

**Chapter V**

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

## CONTENTS

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

## INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The material included in this chapter pertains to procedures of the Security Council in establishing, or authorizing the establishment of, subsidiary organs deemed necessary for the performance of its functions. 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 in which the Council decided to authorize the Secretary-General to set up the subsidiary organs.

During the period covered by this *Supplement* there has been no instance of submission of a proposal to establish a subsidiary organ which was not adopted.

With respect to the case histories in which subsidiary organs were established or set up by the Sec-

retary-General pursuant to Council resolution, no implication is intended as to whether these bodies do or do not come within Article 29 of the Charter.

Part II of this chapter contains no entries as there were no instances during the period under review of consideration by the Council of procedures in relation to subsidiary organs.

### ARTICLE 29 OF THE CHARTER

"The Security Council may establish such subsidiary organs as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions."

### RULE 28 OF THE PROVISIONAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

"The Security Council may appoint a commission or committee or a rapporteur for a specified 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 Secretary-General to establish the force, this authorization having been implemented by the Secretary-General by the setting up of the UNFICYP;<sup>1</sup> (ii) recommended that the Secretary-General designate, in agreement with the parties concerned, a United Nations Mediator in Cyprus;<sup>2</sup> (iii) established a Security Council Mission to the Kingdom of Cambodia and the Republic of Viet-Nam, in connexion with the complaint by Cambodia;<sup>3</sup> (iv) invited the Secretary-General to send a representative to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of reporting to the Council on the situation;<sup>4</sup> (v) established an Expert Committee of the Security Council on measures concerning the question of race conflict in South Africa;<sup>5</sup> (vi) requested the Secretary-General in connexion with the India-Pakistan question to provide the necessary assistance to ensure the supervision of the cease-fire and withdrawal of all armed personnel;<sup>6</sup> and (vii), authorized the Secretary-General to appoint, after consultation with India and Pakistan, a suitable representative for the formulation of an agreed plan and schedule of withdrawal.<sup>7</sup>

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

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 determined by the Council. In the instance of the Representative of the Secretary-General in the Dominican Republic, the Council has defined his terms of reference. The Expert Committee on measures concerning South Africa has also 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 Organization.

Of the subsidiary organs established in connexion with the Security Council's discharge of responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security, the United Nations Representative for India and Pakistan and the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine (UNTSO) continued in existence during the period under review.

Of the Standing Committees of the Security Council, neither the Committee of Experts nor the Committee for the Admission of New Members has been employed by the Council during the period under review.

Besides the organizational functions entrusted to the Secretary-General in connexion with the establishment of the subsidiary organs mentioned above (see Cases 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7), the Security Council in connexion with the India-Pakistan question, faced with the outbreak of an armed conflict in the area, requested the Secretary-General (i) to report within three days on

<sup>1</sup> Case 1.

<sup>2</sup> Case 2.

<sup>3</sup> Case 3.

<sup>4</sup> Case 4.

<sup>5</sup> Case 5.

<sup>6</sup> Case 6.

<sup>7</sup> Case 7.

the implementation of the cease-fire resolution;<sup>8</sup> (ii) to exert every possible effort to give effect to the resolution calling for a cessation of hostilities, to take all measures possible to strengthen the United Nations Military Observer Group for India and Pakistan, and to keep the Council informed;<sup>9</sup> (iii) to provide assistance to ensure supervision of the cease-fire, to exert every possible effort to give effect to the cease-fire resolution, to seek a peaceful solution, and to report to the Council thereon;<sup>10</sup> and (iv) to report urgently on compliance with the resolution on complete and effective cease-fire and a prompt withdrawal of armed forces.<sup>11</sup> In connexion with the question relating to the Yemen-South Arabian Federation frontier, the Secretary-General was requested to use his good offices to try to settle outstanding issues, in agreement with the two parties.<sup>12</sup>

