules of procedure, first put the Soviet amendment to the vote, followed by the United States amendment, both of which were rejected by the Council.<sup>69</sup>

The President then put the draft resolution as a whole to the vote<sup>70</sup> which the Council adopted unanimously.<sup>71</sup>

#### CASE 27

At the 1589th meeting on 6 October 1971, prior to the adoption of the agenda pertaining to the situation

ing on a point of order, formally proposed that a documentary film on Namibia which had been unofficially shown to interested members of the Security Council before the meeting, be shown again officially by the Secretariat to the Council and that the film form part of the documentary record of the Council in regard to the agenda item before it.

The representative of France stated that although he had nothing against the film, he was concerned that if the Security Council admitted such documentary evidence, "the members of the Council, including

the Council will then become a kind of cinema club."

Similarly, the representative of the United Kingdom of the Security Council, in the future, being offered other films as evidence and being burdened with the chore of watching those films in order to determine their suitability as evidence. He therefore urged further reflection in that regard.

The representative of Argentina offered a compromise to Council members in accordance with rule 49 of

The representative of the United States expressed concern at the precedent of admitting films as documentary evidence, as films could be put together to project one point of view or another. He therefore suggested that the representative of Sierra Leone "put into the record, in his own words, his view of the

The representative of the USSR noted that there was no precedent in the practice of the Security Council whereby a film could form part of the documentary record of the Council, although there were instances

<sup>67</sup> 1537th meeting, paras. 107, 112.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.* paras. 113, 128.

of films being shown by other United Nations bodies such as the Committee of Twenty-Four and the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly. As he understood it, the representative of Sierra Leone would like to have any discussion about that film included in the verbatim record. In that sense it would be a document of the Security Council. He then stated:

"I do not think that one should complicate matters. If somebody wants to see a documentary film during the consideration of any item, it is up to him. Those who want to will see it; and those who do not won't see it."

The representative of Sierra Leone stated that discussion in the Council had shown that members were agreed on the value of the film in question and its importance, although they had reservations on the

to have the film included in the documentary evidence of the Council. He said that he had based his proposal under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure which enabled the Security Council to invite members of the Secretariat and other competent persons to give assistance in examining matters within its competence. But he said he would accept the suggestion that the

and informal discussions on the subject.

The President (Nicaragua) said that he would initiate

discussion had indicated a definite interest in the possibility of having the film form part of the archives of the Council.

and continue its discussion on the situation in Namibia.<sup>72</sup>

#### CASE 28

At the 1606th meeting on 4 December 1971, in connexion with the situation in the India/Pakistan sub-

the representative of India requesting that the letter

communication pending its circulation to Council members.<sup>74</sup>

The representative of the USSR stated that it was not necessary to defer consideration of the communication from the delegation of Bangladesh pending its circulation and observed that in several instances in the past, the Security Council had entertained requests to participate in its deliberations without the right to vote even prior to the circulation of the document containing the formal request.

<sup>72</sup> For texts of relevant statements, see, 1589th meeting: President (Nicaragua), para. 43; Argentina, paras. 16-18; France, para. 10; Sierra Leone, paras. 2-8, 35-37; United Kingdom, para. 15; United States, paras. 10, 21; USSR, paras. 22, 26.

The President stated that he regarded the statement by the representative of the USSR as a challenge to

The representative of the USSR then stated that he would not insist on a vote on his proposal, whereas

under Rule 30 of the provisional rules of procedure.

proposal."

representative of Syria then invoked Rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure and moved that the Council

Case 30

pation of the representative of Bangladesh or of any other delegation until after the Council had heard the statements of the representatives of India and Pakistan.

During the course of the 1464th meeting held on 20 March 1969, in connexion with the situation in Namibia, the representative of Zambia read out the text

presenting on behalf of the co-sponsors for the consid-

statements of members already on the list of speakers.

the President (Hungary) stated the following:

been challenged. I now request the representatives to make an immediate decision. There being no objections, my ruling stands."<sup>75</sup>

CASE 31

At the 1527th meeting on 29 January 1970, in

At the 1613th meeting on 13 December 1971, in connexion with the situation in the India/Pakistan sub-continent, the representative of the USSR, speaking on a point of order, stated that the representatives of Bangladesh should be invited to be heard by the Security Council under Rule 39<sup>76</sup> of the provisional rules of procedure.

tative of Finland, after stating that he was introducing "the provisional text" of a draft resolution jointly sponsored by the delegations of Burundi, Finland, Nepal, Sierra Leone and Zambia, pointed out that the sponsors had, however, made one revision to the provisional text and then introduced the revision orally. He then stated: "I think that the text of the draft will be distributed shortly." Subsequently, the draft resolution was circulated as document S/9620.

