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TEXT OF ARTICLE 35

1. Any Member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in Article 34, to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly.

2. A state which is not a Member of the United Nations may bring to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly any dispute to which it is a party if it accepts in advance, for the purposes of the dispute, the obligations of pacific settlement provided in the present Charter.

3. The proceedings of the General Assembly in respect of matters brought to its attention under this Article will be subject to the provisions of Articles 11 and 12.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

1. The General Survey contains a summary of the basic data relating to the initial communications by which disputes and situations were submitted to the Security Council during the period under review. The tabulation which is annexed includes all the new questions thus submitted to the Council.

2. As in the previous studies in the Repertory and its Supplements Nos. 1 and 2, the Analytical Summary of Practice does not cover the procedure adopted by the General Assembly in relation to questions submitted under Article 35, since this procedure is followed in all questions submitted to the Assembly.

3. The authority granted the Interim Committee of the General Assembly to consider and report on any dispute or situation submitted to the General Assembly under Article 35 was not utilized during the period covered by this Supplement.

I. GENERAL SURVEY

4. During the period under review, the Security Council placed on its agenda thirty-six questions submitted by Member States for consideration under its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. In eleven of those cases, Article 35 was specifically cited in the letters of submission.

5. Article 35 was not mentioned by any State in letters submitting a question to the General Assembly, but was cited in the course of the debates in the Assembly. These references are not covered in this study, except those which were made in connexion with the question entitled "Comprehensive review of the whole question of the peace-keeping operations in all their aspects". These are dealt with in paragraphs 30 to 32 of the Analytical Summary of Practice under the heading "The question of the competence of the General Assembly arising from Article 35".

6. On two occasions, after a request for the convening of a meeting of the Security Council had been submitted, it was subsequently requested that the calling of the meeting be postponed.

7. On one occasion, when the item had first been submitted without reference to Article 35 (1), that Article was later invoked in the letters submitting two sub-items relating to the same question.

8. One question was submitted to the Security Council by a non-member State under the provisions of Article 35 (2).

9. In addition to the questions referred to above, the Security Council considered the sub-items of composite agenda items already under its consideration. In those instances none of the letters of submission made reference to Article 35 (1). The sub-items were brought to the attention of the

---

\(^1\) In connexion with the question of Hungary see G A (XIV), Gen. Com., 125th mtg., para. 22. In connexion with the question of the status of the German-speaking element in the Province of Bolzano (Bozen) see G A (XV), Spec. Pol. Com., 180th mtg., para. 10. In connexion with the question of race conflict in South Africa, see G A (XVI), Spec. Pol. Com., 277th mtg., para. 10; 285th mtg., para. 8; G A (XVI), Plen., 1067th mtg., para. 107; G A (XVIII), Spec. Pol. Com., 384th mtg., para. 9. In connexion with the obligations of members with regard to the financing of the United Nations Emergency Force and the peace-keeping operations in the Congo, see G A (XVII), 5th Com., 955th mtg., para. 5.


\(^3\) Item 2 of the tabulation in the annex under D.

\(^4\) See paras. 26–29 below and the item under C of the tabulation in the annex.
Council by Members and, on one occasion, by the Secretary-General. Those sub-items are not included in the tabulation in the annex.

In connexion with the Palestine question see S C, 16th yr., Suppl. for April—June, p. 1, S/4777; S C, 18th yr., Suppl. for July—Sept., p. 76, S/5394; ibid., p. 77, S/5395; S C, 19th yr., Suppl. for Oct.—Dec., p. 55, S/6044; ibid., p. 60, S/6046.

In connexion with the India—Pakistan question, see S C, 19th yr., Suppl. for Jan.—March, p. 26, S/5517 and S C, 20th yr., Suppl. for July—Sept., p. 239, S/6651.

II. ANALYTICAL SUMMARY OF PRACTICE

A. In the Security Council

1. The question of the procedure of the Security Council giving effect to the provision that any Member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in Article 34 to the attention of the Council.

10. As stated in Repertory Supplement No. 2, the attitude of the Security Council regarding the relationship between submission of a dispute or situation under Article 35 and its inclusion in the agenda must be discerned from the proceedings in each case as it arose. During the period under review, objections were raised to the inclusion of a question in the Council’s agenda on the grounds that (a) such consideration would amount to interference in internal affairs, (b) a question which was submitted had been previously examined and disposed of by the General Assembly and (c) the Council did not have sufficient basis for including the question in its agenda.

