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TEXT OF ARTICLE 27

(prior to 31 August 1965)

1. Each member of the Security Council shall have one vote.
2. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members.
3. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.

(from 31 August 1965)

1. Each member of the Security Council shall have one vote.
2. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members.
3. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

1. By resolution 1991 A (XVIII) of 17 December 1963 the General Assembly adopted amendments to Articles 23 and 27 of the Charter which enlarged the membership of the Security Council from eleven to fifteen and changed the required majority for its decisions from seven to nine. Those amendments entered into force on 31 August 1965. In order to give effect to those amendments, elections were held during the twentieth session of the General Assembly and, in accordance with rule 140 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the terms of office of members elected to the Security Council began on 1 January 1966. The material in this Supplement, concerning the relevant voting practice after the actual enlargement of the membership in the Council, that is to say, after 1 January 1966, has been treated along the lines established in earlier volumes since the change in the required majority for the adoption of decisions of the Security Council did not affect the organization of the material under Article 27.

2. This study deals with the voting practice of the Security Council under Article 27. It is not concerned with voting practice extraneous to that Article, such as the election of judges of the International Court of Justice, in pursuance of Article 10 of the Court's Statute. Certain problems of procedure related to voting are treated under Article 30.

3. The General Survey provides a summary statement on recourse by the Council to voting in accordance with the provisions of Article 27.

4. The material included in the Analytical Summary of Practice affords evidence concerning the distinction between "procedural matters" and "all other matters" under Article 27, as well as evidence bearing on the procedure of the Council in deciding the preliminary question whether a matter was procedural within the meaning of Article 27. This evidence consists of discussion and certain decisions in the Council. The Analytical Summary of Practice also deals with the practice of the Council concerning the concurrence of the votes of the permanent members, required under Article 27 (3) for an affirmative decision of the Council on non-procedural matters.

5. Three annexes are appended; annex I lists cases in which the vote indicated the procedural character of the matter; annex II, cases in which the vote indicated the non-procedural character of the matter; annex III, certain cases in which permanent members abstained otherwise than in accordance with the proviso of Article 27 (3). The text of the San Francisco statement has been given in the Repertory.

---


I. GENERAL SURVEY

6. During the period under review, as has been the case in earlier periods, there were rather frequent recourses to methods of reaching a decision other than by voting. On occasion, the President has recorded a decision as taken in the absence of objection, or, at other times, a presidential statement, expressing the consensus of the members of the Council, has indicated the actions to be taken. Between 1 September 1959 and 31 August 1966, the Council took approximately three hundred and twenty decisions, of which two hundred and twenty affirmative or negative decisions were taken by vote.3

7. At the 41st meeting on 16 May 1946 the Council adopted rule 40 of its provisional rules of procedure:

8. The voting in the Council has been by show of hands, the President asking for those in favour, those against and those abstaining. In the record of votes, members have also been identified as not taking part or as not participating in the voting.4 In elections, voting was conducted by secret ballot.

9. As in the Repertory and its Supplements Nos. 1 and 2,5 the present section deals with those decisions of the Security Council which afford evidence on matters deemed procedural and on those deemed non-procedural. In analysing the record of voting the following criteria have been applied:

(a) Whether the decision was procedural is deemed to have been established in those instances where a proposal obtained seven (prior to 1 January 1966) or nine (from 1 January 1966) or more votes, with one or more permanent members casting a negative vote. Adoption by the Council in such circumstances indicates the procedural character of the decision; rejection by the Council in such circumstances indicates the non-procedural character of the decision.

(b) Whether the decision was procedural is established where there has been an express decision by vote of the Council that a matter is procedural or non-procedural.

10. The majority of occasions on which the Security Council has voted affords no indication as to whether it regarded the character of the matter voted upon as procedural or non-procedural. There is no way to determine the nature of the matter when decisions of the Council are reached by a unanimous vote, or when the required majority of votes are obtained which included the affirmative votes of all permanent members or when a proposal failed to obtain the required majority. On one occasion, the official record did not indicate the identity or the number of the members voting for or against two motions,

II. ANALYTICAL SUMMARY OF PRACTICE

A. The question of the distinction between "procedural matters" and "all other matters"6

9. Whether the decision was procedural is deemed to have been established in those instances where a proposal obtained seven (prior to 1 January 1966) or nine (from 1 January 1966) or more votes, with one or more permanent members casting a negative vote. Adoption by the Council in such circumstances indicates the procedural character of the decision; rejection by the Council in such circumstances indicates the non-procedural character of the decision.