The representative of Argentina, opposing the USSR proposal, stated that it would create a bad precedent if representatives of secessionist or subversive movements were allowed a hearing by the Council.

At the 1528th meeting on 29 January 1970, the representative of Finland again took the floor to state that further revisions had been made by the sponsors to the draft resolution and that those revisions

The President (Sierra Leone) stated that since the

immediately. He then said that, in his opinion, Bangladesh did not possess the necessary

duration of

During the course of the 1573rd meeting on 3

After further discussion, the representative of the Chowdhury be invited under rule 39.

Gambia, the representative of Somalia, after orally introducing a draft resolution sponsored by the delega-

of the USSR had made the proposal as a point of order in regard to which he would, in accordance with the effect that he was satisfied that

noted that the text of the draft resolution had not yet been circulated to members of the Council since it had not been possible for the Secretariat, which had received the text only a short time ago, to process and proposed that the Council suspend its meeting until

an individual who qualified as a competent person under rule 39 and who should accordingly be invited

for consultations to take place between certain members

had been raised to inviting the individual named by the representative of the USSR, he would, in accordance with rule 39, submit his ruling to the Security Council for immediate decision.

<sup>77</sup> For texts of relevant statements, see: 1613th meeting: President (Sierra Leone), paras. 26-28, 30-31, 33-34, 37-40, 42, 44-45, 48, Argentina, paras. 83-89, USSR, paras. 77-79, 95, 108-114, 121, 123, 137.

<sup>78</sup> S/9100 adopted without change as resolution 264 (1969).  
<sup>79</sup> For text of relevant statements, see: 1464th meeting;

paras. 57-60.

<sup>76</sup> See chapter III, Case 7.

<sup>81</sup> For texts of relevant statement, see: 1527th meeting, paras. 20-21, 1528th meeting, paras. 26-28.

After further discussion, during which the representative of the United Kingdom stated that he had no objection to the motion of the representative of Somalia, the President (Italy) suspended the meeting.

When the meeting resumed, the President, after stating that the text of the draft resolution had been circulated in some places and requested the representative of Somalia to indicate the changes in the text.<sup>82</sup>

The representative of Somalia then read out the text of the draft resolution. After a brief discussion the draft resolution,

CASE 33

At the 1615th meeting on 15 December 1971, in connexion with the situation in the India/Pakistan sub-continent, the President (Sierra Leone) stated:

"The draft resolution which the representative of Syria has just read is being processed, along with another draft resolution and I understand that it

languages before being processed and distributed. That is the position concerning this draft resolution.

The representative of the United Kingdom then orally introduced the draft resolution sponsored by his delegation. The representative of the USSR also orally introduced a draft resolution sponsored by his delegation.

The President then informed the Council that the draft resolutions just introduced by their sponsors

At the 1617th meeting on 16 December 1971 in connexion with the situation in the India/Pakistan sub-continent, the President (Sierra Leone), in answer to a query by the representative of the United States, stated that members could submit amendments to any of the draft resolutions before the Security Council, either orally or in writing. The representative of the United States stated as follows:

"... we should like to submit a draft resolution which, at one point in the consultations, seemed to have a great deal of support. I shall read out, and after the text has been circulated and the meeting is resumed, I hope that the Council would be willing to discuss it."

After reading out the text of the draft resolution, he further stated:

<sup>82</sup> S/10781, adopted without change of resolution, 206

President (Sierra Leone), paras. 113-128; Syria, paras. 110-

"That is the essence of the draft that was circulated to our Government. I would urge that it be printed up and circulated and be available for consideration when next we meet."

The President (Sierra Leone) then stated:

The representative of the United States has already stated, this appears to be a draft which has been submitted to the Council. It appears to have been agreed with the President to read it out at the meeting.

The meeting was thereupon suspended. Upon resumption of the meeting, the draft resolution was circulated and it bore the names of Japan and the United States as co-sponsors. The representative of the United States then took the floor to orally introduce minor amendments to the draft resolution,<sup>83</sup> stating that he would like to have a period of consultation on the draft resolution.<sup>87</sup>

CASE 35

At the 1622nd meeting on 29 December 1971, in connexion with the situation in Southern Rhodesia

of an informal draft resolution that had been privately circulated to Council members. He then stated that he

proceeded to read out the text of the draft resolution contained in that working paper. He announced that at the 1625th meeting on 30 December, after the President (Sierra Leone) had observed that the draft resolution had not been formally submitted to the Council, the representative of Somalia stated that he would do it then.