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

11. At its 847th meeting, on 7 September 1959, the Security Council had before it a letter from the Secretary-General requesting the President of the Security Council to convene urgently a meeting of the Council for the consideration of an item entitled “Report by the Secretary-General on the letter received from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Royal Government of Laos, transmitted on 4 September 1959 by a note from the Permanent Mission of Laos to the United Nations”. In his letter, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Laos requested the assistance of the United Nations under Articles 1 (1) and 11 (2) of the Charter in order to halt an aggression along the north-eastern frontier of Laos, attributed to elements from the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam.

12. In opposing the inclusion of the above-mentioned item in the agenda, it was said that there was no need to bring that question before the Security Council as the Geneva Agreement of 1954 and other agreements concluded by the Government of Laos, as well as the International Commission for Supervision and Control, established to implement the Geneva Agreement, provided adequate machinery for the solution of Laos’s domestic problems. It was further stated that the submission of the matter before the Security Council was linked with foreign interference in the domestic affairs of Laos, designed to turn the country into a foreign base for strategic and military operations in South East Asia.

Decision

At the same meeting, the Security Council decided, by 10 votes to 1, to include the item in its agenda.

b. Proceedings on 30 March 1960 in connexion with the complaint concerning South Africa

13. At its 851st meeting on 30 March 1960, the Security Council included in its agenda, without objection, a question submitted by a letter dated 25 March 1960 from the representatives of Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic and Yemen who, invoking Article 35 (1) of the Charter, requested an urgent meeting of the Council “to consider the situation arising out of the large-scale killings of unarmed and peaceful demonstrators against racial discrimination and segregation in the Union of South Africa”.

14. At the same meeting, some members of the Council stated that while they had not objected to the inclusion in the agenda of the letter of twenty-nine Member States, they felt strongly, however, that nothing in the Charter authorized the United Nations to intervene in matters which were essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a Member State. The representative of South Africa also maintained that the submission of the item under Article 35 (1) was an act of intervention in the domestic affairs of his country which had not provoked a dispute and that no situation existed which could be considered a threat to international peace and security.

15. One member of the Council stated that, considering the fact that twenty-nine Asian and African Member States had requested the Security Council to discuss the alarming situation which had arisen in the African continent, there could be no question about the Security Council’s duty to

---

6 S C, 14th yr., Suppl. for July—Sept., p. 8, S/1213.
7 In the discussion concerning the adoption of the agenda, the Secretary-General stated that, in submitting the item, he was not acting under Article 99 but in accordance with rule 6 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council (847th mtg., paras. 24—26). See also this Supplement, under Article 99.
8 S C, 14th yr., Suppl. for July—Sept., p. 7, S/4212.
9 For text of relevant statement, see S C, 14th yr., 847th mtg.: USSR, paras. 33—41.
10 Ibid., para. 42.
examine such a situation. As to the competence of the United Nations to discuss the question of racial discrimination in the Union of South Africa, that issue had already been settled since the United Nations had been discussing the question for years. Another member, after stating that the Security Council was confronted with a situation which endangered peace in the whole of the African continent, recalled that in 1946, during its discussion of the Spanish question, the Security Council had given very serious attention to what might have seemed a purely domestic situation and had considered that that situation was “a sufficiently serious threat to the maintenance of peace to warrant its taking up the matter very actively”. 17

16. At the conclusion of its consideration of the item, the Security Council, at its 856th meeting on 1 April 1960, adopted a resolution 18 whereby it, inter alia, recognized that the situation in the Union of South Africa was one that had led to international friction and, if continued, might endanger international peace and security. 14

c. Decision of 18 December 1961 in connexion with the complaint of Portugal with regard to Goa

17. At its 987th meeting on 18 December 1961, the Security Council had before it a letter 19 dated 18 December 1961 from the representative of Portugal, wherein, after referring to his earlier communications, he stated that the Government of India had followed up its build-up of armed forces and provocations “with a full-scale unprovoked armed attack on the territories of Goa, Damão and Diu, comprising the Portuguese State of India”. In his earlier letter dated 11 December 1961, the representative of Portugal, acting under Article 35 (1), had drawn the attention of the Security Council to numerous violations of the Portuguese frontier and air space by Indian armed forces.