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;<sup>13</sup> and (ii) to consider what assistance the United Nations may offer to facilitate consultations among representatives of the people of South Africa.<sup>14</sup> In connexion with the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Secretary-General was requested to follow the situation and to report thereon.<sup>15</sup> In connexion with the situation in the Dominican Republic, the Secretary-General was (i) requested to convey to his representative in Santo Domingo the Council's desires concerning the securing of a suspension of hostilities;<sup>16</sup> and (ii) invited to report to the Council on the implementation of its resolution requesting that the suspension of hostilities be transformed into a permanent cease-fire.<sup>17</sup> In connexion with the complaint by Senegal, the Secretary-General was requested to follow the development of the situation.<sup>18</sup> In connexion with the situation in Territories in Africa under Portuguese administration, the Secretary-General was requested to ensure the implementation of the resolution of 23 November 1965, to furnish necessary assistance and to report to the Council within a certain period.<sup>19</sup> The reports from the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine continued to be submitted to the Se-

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

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

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

<sup>11</sup> Decision of 5 November 1965 (S/RES/215 (1965)), *ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>12</sup> Decision of 9 April 1964 (S/RES/188 (1964)), *O.R.* 19th year, *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*, 1964, pp. 9-10.

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

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

<sup>15</sup> Decision of 30 December 1964 (S/RES/199 (1964)), *ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>16</sup> Decision taken at 1212th meeting, para. 208.

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

<sup>18</sup> Decision of 19 May 1965 (S/RES/204 (1965)), *ibid.*, p. 13.

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

curity Council through the Secretary-General.<sup>20</sup> In connexion with the India-Pakistan question, the Secretary-General also submitted to the Security Council several reports on developments in the current situation in Kashmir.<sup>21</sup>

## A. INVOLVING, TO FACILITATE THEIR WORK, MEETINGS AT PLACES AWAY FROM THE SEAT OF THE ORGANIZATION

### I. Subsidiary organs established

#### CASE I

#### *United Nations Force in Cyprus*

##### *Establishment*

At the 1100th meeting on 2 March 1964, in connexion with the complaint by the Government of Cyprus, the representative of Brazil introduced a draft resolution<sup>22</sup> 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:

"4. *Recommends* the creation, with the consent of the Government of Cyprus, of a United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus. The composition and size of the Force shall be established by the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Governments 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 Secretary-General, who shall keep the Governments providing the Force fully informed, shall report periodically to the Security Council on its operation;

"5. *Recommends* that the function of the Force 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 and restoration of law and order and a return to normal conditions;<sup>23</sup>

<sup>20</sup> S/6061, and Add.1, *O.R.*, 19th year, *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1964*, pp. 70-185.

<sup>21</sup> 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. 348-352.

S/6719 and Add.1-3, *O.R.*, 20th year, *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1965*, pp. 359-361.

<sup>22</sup> S/5571, 1100th meeting; paras. 3-17.

<sup>23</sup> In his report dated 26 March 1964 (S/5593/Add.3, *O.R.*, 19th year, *Suppl. for Jan.-March 1964*, pp. 132-133) on the organization and operation of the Force, the Secretary-General referred to the function of the UNFICYP as follows:

"... the Force in Cyprus is a United Nations Force, 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 one way or another. With co-operation and with a positive attitude from all parties, it is my hope that the United Nations Force may make a large contribution to the restoration

"6. *Recommends* that the stationing of the Force shall be for a period of three months, all costs 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 accept voluntary contributions for that purpose."

At the 1102nd meeting on 4 March 1964 the representative of the USSR requested that a separate vote be taken on operative paragraph 4 on which he intended to abstain.<sup>24</sup>

Prior to the vote, the Secretary-General noting that the draft resolution would call upon him to undertake certain responsibilities, explained that it was his intention in accordance with well established practice concerning previous United Nations peace-keeping forces to "keep the Security Council, which would authorize this establishment, promptly and fully informed about the organization and the operation of the force including its composition, size and command".<sup>25</sup>

Subsequently, operative paragraph 4 was adopted<sup>26</sup> by 8 votes to none against, with 3 abstentions; the draft resolution as a whole was adopted unanimously.

