

thirty-first session were not resumed, however, the Economic and Social Council was authorized to elect the members of the Board.

54. If there were no objection, he would take it that the Council preferred not to hold the elections to the Board of Governors of the Special Fund at its current session but to leave the elections to the General Assembly at its resumed session.

*It was so decided.*

#### COMMISSION ON TRANSNATIONAL CORPORATIONS (E/L.1751)

55. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 16 members of the Commission on Transnational Corporations for a term of three years beginning on 1 January 1978.

56. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) read out the following list of candidates: for the four seats allotted to African States: Benin, Ghana, Tunisia and Zambia; for one of the four seats allotted to Asian States: Japan; for the three seats allotted to Latin American States: Argentina, Colombia and Surinam; for the three seats allotted to Western European and other States: Australia, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland; for the two seats allotted to Eastern European States: the German Democratic Republic and Romania.

57. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should elect by acclamation the candidates from the Group of African States, the Group of Asian States, the Group of Latin American States and the Group of Eastern European States.

*Argentina, Benin, Colombia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Japan, Romania, Surinam, Tunisia and Zambia were elected members of the Commission on Transnational Corporations by acclamation.*

58. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect three members from among the Western European and other States.

*At the invitation of the President, Ms. Kongshem (Norway) and Mr. Pierce (Jamaica) acted as tellers.*

*A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	54
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	52
<i>Required majority:</i>	28

#### *Number of votes obtained:*

Switzerland . . . . .	42
Germany, Federal Republic of . . . . .	41
France . . . . .	40
Australia . . . . .	33

*Having obtained the largest number of votes and the required majority, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, and Switzerland were elected members of the Commission on Transnational Corporations.*

59. The PRESIDENT suggested that the elections for the remaining seats allotted to Asian States should be postponed until a future session.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.*

## 2056th meeting

Wednesday, 11 May 1977, at 4 p.m.

*President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).*

E/SR.2056

### AGENDA ITEM 15

**Elections (continued) (E/L.1741, E/L.1747 and Corr. 1,  
E/L.1750, E/L.1752)**

#### COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS (E/L.1747)

1. The PRESIDENT said the criteria to be applied with regard to the composition of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs were set out in paragraph 4 of document E/L.1747: the Council was required to elect 15 members for a period of four years.

2. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that the following candidatures had been proposed for

the Commission on Narcotic Drugs: the African States had proposed Algeria, Togo and Tunisia; the Asian States had proposed Indonesia, Iran and Japan; the Latin American States had proposed Brazil, Chile, Mexico and Panama; the Western European and other States had proposed Australia, Belgium, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Turkey; and the Eastern European States had proposed the German Democratic Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

3. Mr. AMIRDZHANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished it to be placed on record that his delegation had taken no part in the decision proposing the candidature of the Chilean junta for a seat on the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and that if the election were held by secret

ballot his delegation would vote against that candidature. It would likewise be unable to accept the outcome of any vote to that effect.

4. The PRESIDENT suggested that, since there was no fixed distribution by group for the seats on the Commission and since the number of candidatures submitted exceeded the number of vacancies, the Council should elect the 15 members by secret ballot.

5. Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba) supported the suggestion of the President. Since an objection had been raised to one candidature, the Council should hold the election by secret ballot, in accordance with rule 68 of the rules of procedure.

6. Mr. KANAZAWA (Japan) said that, although there was not a stipulated number of seats on the Commission on Narcotic Drugs for each region, it was the custom for each region to occupy a certain number of seats. That procedure should be followed on the current occasion, since it would facilitate the functioning of the Commission. That being so, he suggested that a secret ballot should be held only for the candidatures from the regional groups where the number of candidates exceeded the number of vacancies.

7. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) said he agreed with the representative of Japan: if the Council were to hold a secret ballot for the regional groups where the number of vacancies was the same as the number of candidatures and where in addition those candidatures were supported by the group concerned, he would be obliged to state that he completely disagreed with that procedure. The Latin American Group had never opposed the candidatures submitted by other groups, and he did not remember a secret ballot ever having been held to elect members of bodies when the number of candidates was the same as the number of vacancies for each region and when, moreover, the candidatures in question were supported by the regional group concerned.

8. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria), speaking on behalf of the African delegations which were members of the Council, expressed support for the statement by the representative of Brazil. The Council should not be misled by the Secretariat, and candidates who were supported by their regional groups should be elected immediately, without a secret ballot.