(b) Whether the decision was procedural is established where there has been an express decision by vote of the Council that a matter is procedural or non-procedural.

10. The majority of occasions on which the Security Council has voted affords no indication as to whether it regarded the character of the matter voted upon as procedural or non-procedural. There is no way to determine the nature of the matter when decisions of the Council are reached by a unanimous vote, or when the required majority of votes are obtained which included the affirmative votes of all permanent members or when a proposal failed to obtain the required majority. On one occasion, the official record did not indicate the identity or the number of the members voting for or against two motions,
1. Establishment of subsidiary organs for the elucidation of fact

Decision of 7 September 1959 in connexion with the report by the Secretary-General relating to Laos

13. The question whether decisions relating to the establishment of subsidiary organs for the elucidation of fact were subject to procedural or non-procedural vote was considered by the Council at its 847th and 848th meetings, on 7 September 1959, when a draft resolution was submitted under which a sub-committee would be established “to examine the statements made before the Security Council concerning Laos, to receive further statements and documents and to conduct such inquiries as it may determine necessary, and to report to the Council as soon as possible.”

14. The procedural nature of the draft resolution was claimed on the ground that the establishment of the proposed sub-committee fell under Article 29 of the Charter. It was also stated that the procedural character of the decision was evidenced by the fact that it would affect only members of the Council (“a sub-committee of itself”) and would provide them with appropriate means for further deliberations. The contrary view was that the decision was a substantive one, bearing on questions of peace and security, and should be taken with full consideration of all its possible political consequences.

15. The exponents of both points of views based their arguments on the San Francisco statement on voting procedure. Paragraph 2 of part I of the statement was cited to the effect that the procedural vote was envisaged in connexion with the establishment by the Council of such bodies or agencies as it might deem necessary for the performance of its functions. The argument for the non-procedural vote was based on paragraph 4 of the San Francisco statement under which the decision to make an investigation was to be taken by a vote which is subject to the rule of unanimity of the permanent members.

Decision

At the 848th meeting on 7 September 1959, after a vote and a ruling by the President on the preliminary question whether the vote on the draft resolution should be considered a procedural one, the draft resolution was adopted by 10 votes in favour and 1 against. The dissenting permanent member commented:

16 For texts of relevant statements, see S C, 14th yr., 847th mtg.: Argentina, paras. 101 and 102; United States, paras. 60 and 61; 848th mtg.: France, paras. 90—93; Panama, paras. 37 and 38; USSR, paras. 30, 52—70, 95—98, 114—123, 133—139 and 156—161; United Kingdom, paras. 104 and 113; United States, paras. 144—155.
17 See para. 18 below.
18 S C, 14th yr., 848th mtg., paras. 131 and 132. The draft resolution was adopted as S C resolution 132 (1959). tested the adoption and argued that the resolution was illegal.

2. Convocation of an emergency special session of the General Assembly

Decision of 17 September 1960 in connexion with the situation in the Congo

16. At the 906th meeting on 17 September 1960, in connexion with the situation in the Congo, after the Security Council failed to adopt a draft resolution submitted by Ceylon and Tunisia, the representative of the United States submitted a draft resolution, under which an emergency special session of the General Assembly would be called as provided in General Assembly resolution 377 A (V) of 3 November 1950. It was specified in the preamble that the lack of unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council at its 906th meeting had prevented the Council from exercising its primary responsibility for international peace and security. A permanent member challenged the procedural character of the vote, taken under General Assembly resolution 377 A (V), since, in his view, the United Nations Charter required unanimity of the permanent members in the Security Council in the matter of convening emergency sessions.

Decision

At the 906th meeting, on 17 September 1960, the draft resolution was adopted by 8 votes to 2, with 1 abstention, one of the dissenting votes was that of a permanent member.

B. The question of procedure in deciding the preliminary question: whether a matter is procedural within the meaning of Article 27

17. The question whether a draft resolution under consideration was procedural or non-procedural was implicitly or explicitly dealt with by the President in his announcements of the results of the vote. On various occasions, it was debated by the members of the Council before or after the vote. In one case, the preliminary question whether a matter was procedural within the meaning of Article 27 was put to the vote before taking the vote on the substantive proposal. The procedural or non-procedural character of the vote on the preliminary question was also the subject of discussion in the Council.