18. Objections were raised in the Security Council to the inclusion of the question in the agenda on the grounds that the letter of the representative of Portugal, describing the events in Goa as an act of aggression by India, could not be accepted as a basis for discussion. Under the Charter of the United Nations, a question concerning the situation within a territory which was part of a sovereign State could not be the subject of consideration by any United Nations body, including the Security Council. There was no doubt that the present matter fell exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of India as it concerned territories forming an integral part of India, and only provisionally held under the colonial administration of Portugal. 17

Decision

At the same meeting, the Security Council decided 20 by 7 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions, to include the item in its agenda.

d. Decision of 27 February 1962 in connexion with a complaint by Cuba (letter dated 22 February 1962)

19. At its 991st meeting on 27 February 1962, the Security Council had before it a letter 19 in which the representative of Cuba declared that the United States had promoted the adoption of enforcement action within and outside the Organization of American States (OAS) as a prelude to a large-scale invasion of Cuba. Invoking, among others, Articles 34, 35 (1), 24 (1), 52 20 and 53, 21 the representative of Cuba requested the Security Council to take the necessary measures to end the illegal action of the United States.

20. In opposing the adoption of the provisional agenda, which listed the above-mentioned letter, it was stated that the charges submitted therein had already been examined and disposed of by the General Assembly and there were no new developments to justify the reopening of the same debate in the Security Council.

21. In support of the adoption of the agenda it was pointed out that the Security Council was duty bound to grant a hearing to a Member State which had submitted a complaint under Article 35 (1). Moreover, the Cuban complaint to the Security Council was quite different from that which had been discussed by the General Assembly because it charged that the United States had not only continued its unilateral aggression but was also using the OAS to further its aggressive designs against Cuba. The Council must examine the resolutions adopted by the OAS at Punta del Este in order to ascertain their legality in the light of the United Nations Charter and the consequences that those decisions might have for international peace and security. 22

Decision

At the same meeting, the Council voted on the adoption of the provisional agenda. The result of the vote was 4 in favour and none against, with 7 abstentions. The provisional agenda was not adopted having failed to obtain the affirmative votes of seven members. 23

c. Decision of 9 September 1963 in connexion with the situation in Southern Rhodesia

22. At its 1064th meeting on 9 September 1963,
the Security Council had before it a letter\[24\] from
the representatives of Ghana, Guinea, Morocco and
the United Arab Republic concerning the situation
in Southern Rhodesia. In an explanatory memoran-
dum attached to the letter it was stated that the
United Kingdom Government had refused to
implement the General Assembly resolutions in
regard to "its Colony of Southern Rhodesia" and
that any further transfer of powers to the Southern
 Rhodesian régime by the United Kingdom would
result in a situation "which might lead to international
 friction" and whose continuance was "likely to
danger the maintenance of international peace and
security".

23. The representative of the United Kingdom,
while not objecting to the adoption of the agenda,
made reservations regarding the competence of the
Security Council in the matter and stated that no
situation existed in Southern Rhodesia which touched
the responsibility of the Security Council for the
maintenance of international peace and security.
Moreover, the United Kingdom Government did
not accept that Southern Rhodesia was a Non-Self-
Governing Territory and expressed the view that
Article 2 (7) clearly applied in the case under con-
sideration. Therefore, insistence on the considera-
tion of the item would represent an abuse of the functions
of the Security Council.\[25\]

**Decision**

At the same meeting, the Security Council decid-
ed,\[26\] without a vote, to include the item in its agenda.

1. **Decision of 9 December 1964 in connexion with the
situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo**

24. At its 1170th meeting on 9 December 1964,
the Security Council had on its provisional agenda
a letter\[27\] addressed to the President of the Council
dated 1 December 1964 from the representatives of
Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cambodia, Central
African Republic, Congo (Brazzaville), Dahomey,
Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Kenya, Malawi,
Mali, Mauritania, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda, United
Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania,
Yugoslavia and Zambia requesting the Council to
consider the situation in the Democratic Republic
of the Congo and a letter\[28\] addressed to the Secre-
tary-General dated 9 December 1964, from the
representative of the Democratic Republic of the
Congo, transmitting to the President of the Security
Council a message from his Government also request-
ing an urgent meeting of the Council to consider
"foreign interference in the domestic affairs of the
Congo".\[29\]

25. The twenty-two-Power letter was included
in the agenda of the Council without objection.
Objections were, however, raised to the inclusion

\[24\] S C, 18th yr., Suppl. for July—Sept., p. 64, S/5382.
\[25\] S C, 18th yr., 1064th mtg.: United Kingdom, paras. 3—8.
\[26\] Ibid., para. 9.
\[27\] S C, 19th yr., Suppl. for Oct.—Dec., p. 198, S/6076 and
Add. 1—5.
\[28\] Ibid., p. 217, S/6096.