At the 1103rd meeting on 13 March 1964, the Council unanimously adopted<sup>27</sup> a draft resolution jointly sponsored by Bolivia, Brazil, Ivory Coast, Morocco and Norway, under which it reaffirmed its resolution 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 that end.

of law and order and to return to normal conditions in the island of Cyprus."

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 of the Force are to be kept at all times within the framework of those Security Council terms of reference and that no action not entirely consistent with them is to be undertaken."

"The Commander of the Force receives from the Secretary-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 a military force, has been the rule scrupulously followed with regard to all other United Nations peace-keeping operations."

As to the function of the Force, in the same report, the 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 and restoration of law and order and a return to normal conditions."

"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 restoration of quiet and through creating an improved climate in which political solutions may be sought."

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

<sup>25</sup> 1102nd meeting, paras. 20-21.

<sup>26</sup> 1102nd meeting, paras. 27-28.

<sup>27</sup> 1103rd meeting: paras. 95, 156, S/RES/187 (1964), *O.R.*, 19th yr., *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*, p. 4.

At the 1139th meeting on 20 June 1964, the Council adopted<sup>28</sup> a draft resolution reaffirming its resolutions of 4 and 13 March 1964. The Council adopted similar resolutions, reaffirming its previous resolutions, at its 1143rd meeting on 9 August 1964;<sup>29</sup> 1159th meeting on 25 September 1964;<sup>30</sup> 1180th meeting on 18 December 1964;<sup>31</sup> 1193rd meeting on 19 March 1965;<sup>32</sup> 1224th meeting on 15 June 1965;<sup>33</sup> and 1270th meeting on 17 December 1965.<sup>34</sup>

#### *Composition and organization*

At the 1103rd meeting on 13 March 1964, the Secretary-General referred to his report<sup>35</sup> to the Council dated 12 March 1964, and stated<sup>36</sup> that the UNFICYP was in the process of actually being constituted. He had received firm official assurances from three of the Governments which he had approached, namely the Governments of Canada, Ireland and Sweden, to the effect that they would make contingents available. With regard to each of those Governments, certain conditions and prerequisites were defined which had either been met or, in his view, could be coped 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 would soon be deployed in Cyprus. The requisite financial support for the UNFICYP, through voluntary contributions, was also assured.

In his report<sup>37</sup> dated 26 March 1964, the Secretary-General informed the Security Council that the Commander of the UNFICYP would assume command over 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 date and shortly thereafter, the UNFICYP would consist of contingents or parts thereof, made available by the Governments of Canada, the United Kingdom, Finland, Sweden and Ireland.

In his report<sup>38</sup> dated 31 March 1964, the Secretary-General informed the Security Council that by an exchange of letters on the same date between himself and the Foreign Minister of Cyprus, an agreement<sup>39</sup>

<sup>28</sup> 1139th meeting, para. 21.

<sup>29</sup> 1143rd meeting, para. 178.

<sup>30</sup> 1159th meeting, para. 24.

<sup>31</sup> 1180th meeting, para. 176.

<sup>32</sup> 1193rd meeting, para. 153.

<sup>33</sup> 1224th meeting, para. 145.

<sup>34</sup> 1270th meeting, para. 162.

<sup>35</sup> S/5593, *O.R.*, 19th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1964*, pp. 125-131. In this report, the Secretary-General recalled the steps he had taken to establish the UNFICYP immediately after the adoption of the Council resolution of 4 March 1964.

<sup>36</sup> 1103rd meeting: paras. 4-6.

<sup>37</sup> S/5593/Add.3, *O.R.*, 19th yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1964*, pp. 132-133.

<sup>38</sup> 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 UNFICYP. The arrangements which were set out in detail were fully agreed to, and accepted by the Government of Cyprus (annexes I and II).