19 Ibid., paras. 133—139.
23 For texts of relevant statements, see S C, 15th yr., 906th mtg.: Poland, paras. 188 and 189; USSR, paras. 195 and 196; United States, paras. 172 and 173.
24 Ibid., para. 198. The draft resolution was adopted as S C resolution 157 (1960).
**Decision of 7 September 1959 in connexion with the report by the Secretary-General relating to Laos**

18. At the 848th meeting, on 7 September 1959, the representative of the USSR requested that a vote be taken on the question whether the vote on the draft resolution\(^{26}\) was to be considered a procedural one. The President (Italy) put that preliminary question to the vote. There were 10 votes in favour and 1 against (that of a permanent member). The President ruled that in accordance with the Charter and the provisional rules of procedure that draft resolution should be considered procedural. A permanent member protested against the ruling on the ground that it was at variance with the Charter, with the practice of the Council and with the San Francisco statement which, he said, specifically covered that situation. Three permanent members supported the ruling of the President since, in their view, it was in accordance with the Charter and the provisional rules of procedure and the San Francisco statement provided for a different set of circumstances.\(^{28}\) No vote on the ruling was requested.

**C. The question of the fulfilment of the requirement of Article 27 (3) regarding “the concurring votes of the permanent members”**


19. During the period under review, the Council adopted some forty-three decisions on non-procedural matters by a vote in which one or more of the permanent members voluntarily abstained. That such an abstention did not preclude the fulfilment of the requirement of Article 27 (3) concerning affirmative decisions by the Council was asserted in presidential statements announcing the results of the voting and, in certain cases, in statements by permanent members.\(^{27}\) A list of certain instances in which the permanent members thus abstained is provided in annex III.

20. **The question whether the absence of a permanent member precludes fulfilment of the requirement of Article 27 (3) concerning “the concurring votes of the permanent members”**

**D. The question of the application of the proviso of Article 27 (3) regarding abstention from voting by a party to a dispute**

21. The Council had before it a draft resolution submitted by Argentina,\(^{29}\) incorporating two amendments\(^{30}\) submitted by a permanent member of the Council and accepted by the original sponsor under the terms of which the Council would declare that acts such as the transfer of Adolf Eichmann from Argentina to the territory of Israel affected the sovereignty of a Member State and might, if repeated, endanger international peace and security. Before the vote was taken the representative of Argentina stated, referring to Article 27 (3), of the Charter, that he would not take part in the vote.\(^{31}\)

**Decision of 23 June 1960 in connexion with the complaint by Argentina (Eichmann Case)**

21. The Council had before it a draft resolution submitted by Argentina,\(^{29}\) incorporating two amendments\(^{30}\) submitted by a permanent member of the Council and accepted by the original sponsor under the terms of which the Council would declare that acts such as the transfer of Adolf Eichmann from Argentina to the territory of Israel affected the sovereignty of a Member State and might, if repeated, endanger international peace and security. Before the vote was taken the representative of Argentina stated, referring to Article 27 (3), of the Charter, that he would not take part in the vote.\(^{31}\)

**Decision**

At the 868th meeting the draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 2 abstentions. The representative of Argentina was recorded as present and not voting.\(^{32}\)

---

\(^{26}\) See para. 13 above.

\(^{28}\) For texts of relevant statements, see S C, 14th yr., 848th mtg., President (Italy), paras. 74, 76, 78, 79, 125 and 130; France, paras. 92 and 93; USSR, paras. 72, 73, 80–89, 96 and 97; United Kingdom, paras. 94 and 103–113; United States, paras. 142, 146 and 155.

\(^{27}\) In communications addressed to the Secretary-General, Portugal (S C, 21st yr., Suppl. for April–July, S/7271) and South Africa (S C, 21st yr., Suppl. for July–Sept., S/7392) expressed reservations as to the validity of Security Council resolution 221 (1966) on the question of Southern Rhodesia, which was adopted with two permanent members abstaining from the vote. Portugal contended, in essence, that the doctrine that an abstention of a permanent member did not amount to a veto, (which doctrine it considered to be contrary to the Charter) had been admitted in the past when the Security Council consisted of eleven members and only with regard to decisions not involving Chapter VII of the Charter. Furthermore, since the Security Council had now been enlarged to include fifteen members, joint abstentions by the five permanent members alone would not prevent a decision from being adopted, as had been the case in the past. In view of the fact that the adoption of Security Council resolution 221 (1966) was the first occasion, after the Council membership had been enlarged, on which a decision involving Chapter VII had been taken with the abstentions of permanent members, the problem raised by such abstentions required urgent examination. The Secretary-General in his reply to the Government of Portugal (S C, 21st yr., Suppl. for April–June, S/7373) indicated, inter alia, that only the Security Council was in a position to give an authoritative interpretation of the constitutional question raised by Portugal in relation to Security Council resolution 221 (1966). He felt that it was his responsibility, however, to inform the Government of Portugal that a detailed study prepared for his information by the Office of Legal Affairs did not, in its conclusions, support the reservations advanced by the Government of Portugal.