in the agenda of the letter from the representative
of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It was
said that that letter, which made no specific charges,
was submitted as a manoeuvre to divert attention
from the real question of the aggressive actions of
Belgium, the United Kingdom and the United States
against the people of the Congo in violation of the
Charter. Those favouring the inclusion of that item
in the agenda, however, stated that it would be
impossible for the Council to consider adequately
the original complaint submitted by twenty-two
Member States without examining also the sub-
sequent complaint by the Democratic Republic of
the Congo since both complaints dealt with charges
of acts of intervention in the internal affairs of the
Congo.\[30\]

**Decision**

At the same meeting the Security Council decided\[30\] by 7 votes to 4, to include the item submitted
by the letter from the representative of the Demo-
ocratic Republic of the Congo in its agenda.

2. **The question of submission by States not
Members of the United Nations**

**Decision of 2 July 1962 in connexion with
complaints submitted by Kuwait and Iraq**

26. By a telegram\[31\] dated 1 July 1961, the State
Secretary of Kuwait requested, in accordance with
Article 35 (2), an urgent meeting of the Security
Council to consider the question entitled "Complaint
by Kuwait in respect of the situation arising from
threats by Iraq to the territorial independence of
Kuwait which is likely to endanger the maintenance
of international peace and security". In a letter\[32\]
of the same date, the representative of the United
Kingdom, after noting that Kuwait had requested
a meeting of the Security Council in accordance
with Article 35 (2), expressed his Government's
support for that request.

27. In a letter\[33\] dated 2 July 1961, the represen-
tative of Iraq stated that the "complaint" submitted
by Kuwait "is not receivable by the Security Council
since paragraph 2 of Article 35 of the Charter relates
to the right of States, not Members of the United
Nations, to bring questions to the attention of the
Security Council". "Kuwait", the letter added, "is not
and has never been an independent State. It has
always been considered, historically and legally,
a part of the Basrah province of Iraq. There can
be no question of an international dispute arising
between Iraq and Kuwait since the latter is an
integral part of the Iraqi Republic".

\[30\] For texts of relevant statements, see S C, 19th yr., 1170th
mtg.: Brazil, para. 31; Czechoslovakia, paras. 13—16; Ivory
Coast, paras. 33—35; Morocco, paras. 22—27; USSR, paras.
2—7 and 39—44; United Kingdom, paras. 17—19; United
States, paras. 9—12.
\[31\] Ibid., para. 63.
\[33\] Ibid., p. 1, S/4845.
\[34\] Ibid., p. 3, S/4848.
28. The provisional agenda of the 957th meeting of the Security Council held on 2 July 1961 read as follows:  

"1. Adoption of the agenda.  
"2. Complaint by Kuwait in respect of the situation arising from the threat by Iraq to the territorial independence of Kuwait, which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security (S/4845, S/4844);  
"3. Complaint by the Government of the Republic of Iraq in respect of the situation arising out of the armed threat by the United Kingdom to the independence and security of Iraq, which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security (S/4847)."

29. Before the adoption of the agenda, a member of the Council stated that the information given in the document submitted by the United Kingdom was not in accord with the existing reports on the state of affairs in the Kuwait area. However, since the situation in that area had become acute and since there was also a request before the Council from Iraq, his delegation would not object to the adoption of the agenda. He further pointed out that the documents to be regarded as forming the basis for inclusion of this whole question in the Council’s agenda were the requests submitted by two Members of the United Nations, namely, the United Kingdom and Iraq.

30. At its twentieth session, during the discussion in the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly of the item entitled "Comprehensive review of the whole question of the peace-keeping operations in all their aspects", references were made to Article 35, together with Articles 10, 11, 12, 14 and 15, on the question of the competence of the General Assembly with regard to matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security.

31. A number of representatives stated that while the Charter conferred on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Assembly also shared responsibility in that field in accordance with Articles 10, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 35. Other representatives, however, maintained that while the Charter no doubt authorized the General Assembly to discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security and, within its powers, to make recommendations on such questions to the States concerned or to the Security Council, the Security Council alone was entitled under the Charter to take necessary actions and decisions on matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security binding on all Member States. Thus, any question on which it was necessary to consider taking action must be referred to the Security Council.