<sup>39</sup> In the agreement the "United Nations Force in Cyprus" was defined as consisting of the United Nations Commander 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 report<sup>40</sup> 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 report<sup>41</sup> dated 2 May 1964 and 15 June 1964, the Secretary-General informed the Security Council on the composition and operation of the Force.

#### *Area of operation*

In his report dated 31 March 1964 in which the Secretary-General informed the Security Council on the agreement concluded with the Republic of Cyprus concerning the status of the UNFICYP, the "area of operations" of the Force was defined<sup>42</sup> as including "all 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 1964<sup>43</sup> the Secretary-General stated concerning the use of force by UNFICYP:

"The troops of the Force carry arms which, however, 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 1964<sup>44</sup> 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 result in the removal of any post used as a base for fire against troops of UNFICYP, using force if necessary 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 1136th to the 1139th meetings held between 18-29 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-General. For his part, the representative of the USSR recalled that his delegation had consistently opposed any expansion of the functions of the UNFICYP, in-

cluding the use of force to restore order. That would inevitably lead to direct intervention in the internal 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.<sup>45</sup>

In his report dated 10 September 1964, the Secretary-General also referred<sup>46</sup> to certain actions that the Force may take in the discharge of its mandate, and 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, and (c) the need that the opposing armed forces be separated by buffer zones. Those observations of the Secretary-General concerning the actions that the Force might take to improve the position of UNFICYP 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 function of the Force<sup>47</sup> as set out in its original mandate stipulated in the Council resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964.<sup>48</sup>

#### *Duration of the mandate of the Force*

Paragraph 6 of the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964 provided that the stationing of the 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,<sup>49</sup> at the 1159th meeting on 25 September 1964,<sup>50</sup> at the 1180th meeting on 18 December 1964,<sup>51</sup> at the 1193rd meeting on 19 March 1965,<sup>52</sup> at the 1224th meeting on 15 June 1965,<sup>53</sup> and at the 1270th meeting on 17 December 1965,<sup>54</sup> the Security Council extended the mandate of the Force, in five instances for periods of three months, in one instance<sup>55</sup> for a period of six months.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>45</sup> For texts of relevant statements, see: 1136th meeting: Cyprus,\* para. 124; 1137th meeting: Brazil, para. 60; Greece,\* 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.

<sup>46</sup> S/5950, *O.R.*, 19th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1964*, pp. 336, 337.

<sup>47</sup> Their 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.

<sup>48</sup> For texts of relevant statements, see: 1151st meeting: 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, para. 9-10; Czechoslovakia, para. 64; France, paras. 18-19; Ivory Coast, para. 27; Morocco, paras. 38-39; 1156th meeting: Bolivia, paras. 6-7; 1159th meeting: Brazil, paras. 3-8; Ivory Coast, paras. 13-15; Morocco, para. 17; 1180th meeting: USSR, paras. 136-138.

<sup>49</sup> S/RES/192 (1964), *O.R.* 19th yr., *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council 1964*, p. 5.

<sup>50</sup> S/RES/194 (1964), *ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

<sup>51</sup> S/RES/198 (1964), *ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

<sup>52</sup> S/RES/201 (1965).

<sup>53</sup> S/RES/206 (1965).

<sup>54</sup> S/RES/219 (1965).

<sup>55</sup> 1224th meeting, para. 145 S/6440.

<sup>56</sup> By his reports dated 15 June 1964 (S/5764 and Add.1, *O.R.*, 19th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1964*, pp. 211-244), 10 September 1964 (S/5950 and Add.1 and 2, *O.R.*, 19th yr., *Suppl. for July-Sept. 1964*, pp. 280-341), 12 December 1964

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

<sup>41</sup> S/5679, *O.R.*, 19th year, *Suppl. for April-June 1964*, pp. 105-106. S/5764 and Add.1, *O.R.*, 19th year, *Suppl. for April-June 1964*, pp. 211-212. In the latter report dated 15 June 1964, the Secretary-General stated that as of 8 June 1964, the strength of the Force totalled 6,411 men, including 6,238 military and 173 policemen, and was composed of military contingents from Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Sweden and the United Kingdom, and police contingents from Australia, Austria, Denmark, New Zealand and Sweden.