\(^{28}\) S C, 15th yr., 868th mtg., paras. 51 and 52.

\(^{29}\) S C, 15th yr., 865th mtg., para. 47 (S/4345).

\(^{30}\) S C, 15th yr., 865th mtg., paras. 78 and 79 (S/4346).

\(^{31}\) For text of relevant statement, see S C, 15th yr., 868th mtg.: Argentina, para. 51.

\(^{32}\) S C, 15th yr., 868th mtg., para. 52. The draft resolution (S/4349), as amended, was adopted as S C resolution 138 (1960).
ANNEX I

Cases in which the vote indicated the procedural character of the matter

Decision arranged in chronological order (with indication as to the nature of the question involved)

Decision of 7 September 1959:
Inclusion in the agenda: Report by the Secretary-General relating to Laos

Decision of 7 September 1959:
USSR's request that a vote be taken on whether a vote on the draft resolution relating to Laos was to be considered procedural

Decision of 7 September 1959:
France, United Kingdom and United States draft resolution to appoint a sub-committee

Decision of 12 September 1960:
United States proposal to adjourn the meeting

Decision of 17 September 1960:
Situation in the Congo: United States draft resolution to call for an emergency special session of the General Assembly (S C, 15th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept., S/4526. Same text as S C resolution 157 (1960)).

Decision of 3/4 December 1960:
Inclusion in the agenda: United States proposal to include an item relating to the question of the admission of Mauritania

Decision of 10 December 1960:
President's and United States proposals to adjourn the meeting

Decision of 17 February 1961:
China's proposal to adjourn the meeting

Decision of 26 September 1961:
Inclusion in the agenda: President's proposal to include and renumber an item relating to the question of the admission of Mauritania

Decision of 24 November 1961:
United States proposal to suspend the meeting

Decision of 18 December 1961:
Inclusion in the agenda: Letter dated 18 December 1961 from the representative of Portugal to the President of the Security Council concerning Goa

Decision of 18 December 1961:
United States proposal concerning the time for holding the next meeting

Decision of 30 January 1962:
United States proposal to adjourn the meeting

Decision of 19 May 1964:
United States proposal to invite the Republic of Viet-Nam to participate

Decision of 9 August 1964:
USSR proposal to overrule the President's ruling on voting

Decision of 9 December 1964:
Inclusion in the agenda: Letter dated 1 December 1964 from the representatives of twenty-two Member States and letter dated 9 December 1964 from the Democratic Republic of the Congo addressed to the President of the Security Council concerning the situation in the Congo. Vote on whether to include latter item.

Decision of 25 October 1965:
United States proposal for a recess of the Security Council

Decision of 2 February 1966:
Inclusion in the agenda: Letter dated 31 January 1966 from the representative of the United States addressed to the President of the Security Council concerning the situation in Viet-Nam

ANNEX II

Cases in which the vote indicated the non-procedural character of the matter

Draft resolutions et cetera arranged under agenda items (with document reference for text)

Complaint by the USSR (RB-47 incident)

Draft resolution submitted by the United States and amended orally by Ecuador (S C, 15th yr., 881st mtg., para. 29; 883rd mtg., paras. 96 and 142; S C, 15th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept., S/4409/Rev. 1)

Draft resolution submitted by Italy (S C, 15th yr., 882nd mtg., para. 42)

Draft resolution submitted by the United States and amended orally by Ecuador (S C, 15th yr., 883rd mtg., para. 188)