The President, after observing that it would take about one hour to process the draft resolution, suspended the meeting for that duration with the consent of the Council. After the resumption of the meeting the representative of Somalia declared that a further change had been made in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. At the same meeting the draft resolution was put to the vote but was not adopted because of the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.<sup>89</sup>

d. Rule 32

CASE 36

At the 1481st meeting on 24 June 1969, in connexion with the situation in Southern Rhodesia, the representative of Spain requested separate votes on a

<sup>83</sup> S/10781, adopted without change of resolution, 206

Somalia, paras. 4-36; 1623rd meeting (P.V.); President (Sierra

preambular paragraph and two paragraphs of a draft resolution<sup>90</sup> sponsored by Algeria, Nepal, Pakistan, Senegal and Zambia. The President (Paraguay), after consultations with the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, announced, however, that they had indicated their wish that the draft resolution be put to the vote

The Council then proceeded to vote on the draft resolution as a whole.<sup>91</sup>

#### CASE 37

During the course of the 1606th meeting on 4 December 1971, in connexion with the situation in the India/Pakistan sub-continent, four separate draft resolutions were introduced in the following chronological order: a draft resolution sponsored by the delegation of the United States,<sup>92</sup> a draft resolution sponsored by the delegation of the USSR,<sup>93</sup> a draft resolution sponsored by the delegations of Argentina, Burundi, Nica-

and Japan.

After completion of the voting on the United States draft resolution, the President (Sierra Leone) was

point of order and stated the following:

from you because you have just said that you would

the draft resolution submitted by Belgium, Italy and

the Soviet proposal is numbered S/10416. I should like to know if there is any special reason why we should abandon the order established in our rules of procedure."

The President replied as follows:

"According to the order of presentation and receipt, the first draft resolution received by the President was that of the United States; the second was that of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

#### e. Rule 33

##### CASE 38

At the 1484th meeting on 2 July 1969, in connexion with the situation in the Middle East, the representative

order to continue his statement. In light of the request by the representative of Jordan, the representative of the United States then invoked rule 33 of the provi-

<sup>90</sup> S/9270/Rev. 1, mimeo.

<sup>91</sup> For texts or relevant statements, see: 1481st meeting, President (Paraguay), para. 57; Spain, para. 50.

<sup>92</sup> S/10416, *OR*, 26th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1971*, p. 90.

<sup>93</sup> S/10419, *Ibid.*

<sup>94</sup> S/10417, *Ibid.*, pp. 90-91.

<sup>95</sup> For texts of relevant statements, see: 1606th meeting, President (Sierra Leone), para. 574; Argentina, para. 571.

sional rules of procedure and formally moved that the Council be adjourned until 4.00 p.m. the following day.

The President (Senegal) after quoting rule 33 of the provisional rules of procedure stated that he assumed the representative of the United States was moving for adjournment under paragraph 3 of rule 33.

States proposal, he adjourned the meeting until 4.00 p.m. the following day.<sup>97</sup>

#### CASE 39

At the 1503rd meeting on 20 August 1969, in connexion with the complaint of Ireland, the representative of the United Kingdom, objecting to the adoption of the agenda, quoted Article 2 (7) of the Charter prohibiting United Nations intervention in matters which were essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State.

After some debate, the Council agreed to a proposal

make a statement prior to the adoption of the agenda.

After the Council had heard the representative of Ireland, the representative of Zambia observed that the question before the Council was whether or not to

would be to adopt a decision to adjourn the meeting.

adjournment which had been submitted had to be decided without debate, and since there was no objection, declared that motion unanimously adopted by the Council.<sup>99</sup>

#### CASE 40

At the 1534th meeting on 17 March 1970, in connexion with the situation in Southern Rhodesia, the representative of the United Kingdom moved that

it by six votes in favour, seven against, with two abstentions.<sup>101</sup>

Following the Council's rejection of the United Kingdom motion for adjournment, the representative of the United States proposed that the motion for adjournment

dom supported the U.S. motion and the representatives of Burundi, Poland, Sierra Leone and Syria and Zambia supported it, the motion was put to a vote and adopted

<sup>97</sup> For the text of relevant statements, see: 1484th meeting: President (Senegal), paras. 258-259; Jordan, para. 255; United States, para. 257.

<sup>98</sup> See also chapter VIII, part II, p. 139.

President (Spain), paras. 20-21, 69-70; Finland, paras. 15-17; United Kingdom, paras. 2-14, 18-19; Zambia, paras. 67-68.