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

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

<sup>44</sup> S/5764 and Add.1, *O.R.*, 19th yr., *Suppl. for April-June 1964*, p. 219, para. 31.

## CASE 2

## United Nations Mediator in Cyprus

## Establishment

At the 1100th meeting on 2 March 1964, in connexion with the Cyprus question, the representative of Brazil introduced a draft resolution<sup>57</sup> jointly sponsored by Bolivia, Brazil, Ivory Coast, Morocco and Norway. Under paragraph 7 of the proposed text, the Security Council would recommend "that the Secretary-General designate, in agreement with the Government of Cyprus and the Governments of Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom a Mediator, who shall use his best endeavours with the representatives of the communities and also with the aforesaid four Governments, for the purpose of promoting a peaceful solution and an agreed settlement of the problem confronting 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 would also provide that the Mediator should report periodically to the Secretary-General on his efforts, and that the expenses to be incurred by the Mediator and his staff would be disbursed by the United Nations.

At the 1102nd meeting on 4 March 1964,<sup>58</sup> the joint draft resolution submitted by Bolivia, Brazil, Ivory Coast, Morocco and Norway was adopted unanimously by the Council.

At the 1103rd meeting on 13 March 1964, the Council adopted<sup>59</sup> a draft resolution jointly sponsored by Bolivia, Brazil, Ivory Coast, Morocco and Norway, under which it reaffirmed its resolution 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".

At the 1139th meeting on 20 June 1964, the Council adopted<sup>60</sup> 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;<sup>61</sup> 1159th meeting on 25 September 1964;<sup>62</sup> 1180th meeting on 18 December 1964;<sup>63</sup> 1193rd meeting on 19 March 1965;<sup>64</sup> 1224th meeting on 15 June 1965;<sup>65</sup> and 1270th meeting on 17 December 1965.<sup>66</sup>

(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/6426, 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 Secretary-General proposed the extension of the mandate of the Force for periods of three months, in two instances (reports dated 10 June 1965 and 17 December 1965) for periods of six months.

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

<sup>58</sup> S/5571, 1102nd meeting: para. 28.

<sup>59</sup> 1103rd meeting: para. 156.

<sup>60</sup> 1139th meeting: para. 21.

<sup>61</sup> 1143rd meeting: para. 178.

<sup>62</sup> 1159th meeting: para. 24.

<sup>63</sup> 1180th meeting: para. 176.

<sup>64</sup> 1193rd meeting: para. 153.

<sup>65</sup> 1224th meeting: para. 145.

<sup>66</sup> 1270th meeting: para. 162.

## Composition and reports

In his report<sup>67</sup> dated 26 March 1964, the Secretary-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 as United Nations Mediator in Cyprus.

In a statement<sup>68</sup> 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 report<sup>69</sup> 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 further stated in the report that after consultations 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 end.

At the 1151st meeting on 16 September 1964, the Secretary-General reported<sup>70</sup> to the Council that the four Governments concerned had agreed to the appointment of Mr. Galo Plaza as United Nations Mediator in Cyprus.

In his report<sup>71</sup> 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 resolution of 4 March 1964.

On 26 March 1965 the Secretary-General submitted to the Council and other parties directly concerned with the Cyprus problem a report<sup>72</sup> by the United Nations Mediator in Cyprus. Observations from the parties concerning that report were communicated to the Secretary-General and subsequently transmitted<sup>73</sup> 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 of reference of the Mediator, the Secretary-General in his report<sup>74</sup> of 10 December 1965 stated that he had informed the representative of Turkey<sup>75</sup> 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

<sup>67</sup> S/5625, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1964, pp. 162-163.