Draft resolution submitted by Italy (S C, 15th yr., 883rd mtg., para. 189)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft resolutions et cetera arranged under agenda items (with document reference for text)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Document reference for vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situation in the Congo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admission of new Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situation in the Congo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft resolution submitted by Argentina, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States (S C, 15th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec., S/4578/Rev. 1)</td>
<td>14 December 1960</td>
<td>S C, 15th yr., 920th mtg., para. 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States amendments to draft resolution submitted by Ceylon, Liberia and the United Arab Republic (S C, 16th yr., 942nd mtg., para. 97)</td>
<td>21 February 1961</td>
<td>S C, 16th yr., 942nd mtg., para. 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States oral amendment to draft resolution submitted by Ceylon, Liberia and the United Arab Republic (S C, 16th yr., 942nd mtg., para. 169)</td>
<td>21 February 1961</td>
<td>S C, 16th yr., 942nd mtg., para. 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complaint by Kuwait</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom (S C, 16th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept., S/4855)</td>
<td>7 July 1961</td>
<td>S C, 16th yr., 960th mtg., para. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situation in the Congo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth United States amendment to draft resolution submitted by Ceylon, Liberia and the United Arab Republic (S C, 16th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec., S/4989/Rev. 2, amendment to draft resolution S/4985/Rev. 1)</td>
<td>24 November 1961</td>
<td>S C, 16th yr., 982nd mtg., para. 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admission of new Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kuwait) Draft resolution submitted by the United Arab Republic (S C, 16th yr., 984th mtg., para. 20)</td>
<td>30 November 1961</td>
<td>S C, 16th yr., 985th mtg., para. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question of Goa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft resolution submitted by France, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States (S C, 16th yr., 988th mtg., para. 97)</td>
<td>18 December 1961</td>
<td>S C, 16th yr., 988th mtg., para. 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>India-Pakistan question</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft resolution submitted by Ireland (S C, 17th yr., Suppl. for April-June, S/5134)</td>
<td>22 June 1962</td>
<td>S C, 17th yr., 1016th mtg., para. 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palestine question</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom and the United States (S C, 18th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept., S/5407)</td>
<td>3 September 1962</td>
<td>S C, 18th yr., 1063rd mtg., para. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question of Southern Rhodesia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft resolution submitted by Ghana, Morocco and the Philippines (S C, 18th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept., S/5425/Rev. 1)</td>
<td>13 September 1963</td>
<td>S C, 18th yr., 1069th mtg., para. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complaint by Malaysia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft resolution submitted by Norway (S C, 19th yr., 1150th mtg., para. 72, S/5973)</td>
<td>15 September 1964</td>
<td>S C, 19th yr., 1152nd mtg., para. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palestine question</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNEX III**

Certain cases in which permanent members abstained otherwise than in accordance with the proviso of Article 27 (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions arranged under agenda items (with document reference for text)</th>
<th>Document reference for vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question of race conflict in South Africa</strong></td>
<td>S C, 15th yr., 856th mtg., para. 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision of 1 April 1960 (856th meeting):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft resolution submitted by Ecuador (S C, 15th yr., Suppl. for April-June, S/4300. Same text as S C resolution 134 (1960))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complaint by the USSR (U-2 incident)</strong></td>
<td>S C, 15th yr., 863rd mtg., para. 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision of 27 May 1960 (863rd meeting):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft resolution submitted by Argentina, Ceylon, Ecuador and Tunisia (S C, 15th yr., Suppl. for April-June, S/4328. Same text as S C resolution 135 (1960))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decisions arranged under agenda items (with document reference for text)

**Situation in the Congo**

Decision of 14 July 1960 (873rd meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Tunisia (S C, 15th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept., S/4387. Same text as S C resolution 143 (1960))

Decision of 9 August 1960 (886th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Ceylon and Tunisia (S C, 15th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept., S/4426. Same text as S C resolution 146 (1960))

Decision of 17 September 1960 (906th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Ceylon and Tunisia (S C, 15th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept., S/4523)

Decision of 17 September 1960 (906th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by the United States (S C, 15th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept., S/4526. Same text as S C resolution 157 (1960))

Decision of 21 February 1961 (942nd meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Ceylon, Liberia and United Arab Republic (S C, 16th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March, S/4741. Same text as S C resolution 161 (1961))

**Palestine question**

Decision of 11 April 1961 (949th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Ceylon and United Arab Republic as amended (S C, 16th yr., 948th mtg., para. 20, Suppl. for April-June, S/4788. Same text as S C resolution 162 (1961))

Decision of 9 June 1961 (956th meeting):
Amendments submitted by Chile to the draft resolution submitted by Ceylon, Liberia and United Arab Republic (S C, 16th yr., 955th mtg., paras. 66 and 68, amendments S/4833/Rev. 1 to draft resolution S/4828)