<sup>100</sup> S/9676/Rev. 1, and S/9696, mimeo.

<sup>101</sup> 1534th meeting, para. 150.



by six votes in favour, seven against, with two abstentions.<sup>102</sup>

The Council then proceeded to vote on the two

gation and the delegations of France, and that those consultations were not likely to be completed that day. He therefore suggested the Council's adjournment

## CASE 41

continent, the President (Sierra Leone) informed the Council that the Foreign Minister of Pakistan\* who was the next speaker inscribed on the list of speakers, had requested the Council to recess for fifteen minutes, as he had received important messages from his Government which he would like to study before addressing

After some discussion as to whether the meeting should be adjourned till the following day or whether, in view of the urgency of the situation, it should be reconvened that evening, the representative of the

the provisional rules of procedure, "to suspend the meeting until such time as you (the President) are

that we are able to reach agreement and can have a fruitful meeting."

## CASE 42

At the 1611th meeting on 12 December 1971, in connexion with the situation in the India/Pakistan sub-continent, the President (Sierra Leone) after observing that there were no more speakers on his list, suggested that the meeting be adjourned till the following day.

conflict" and "if either of those two parties wishes to take the floor at this stage, of course, such consultations would be of no avail." He asked the President to ascertain if either of those two parties wished to take the floor.

The President (Sierra Leone) then stated as follows:

"Under rule 22, I cannot prevent the representative of the United Kingdom from insisting that for the purpose of compromise, that we agree to suspend the meeting and re-convene tonight as soon

taking part in the consultations and that, sooner or later, we will know at what specific time we are to

has been reached, I will still re-convene the meeting

if that is agreeable.

He reminded the President that he had made a formal

The Council then proceeded to vote on the United

## CASE 43

At the 1614th meeting on 14 December 1971, in connexion with the situation in the India/Pakistan sub-continent, the representative of the United Kingdom stated that consultations were in progress with regard

## f. Rule 36

## CASE 44

At the 1537th meeting on 12 May 1970, in con-

requested that it be put to the vote immediately. Before the vote, however, the representative of the United States proposed an amendment to the draft resolution. Following a procedural debate, the representative of the USSR proceeded to submit a formal sub-amendment to the amendment proposed by the representative of the United States.

<sup>102</sup> 1534th meeting, para. 172.

<sup>103</sup> For texts of relevant statements, see: 1534th meeting: President (Colombia), paras. 133-134, 138, 152, 157; Burundi, para. 137; Nicaragua, para. 158; Poland, para. 170; Sierra Leone, paras. 135, 151, 166; Suria, para. 153; United Kingdom, paras. 152, 154; United States, para. 149.

<sup>104</sup> For text of relevant statement, see: 1611th meeting: President (Sierra Leone), paras. 138-139.

<sup>105</sup> S/10446, mimeo.

<sup>106</sup> For texts of relevant statements, see: 1611th meeting: President (Sierra Leone), paras. 244-246, 251, 254, 260, 271-272, 279, 285, 288-289; China, paras. 264-265; France, paras. 268-269; Poland, para. 267; Somalia, paras. 262, 280-284; USSR, paras. 255-259, 273-275; United States, paras. 247, 250.

<sup>107</sup> 1614th meeting, para. 49.

<sup>108</sup> For texts of relevant statements, see: 1614th meeting: President (Sierra Leone), paras. 45, 47, 49; Somalia, para. 44; United Kingdom, paras. 12, 17, 46, 48.

<sup>109</sup> S/10800, adopted without change to resolution, 230.

The President (France) invoking rule 36 of the provisional rules of procedure, first put the USSR sub-amendment to the vote, followed by the United States amendment, both of which were rejected by the

whole to the vote which the Council adopted un-animously.<sup>110</sup>

<sup>110</sup> For text of relevant statements, see: 1537th meeting: President (France) paras. 120, 122, 125, 129, 131; Spain

## Part VI

### \*\*VOTING (RULE 40)

## Part VII

### LANGUAGES (RULES 41-47)

#### NOTE

During the period under review, the Security Council adopted amendments to its provisional rules of procedure when rules 41, 42, 43 and 44 were amended

languages of the Council and, in this connexion, to amend rules 41, 42, 43 and 44 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Council. Annexed to the aforementioned draft resolution was a revised text of those

generally been followed by members of the Council. This practice was later extended also to include statements by the President (Case 46).

procedures of the Security Council reflected the increase in the number of the Council's working languages and would not call for any other changes in the rules of procedure. He noted that the changes in those rules would have no effect on the existing practice in the