<sup>68</sup> 1144th meeting, para. 2.

<sup>69</sup> S/5950, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1964, p. 330.

<sup>70</sup> 1151st meeting: paras. 5-6.

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

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

<sup>73</sup> S/6267 and Add.1, S/6279 and S/6280, O.R., 20th yr., Suppl. for April-June 1965, pp. 1-5, pp. 13-14, pp. 21-25 and pp. 25-26.

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

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

the fact that under prevailing circumstances the Mediator had been unable to function and that consequently the search for a peaceful solution and an agreed settlement of the Cyprus problem had been at a standstill. Nevertheless, upon his request the Mediator had continued to be available to the parties for further efforts of mediation in accordance with the provisions of the Security Council resolution of 4 March 1964. On 31 December 1965 the Secretary-General transmitted to the Council an exchange of letters<sup>76</sup> 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 report<sup>77</sup> dated 10 March 1966, the Secretary-General stated that his subsequent efforts towards achieving a resumption of the mediation function had up to that date been unavailing, due primarily to the widely differing and firmly held views on the matter of 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 instructions<sup>78</sup> broadening his mandate. As he had informed the Council by his note of 4 March 1966, the broader activity thus envisaged was without prejudice to the mediation function as 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 introduced<sup>79</sup> 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.<sup>80</sup>

##### *Composition*

The President of the Council (Ivory Coast), after consulting the members of the Council, announced

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

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

<sup>78</sup> Under these instructions the Special Representative was authorized to "employ his good offices and make such approaches to the parties in or outside the island" as might seem likely to be productive "in the sense of achieving in the first instance discussions at any level of problems and issues of either a purely local or broader nature". (S/7180).

<sup>79</sup> S/5735, 1125th meeting: paras. 8-26.

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

in a note<sup>81</sup> of 5 June 1964 that he had appointed Brazil, Ivory Coast and Morocco to carry out the mission. Subsequently, the three Governments designated their representatives to serve as Members of the Mission.<sup>82</sup>

##### *Termination*

The Security Council Mission submitted to the Council its report<sup>83</sup> on 27 July 1964. During the period covered by this Supplement the report of the Mission has not been acted upon by the Council. With the submission of its report, the Mission had fulfilled its mandate.

### CASE 4

#### *Representative of the Secretary-General in the Dominican Republic*

##### *Establishment*

At the 1208th meeting on 14 May 1965, in connexion with the situation in the Dominican Republic, the representative of Jordan introduced a draft resolution<sup>84</sup> 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 to co-operate with the Representative of the Secretary-General in the carrying out of his task".

In submitting the proposed text to the Council, the representative of Jordan stated<sup>85</sup> 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.<sup>86</sup>

##### *Composition*

The Secretary-General reported on 15 May to the Council<sup>87</sup> 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 Council<sup>88</sup> that his Representative in the Dominican Republic had arrived in Santo Domingo on 18 May. Reports by the Secretary-General on the situation in the Dominican Republic, based on information communicated by his Representative in that country, continued to be submitted to the Council throughout the duration of the United Nations Mission in the Dominican Republic.<sup>89</sup>

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

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

<sup>83</sup> S/5832, O.R., 19th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept. 1964, pp. 101-112.

<sup>84</sup> S/6355, 1208th meeting: para. 6.

<sup>85</sup> 1208th meeting: paras. 6, 7.

<sup>86</sup> 1208th meeting: para. 8.

<sup>87</sup> S/6358.

<sup>88</sup> 1212th meeting: paras. 78-87.