32. Following the discussion in the Special Political Committee, the General Assembly, at its 1395th plenary meeting on 15 December 1965, adopted resolution 2053 (XX) on the above-mentioned item, in which it requested the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations to continue and to complete, as soon as possible, the work assigned to it by the General Assembly in its resolution 2006 (XIX).

3. THE QUESTION OF DELEGATION TO A SUBSIDIARY ORGAN OF RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ARISING FROM ARTICLE 35

34 For texts of relevant statements, see G A (XX), Spec. Pol. Com.: 463rd mtg.: Costa Rica, para. 20; Peru, para. 5; 465th mtg.: USSR, para. 64; 466th mtg.: Czechoslovakia, paras. 26—28; India, para. 12; 467th mtg.: Tanzania, para. 13; 468th mtg.: Guatemala, para. 19; Hungary, para. 24; Venezuela, para. 12; 482nd mtg.: Austria, para. 9; China, para. 15; 483rd mtg.: Morocco, para. 36; Zambia, para. 11. See also this Supplement, under Articles 10, 11, 12 and 14, where this question has been more fully discussed.
Chapter VI. Pacific settlement of disputes

ANNEX
Tabulation of questions submitted to the Security Council (1959—1966)

**A. QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS AS DISPUTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Submitting Member and date</th>
<th>Article invoked as basis for submission</th>
<th>Action taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 25 March 1960 from the representatives of Afghanistan, Burm...</td>
<td>Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, India,...</td>
<td>35 (1)</td>
<td>Included in the agenda S C, 15th yr., 851st mtg., para. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 18 May 1960 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the U...</td>
<td>USSR; 18 May 1960</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Included in the agenda S C, 15th yr., 857th mtg., para. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 23 May 1960 from the representatives of Argentina, Ceylon, E...</td>
<td>Argentina, Ceylon, Ecuador and Tunisia; 23 May 1960</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Included in the agenda S C, 15th yr., 861st mtg., preceding para. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 15 June 1960 from the representative of Argentina (Eichmann cas...</td>
<td>Argentina; 15 June 1960</td>
<td>34, 35 (1)</td>
<td>Included in the agenda S C, 15th yr., 865th mtg., para. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 11 July 1960 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cuba</td>
<td>Cuba; 11 July 1960</td>
<td>24, 34, 35(1), 36, 52(4), 103</td>
<td>Included in the agenda S C, 15th yr., 874th mtg., preceding para. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegrams dated 13 July 1960 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the U...</td>
<td>USSR; 13 July 1960</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Included in the agenda; S C, 15th yr., 880th mtg., para. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 5 September 1960 from the First Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the U...</td>
<td>USSR; 5 September 1960</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Included in the agenda; S C, 15th yr., 893rd mtg., preceding para. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 31 December 1960 from the Minister for External Relations of Cuba (Complaint by Cuba)</td>
<td>Cuba; 31 December 1960</td>
<td>34, 35(1), 52(4), 103, 24(1), 31 and 32</td>
<td>Included in the agenda; S C, 15th yr., 921st mtg., para. 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter dated 20 February 1961 from the representative of Liberia (Situation in Angola)</td>
<td>Liberia; 20 February 1961</td>
<td>34*</td>
<td>Included in the agenda; S C, 15th yr., 944th mtg., para. 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Article 34 was invoked by Liberia at the 934th mtg. of the Security Council.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Submitting Member and date</th>
<th>Article invoked as basis for submission</th>
<th>Action taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Letter dated 26 May 1961 from 32 Member States (Situation in Angola)</td>
<td>Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen and Yugoslavia; 26 May 1961</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Included in the agenda; S C, 16th yr., 950th mtg., para. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Telegram dated 20 July 1961 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Tunisia Letter dated 20 July 1961 from the representative of Tunisia</td>
<td>Tunisia; 20 July 1961</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Included in the agenda S C, 16th yr., 961st mtg., preceding para. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Letter dated 21 November 1961 from the representative of Cuba (Complaint by Cuba)</td>
<td>Cuba; 21 November 1961</td>
<td>24(1), 31, 34, 35(1), 52(4), and 103.</td>
<td>Included in the agenda S C, 16th yr., 980th mtg., preceding para. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Letter dated 18 December 1961 from the representative of Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal; 18 December 1961</td>
<td>35(1)*</td>
<td>Included in the agenda S C, 16th yr., 987th mtg., para. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Letter dated 8 March 1962 from the representative of Cuba</td>
<td>Cuba; 8 March 1962</td>
<td>24(1), 34, 35(1), 40, 41, 52, 53, 96 and 103</td>
<td>Included in the agenda S C, 17th yr., 992nd mtg., preceding para. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Letter dated 22 October 1962 from the representative of the United States of America</td>
<td>United States; 22 October 1962</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Included in the agenda S C, 17th yr., 1022nd mtg., para. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Letter dated 10 April 1963 from the Chargé d'affaires a. 2. of the Permanent Mission of Senegal</td>
<td>Senegal; 10 April 1963</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Included in the agenda S C, 18th yr., 1027th mtg., preceding para. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Telegram dated 5 May 1963 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Haiti</td>
<td>Haiti; 5 May 1963</td>
<td>34, 35(1)</td>
<td>Included in the agenda S C, 18th yr., 1035th mtg., preceding para. 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For parallel complaint by Kuwait, see under C below.