**Question of Angola**

Decision of 9 June 1961 (956th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Ceylon, Liberia and United Arab Republic (S C, 16th yr., Suppl. for April-June, S/4835. Same text as S C resolution 163 (1961))

**Admission of new Members**

(Mongolia) Decision of 25 October 1961 (971st meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by USSR (S C, 16th yr., 971st mtg., para. 15, S C, 16th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec., S/4966. Same text as S C resolution 166 (1961))

(Mauritania) Decision of 25 October 1961 (971st meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by France and Liberia (S C, 16th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec., S/4969. Same text as S C resolution 167 (1961))

**Situation in the Congo**

Decisions of 24 November 1961 (982nd meeting):
(i) First amendment submitted by United States to revise the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution submitted by Ceylon, Liberia and United Arab Republic (S C, 16th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec., amendment S/4989/Rev. 2 to draft resolution S/4985/Rev. 1)

(ii) Second amendment submitted by United States to add first new preambular paragraph to the draft resolution submitted by Ceylon, Liberia and United Arab Republic (S C, 16th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec., amendment S/4989/Rev. 2 to drop resolution S/4985/Rev. 1)

(iii) Second amendment submitted by United States to add second new preambular paragraph to the draft resolution submitted by Ceylon, Liberia and United Arab Republic (S C, 16th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec., amendment S/4989/Rev. 2 to draft resolution S/4985/Rev. 1)

(iv) Third amendment submitted by United States to revise operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution submitted by Ceylon, Liberia and United Arab Republic (S C, 16th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec., amendment S/4989/Rev. 2 to draft resolution S/4985/Rev. 1)

(v) Fourth amendment submitted by United States to revise operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution submitted by Ceylon, Liberia and United Arab Republic (S C, 16th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec., amendment S/4989/Rev. 2 to draft resolution S/4985/Rev. 1)


**Palestine question**

Decision of 9 April 1962 (1006th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by United Kingdom and United States (S C, 17th yr., Suppl. for April-June, S/5111. Same text as S C resolution 171 (1962))

Document reference for vote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>S C, 15th yr., 873rd mtg., para. 232</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S C, 15th yr., 886th mtg., para. 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S C, 15th yr., 906th mtg., para. 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S C, 15th yr., 906th mtg., para. 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S C, 16th yr., 942nd mtg., para. 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S C, 16th yr., 949th mtg., para. 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S C, 16th yr., 956th mtg., para. 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S C, 16th yr., 956th mtg., para. 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S C, 16th yr., 971st mtg., para. 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S C, 16th yr., 971st mtg., para. 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S C, 16th yr., 982nd mtg., para. 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S C, 16th yr., 982nd mtg., para. 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S C, 16th yr., 982nd mtg., para. 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S C, 16th yr., 982nd mtg., para. 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S C, 16th yr., 982nd mtg., para. 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S C, 16th yr., 982nd mtg., para. 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S C, 17th yr., 1006th mtg., para. 106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter V. The Security Council

Decisions arranged under agenda items (with document reference for text)

Admission of new Members

(Algeria) Decision of 4 October 1962 (1020th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Chile, France, Ghana, Ireland, Romania, USSR, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom, United States and Venezuela (S C, 17th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec., S/5174. Same text as S C resolution 176 (1962))

Reports of the Secretary-General concerning Yemen

Decision of 11 June 1963 (1039th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Ghana and Morocco (S C, 18th yr., 1038th mtg., para. 27), S/5331. Same text as S C resolution 179 (1963)

Situation in Territories in Africa under Portuguese administration

Decision of 31 July 1963 (1049th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Ghana, Morocco and Philippines (S C, 18th yr., 1044th mtg., para. 4, S/5372, with amendments proposed by Venezuela at 1048th mtg., para. 21 in S/5379. Amended text S/5380 same as S C resolution 180 (1963)

Question of race conflict in South Africa

Decision of 7 August 1963 (1056th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Ghana, Morocco and Philippines (S C, 18th yr., 1054th meeting, para. 62, S/5386. Same text as S C resolution 181 (1963))

Situation in Territories in Africa under Portuguese administration

Decision of 11 December 1963 (1083rd meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Ghana, Morocco and Philippines (vote on operative paragraph 3) (S C, 18th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec., S/5481. Same text as S C resolution 183 (1963))