<sup>89</sup> 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 report<sup>90</sup> of 3 June 1965 to the Council, stated that in the Dominican Republic "the general situation is one of an uneasy truce", and that his Representative "... has been provided only with the staff and facilities necessary for the discharge of the mandate set forth in operative 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, investigators and subsidiary personnel, as well as ancillary 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, suggestions were made by the representative of Jordan<sup>91</sup> for the broadening of the mandate and that the Secretary-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 that meeting by the representatives of Uruguay,<sup>92</sup> France<sup>93</sup> and at the 1222nd meeting on 9 June 1965 by the USSR.<sup>94</sup> At the latter meeting the representative of Malaysia<sup>95</sup> while disagreeing with the broadening 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 concerning these suggestions were made by the representatives of the United States,<sup>96</sup> the United Kingdom<sup>97</sup> and Bolivia.<sup>98</sup>

In his report before the Council<sup>99</sup> on 11 June 1965, the Secretary-General further stated that "the extent of the personnel requirements and other ancillary facilities 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 complaints". This added function of investigation, he observed, would require "specific clarification by this Council".

At the 1227th meeting on 18 June 1965, the President (Netherlands), in summing up the discussion, stated<sup>100</sup> 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 implementation of the cease-fire". He further stated that there was a consensus in the Council to the extent "that the Representative's task of reporting on the im-

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 "a more elaborate mandate of investigation than up to now". There was also a basic agreement in the Council in considering that it was "within the competence of the Secretary-General to 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 1966<sup>101</sup> the Secretary-General stated that in view of the developments in the Dominican Republic he had initiated arrangements for the withdrawal of the United Nations Mission in the Dominican Republic.

## CASE 5

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

At the 1133rd meeting on 16 June 1964, in connexion with the question of race conflict in South Africa, the representative of Norway introduced<sup>102</sup> a draft resolution jointly sponsored by Bolivia and Norway. Under operative paragraph 8 of the proposed text, the Council would "establish an Expert Committee, composed of representatives of each present member of the Security Council, to undertake a technical 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 the Security Council under the United Nations Charter". The Council would further authorize the Expert 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 thereafter".

At the 1135th meeting on 18 June 1964, the joint draft resolution submitted by Bolivia and Norway was adopted by 8 votes in favour, none against and 3 abstentions.<sup>103</sup>

*Composition*

In submitting the joint draft resolution at the 1133rd meeting on 16 June 1964, the representative of Norway explained<sup>104</sup> that the composition of the Expert Committee would include the "present" members of the Council so as to avoid changing its composition when new members of the Council were elected at the end of the year. The members of the expert committee were thus Bolivia, Brazil, China, Czechoslovakia, France,<sup>105</sup> Ivory Coast, Morocco, Norway, USSR, United Kingdom and United States.

<sup>90</sup> S/6408.

<sup>91</sup> 1221st meeting: paras. 27-31.

<sup>92</sup> 1221st meeting: paras. 55-56.

<sup>93</sup> 1221st meeting: para. 62.

<sup>94</sup> 1222nd meeting: paras. 88-91.

<sup>95</sup> 1222nd meeting: paras. 114-116.

<sup>96</sup> 1221st meeting, paras. 106-108.

<sup>97</sup> 1222nd meeting, paras. 8-12.

<sup>98</sup> 1222nd meeting, para. 129.

<sup>99</sup> S/6408, 1223rd meeting, paras. 5, 6.

<sup>100</sup> 1227th meeting, paras. 16-25.

<sup>101</sup> S/7552.

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

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

<sup>104</sup> 1133rd meeting: para. 10.

<sup>105</sup> France did not participate in the meetings of the Committee.

### Termination

The Expert Committee submitted to the Council its report<sup>106</sup> on 27 February 1965. During the period covered by this *Supplement* the report of the Expert Committee has not been acted upon by the Council. With the submission of its report, the Committee has fulfilled its mandate.