* In an earlier letter (S/5018) dated 11 December 1961, the representative of Portugal had referred to Article 35 (1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Submitting Member and date</th>
<th>Article invoked as basis for submission</th>
<th>Action taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Letter dated 11 July 1963 from 32 Member States. (Situation in the Territories in Africa under Portuguese administration)</td>
<td>Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Tanganika, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic and Upper Volta; 11 July 1963</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Included in the agenda; SC, 18th yr., 1040th mtg., preceding para. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. (i) Letter dated 2 August 1963 from the representatives of Ghana, Guinea, Morocco and the United Arab Republic; (ii) Letter dated 30 August 1963 from the representative of the Congo (Brazzaville) (Situation in Southern Rhodesia)</td>
<td>Ghana, Guinea, Morocco and United Arab Republic; 2 August 1963; Congo (Brazzaville), forwarding on 30 August 1963 the support of its delegation as well as of Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Leopoldville), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Tanganika, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda and Upper Volta.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Included in the agenda; SC, 18th yr., 1064th mtg., para. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Letter dated 26 December 1963 from the representative of Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus: 26 December 1963 1(1), 2(4), 24(1), 34, 35, 39</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Included in the agenda; SC, 18th yr., 1085th mtg., preceding para. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Letter dated 10 January 1964 from the representative of Panama</td>
<td>Panama; 10 January 1964 —</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Included in the agenda; SC, 19th yr., 1086th mtg., preceding para. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Letter dated 1 April 1964 from the representative of Yemen</td>
<td>Yemen: 1 April 1964 34, 35(1)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Included in the agenda; SC, 19th yr., 1106th mtg., preceding para. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Complaint concerning acts of aggression against the territory and civilian population of Cambodia</td>
<td>Cambodia; 13 May 1964 35</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Included in the agenda; SC, 19th yr., 1118th mtg., preceding para. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Letter dated 4 August 1964 from the representative of the United States. (Tonkin Gulf incident)</td>
<td>United States; 4 August 1964 —</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Included in the agenda; SC, 19th yr., 1140th mtg., para. 32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY STATES NOT MEMBERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Submitting Member and date</th>
<th>Article invoked as basis for submission</th>
<th>Action taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. Letter dated 5 September 1964 from the representative of Greece</td>
<td>Greece; 5 September 1964</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Included in the agenda; S C, 19th yr., 1146th mtg., preceding para. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Letter dated 6 September 1964 from the representative of Turkey</td>
<td>Turkey; 6 September 1964</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Letter dated 1 May 1965 from the representative of the USSR</td>
<td>USSR; 1 May 1965</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Included in the agenda; S C, 20th yr., 1196th mtg., preceding para. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Complaints by Senegal of violations of its air space and territory</td>
<td>Senegal; 7 May 1965</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Included in the agenda; S C, 20th yr., 1205th mtg., preceding, para. 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Submitted by</th>
<th>Article invoked as basis for submission</th>
<th>Action taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Complaint by Kuwait</td>
<td>Kuwait; 1 July 1961</td>
<td>35(2)</td>
<td>Included in the agenda; S C, 16th yr., 957th mtg., para. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Letter dated 13 July 1960 from the Secretary-General (situation in the Republic of the Congo)</td>
<td>Secretary-General; 13 July 1960</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Included in the agenda; S C, 15th yr., 873rd mtg., para. 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Article 99 was not mentioned in the letter of the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council. However, in his statement before the Council, the Secretary-General said that he was making his request under Article 99 of the Charter (S C, 15th yr., 873rd mtg., para. 18).