Decision of 11 December 1963 (1083rd meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Ghana, Morocco and Philippines (vote on draft resolution as a whole) (S C, 18th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec., S/5481. Same text as S C resolution 183 (1963))

The Cyprus question

Decision of 4 March 1964 (1102nd meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Bolivia, Brazil, Ivory Coast, Morocco and Norway (vote on operative paragraph 4) (S C, 19th yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March, S/5575. Same text as S C resolution 186 (1964))

Complaint by Yemen

Decision of 9 April 1964 (1111th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Ivory Coast and Morocco (S C, 19th yr., Suppl. for April-June, S/5650. Same text as S C resolution 188 (1964))

Complaint by Cambodia

Decision of 4 June 1964 (1126th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Ivory Coast and Morocco (vote on operative paragraph 5) (S C, 19th yr., Suppl. for Apr.-June, S/5741. Same text as S C resolution 189 (1964))

The question of race conflict in South Africa

Decision of 9 June 1964 (1128th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Ivory Coast and Morocco (S C, 19th yr., Suppl. for Apr.-June, S/5761. Same text as S C resolution 190 (1964))

The Cyprus question

Decision of 9 August 1964 (1143rd meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by United Kingdom and United States (S C, 19th yr., Suppl. for July-Sept., S/5668. Same text as S C resolution 193 (1964))

Palestine question

Decisions of 21 December 1964 (1182nd meeting):
(i) Third amendment submitted by Morocco to draft resolution submitted by United Kingdom and United States (S C, 19th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec., amendment S/6116 to draft resolution S/6113)
(ii) Fifth amendment submitted by Morocco to draft resolution submitted by United Kingdom and United States (S C, 19th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec., amendment S/6116 to draft resolution S/6113)

Questions concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Decision of 30 December 1964 (1189th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Ivory Coast and Morocco as amended (S C, 19th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec., S/6129. Same text as S C resolution 199 (1964))

Situation in Southern Rhodesia

Decision of 6 May 1965 (1202nd meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Ivory Coast, Jordan and Malaysia (S/6329/Rev. 1. Same text as S C resolution 202 (1965))
Article 27

Decisions arranged under agenda items (with document reference for text)

Situation in the Dominican Republic
Decision of 22 May 1965 (1217th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by France (S C, 20th yr., 1216th mtg., para. 123, S/6376. Same text as S C resolution 205 (1965))

India-Pakistan question
Decision of 5 November 1965 (1251st meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Bolivia, Ivory Coast, Malaysia, Netherlands and Uruguay (S/6876. Same text as S C resolution 215 (1965))

Situation in Southern Rhodesia
Decision of 12 November 1965 (1258th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Jordan as amended (S C, 20th yr., 1258th mtg., para. 24, S/6921/Rev. 1. Same text as S C resolution 216 (1965))

Decision of 20 November 1965 (1265th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Bolivia and Uruguay (S C, 20th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Nov. and Dec., S/6955. Same text as S C resolution 217 (1965))

Situation in Territories in Africa under Portuguese administration
Decisions of 23 November 1965 (1268th meeting):
(i) First amendment submitted by Uruguay to draft resolution submitted by Ivory Coast, Jordan, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Sierra Leone and Tunisia (S C, 20th yr., 1268th mtg., para. 3, amendment S/6965 to draft resolution S/6953/Rev. 1)
(ii) Second amendment submitted by Uruguay to draft resolution submitted by Ivory Coast, Jordan, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Sierra Leone and Tunisia,
(S C, 20th yr., 1268th mtg., para. 4, amendment S/6965 to draft resolution S/6953/Rev. 1)

Decision of 23 November 1965 (1268th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by Ivory Coast, Jordan, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Sierra Leone and Tunisia as amended (S C, 20th yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec., S/6953/Rev. 1. Same text as S C resolution 218 (1965))

Situation in Southern Rhodesia
Decision of 9 April 1966 (1277th meeting):
Draft resolution submitted by United Kingdom (S/7236/Rev. 1. Same text as S C resolution 221 (1966))

Document reference for vote

S C, 20th yr., 1217th mtg., para. 46
S C, 20th yr., 1251st mtg., para. 80
S C, 20th yr., 1258th mtg., para. 29
S C, 20th yr., 1265th mtg., para. 4
S C, 20th yr., 1268th mtg., para. 15
S C, 20th yr., 1268th mtg., para. 16
S C, 20th yr., 1268th mtg., para. 30
S C, 21st yr., 1277th mtg., para. 179.