#### 1. CONSIDERATION OF THE ADOPTION

##### Rules 41-44

##### CASE 45

In separate *notes verbales*<sup>111</sup> dated 16 January 1969, the representatives of the USSR and Spain requested the President to convene a meeting of the Security Council to consider the possibility of taking

interpretation in all the official languages of all statements made in the Council. He also noted that in view of the increase in the number of working languages of the Council, the question had been raised concerning changes that might be made in the existing practice regarding consecutive interpretation of statements made by the representatives of member states in the Council. He said the answer could only be determined from future experience of the Council.

measures in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 2470 (XXIII) of 21 December 1968, in which it

Russian and Spanish among the working languages of

The representative of Spain expressed the hope of

earlier been transmitted by the Secretary-General to the President of the Council by a letter<sup>112</sup> dated 9 January 1969.

Security Council would be unanimously adopted.

The representative of China, Colombia, Finland

to include Russian and Spanish among the working languages of the Council should

March 1969, p. 56.

<sup>112</sup> S/8962, *ibid.*, p. 54.

<sup>113</sup> S/8976, text same as resolution 263 (1969) of 24 January 1969.

The representative of the United States expressing his delegation's support for the draft resolution, noted the desirability of taking additional steps to deal with

the problem of consecutive interpretation. He hoped that a further amendment to the rules of procedure might be adopted soon to provide for consecutive interpretation only at the prior request of a member

deal with the anachronistic system of consecutive interpretation facilitate the Council's work and contribute substantially to economy and efficiency in the Secretariat.<sup>114</sup>

The Council adopted the draft resolution unanimously.<sup>115</sup> In connexion with the adoption of the new wording of rules 41, 42, 43 and 44 of the provisional rules of procedure the President made the following statement:

My Council deal with consecutive interpretation of the official languages of the Security Council remains the practical effects of the decision to increase the number of its working languages, the Council may wish to consider at a later stage whether any im-

effectively as possible.

Paraguay, paras. 91-100; Nepal, paras. 141-150; Senegal, paras. 151-168; Spain, paras. 46-57; USSR, paras. 18-45; United Kingdom, paras. 78-90; United States, paras. 111-124; Zambia, paras. 125-140

2. SPECIAL CASES CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF RULES 41-47

Rule 42

At the outset of the 1565th meeting on 9 February 1971 in connexion with admission of new members the President (United States), *inter alia*, stated:

"It strikes me as an anachronism that consecutive interpretation into the other three working languages, in addition to their simultaneous interpretation into the official languages, is now almost exclusively restricted to procedural and ceremonial statements by the President. Thus, statements by the President welcoming new members, congratulating his predecessor, returning compliments paid to him and under rule 37 to take their seats when interpreted

tion of certain statements of the kind I have just mentioned but no steady practice has yet been estab-

functioning of the Security Council by following their good example. I therefore declare that during my presidency, consecutive interpretation will not

when I believe consecutive interpretation of have the right to request that a particular statement

<sup>110</sup> This practice was subsequently followed by succeeding presidents of the Council.

<sup>111</sup> For text of relevant statement, see 1565th meeting

Part VIII

PUBLICITY OF MEETINGS, RECORDS (RULES 48-57)

NOTE

In accordance with rule 49, the verbatim records of each meeting are made available in the working languages to the representatives of the Council, as well as to the representatives of any other States which have participated in the meeting. In mimeographed copies of the record is incorporated a note showing the time and date of distribution. Corrections are requested in writing, in quadruplicate, within three work-

text to which they refer. These corrections are included, in the absence of any objection, in the Official Record

as possible after the time limit for correction. During the period under review, the Security Council held seven private meetings;<sup>118</sup> at the close of each, it issued

<sup>118</sup> The seven meetings were the following:  
1513 15 Oct. 1969 Adoption of the Council's draft report to the General Assembly

a communiqué through the Secretary-General in accordance with rule 55 of the provisional rules of procedure.

\*\*1. CONSIDERATION OF THE ADOPTION OR AMENDMENT OF RULES 48-57

\*\*2. SPECIAL CASES CONCERNING

1553 10 Oct. 1970 Adoption of the Council's draft report to

1555 21 Oct. 1970 First periodic meeting

1596 19 Oct. 1971 Adoption of the Council's draft report to the General Assembly

1618 17 Dec. 1971 Appointment of the Secretary-General

1619 20 Dec. 1971 Appointment of the Secretary-General

1620 21 Dec. 1971 Appointment of the Secretary-General.

\*\*Part IX

APPENDIX TO PROVISIONAL RULES OF PROCEDURE