## CASE 6

### United Nations India-Pakistan Observation Mission

#### Establishment

At the 1242nd meeting on 20 September 1965, in connexion with the India-Pakistan question, the representative of the Netherlands introduced<sup>106a</sup> 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 report<sup>107</sup> 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 report<sup>108</sup> 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)". Nevertheless, the operations of UNIPOM and UNMOGIP would be closely co-ordinated both administratively and operationally.<sup>109</sup>

#### Composition

In his report<sup>110</sup> 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 Pakistan sides of the front on that day had been dispatched. In addition, a party of fifteen military observers from the

United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine (UNTSO) was then en route to the area and was expected to arrive on the next day. Pending the appointment of a senior officer in charge of UNIPOM, the Chief Officer had been asked to direct both operations. The report further stated that the Secretary-General had made urgent requests to a number of Governments to provide military observers for UNIPOM and had in general received a positive response.<sup>111</sup> The report also stated that the necessary co-operation and assistance had been requested and were forthcoming both from the Indian and Pakistan armies, to enable the observers to carry out their functions.

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,<sup>112</sup> 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 continuation of UNIPOM for a second three-month period would be necessary.

#### Termination

In a report dated 30 December 1965,<sup>113</sup> 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 unilateral cessation of firing by all formations effective 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 reported<sup>114</sup> to the Council that an agreement had been reached between the parties on a plan for disengagement and withdrawal of their troops and on the ground rules for implementation of the plan; the withdrawal to be completed by 25 February 1966.<sup>115</sup>

<sup>106</sup> S/6210 and Add.1, O.R., 20th yr., *Special Supplement No. 2*.

<sup>106a</sup> 1242nd meeting, para. 44; S/6694.

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

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

<sup>109</sup> At the 1247th and 1251st meetings on 25 October and 5 November 1965 respectively, the representative of the USSR 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.

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

<sup>111</sup> "Specific agreement urgently to provide observers has been received so far from the Governments of Brazil, Canada, Ethiopia, Ireland, Nigeria" and "arrangements are now in hand to get these observers to the subcontinent with the shortest possible delay".

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

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

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

<sup>115</sup> 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<sup>116</sup> that the withdrawal of troops by India and Pakistan had been completed on schedule on 25 February, and that the withdrawal provisions of the Council's resolution had thus been fulfilled by the two parties.

#### 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 connexion with the India-Pakistan question, the Council adopted a draft resolution<sup>117</sup> jointly sponsored by 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<sup>118</sup> the Council that after consultations with both parties he had appointed a personal representative<sup>119</sup> who was to meet with the representatives of India and Pakistan for the purpose of formulating an agreed plan and schedule for the withdrawal, as envisaged in Security Council resolution 215 (1965) of 5 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 report<sup>120</sup> dated 15 December 1965, the Secretary-General informed the Council that whereas the

<sup>116</sup> S/6719/Add.6, *ibid.*; also S/6699/Add.12, *O.R.*, 21st yr., *Suppl. for Jan.-Mar. 1966*.

<sup>117</sup> S/RES/215 (1965).

<sup>118</sup> S/6719/Add.4, *O.R.*, 20th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1965*, pp. 131-132.

<sup>119</sup> Brigadier General Tulio Marambio of Chile.

<sup>120</sup> S/6699/Add.11, *O.R.*, 20th yr., *Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1965*, pp. 131-132.

first three-month period of the cease-fire demanded by the Security Council on 20 September would have elapsed on 22 December, the situation remained such as to necessitate the continuance of United Nations activities relating to the cease-fire and withdrawal provisions of the Security Council resolutions. In that connexion he expressed his intention to prolong the mission of his personal representative.

On 17 February 1966, the Secretary-General reported<sup>121</sup> 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 between the parties on a plan for disengagement and 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 reported<sup>122</sup> 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-General's representative would come to an end on 28 February and his mission would be terminated on that date. On 26 February 1966, the Secretary-General reported<sup>123</sup> to the Council that the withdrawal 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 OF THE ORGANIZATION**

<sup>121</sup> S/6719/Add.5.

<sup>122</sup> S/6699/Add.12.

<sup>123</sup> S/6719/Add.6.

## Part II

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