9. Mr. FUENTES IBÁÑEZ (Bolivia) said that the Council could not make any change in established practices at the current stage. The Latin American Group had officially submitted its candidates for the four seats available to it on the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and his delegation would regard any decision which did not take those candidatures into account as unjustified and unacceptable interference.

10. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) supported the statements of previous speakers to the effect that the candidatures proposed by the regional groups should be respected.

11. Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) said that the Council should respect the principle of equitable geographical distribution in the composition of its functional commissions and the agreements reached in the regional groups.

12. Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba) said that the secret ballot which in his view the Council should hold in no way endangered the agreements reached by the regional groups and would not alter the geographical balance in the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. It should be remembered that there was no fixed distribution of seats by region in that Commission and that consequently its members could not be elected according to the same criteria as were applied in the case of other organs. Moreover, since an objection had been raised to one candidature, the Council must inevitably apply the relevant provision of rule 68 of the rules of procedure, which, moreover, showed that the general principle was that of election by secret ballot, and that cases in which such balloting was not used constituted the exception.

13. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation respected the decisions taken by the regional groups, but it should also be remembered that the case of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs had special characteristics. Although equitable geographical distribution should be taken into account with regard to its composition, it was also necessary to apply the relevant provisions of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961. It should also be borne in mind that the current case involved the candidature of a Government which had been repeatedly condemned by the United Nations. In the light of those considerations, the only correct way of proceeding would be to adopt the President's suggestion.

14. Mr. BATIUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the very nature of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs prevented any fixed geographical distribution of its members; in fact, the problem of narcotic drugs did not affect all regions of the world equally. In the circumstances, since there were 15 vacancies and 16 candidatures, the only course was for the Council to hold a secret ballot on all the candidates proposed.

15. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) said that two questions had been raised during the current discussion: first, it had been stated that there was no established geographical distribution of seats on the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, an assertion which was highly debatable if it was remembered that there were tacit understandings whereby it was agreed that the members of the Council would work in concert with one another. He did not wish to enter into a debate and if it was asserted that the criterion of geographical distribution did not apply in that Commission, then for the time being and for the purposes of the current election, his delegation would not object to that view and would vote accordingly. With regard to the second question, which was procedural, if one or two members of the Council invoked the rules of procedure in order to put to the vote a matter which was normally decided by consensus, his delegation would accept that course, since it did not question their right to do so, and once again, would vote accordingly on the current occasion and in the current circumstances.

16. Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) requested that the list of candidates and regional groups should be read out once again, indicating the regional groups whose candidates exceeded the number of vacancies.

17. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) read out the following list of candidates:

Three members from African States: Algeria, Togo and Tunisia;

Three members from Asian States: Indonesia, Iran and Japan;

Four members from Latin American States: Brazil, Chile, Mexico and Panama;

Two members from Eastern European States: German Democratic Republic and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

Four members from Western European and other States: Australia, Belgium, Turkey and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The candidatures from the last group thus exceeded the number of vacancies, of which there were three.

18. Mr. TREVIÑO (Mexico) stressed the importance which his Government attached to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and observed that none of the members of the Group of 77 was occupying a seat to which it was not entitled. He stressed once again his country's great interest in becoming a member of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

19. The PRESIDENT suggested that the voting to elect 15 members of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs should be held by secret ballot.

*At the invitation of the President, Ms. Kongshem (Norway) and Mr. Pierce (Jamaica) acted as tellers.*

*A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	54
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	54
<i>Required majority:</i>	28

*Number of votes obtained:*

Mexico	52
Algeria	50
Turkey	50
Iran	49
Japan	48
Panama	48
Brazil	46
Indonesia	46
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	46
Belgium	44
Togo	44
Tunisia	43
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	40
German Democratic Republic	38
Australia	34
Chile	25
Morocco	3
Poland	1
Yugoslavia	1
Austria	1
Jamaica	1

*Having obtained the required majority, Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, the German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland were elected members of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.*

COMMITTEE ON REVIEW AND APPRAISAL (concluded)  
(E/L.1750)

20. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) observed that, of the 10 members from African States who were to be elected to the Committee on Review and Appraisal to fill the vacancies that would occur on 31 December 1977, 5 had already been elected. The candidature of Benin had been proposed, leaving four seats to be filled.

21. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to elect Benin a member of the Committee on Review and Appraisal.

*It was so decided.*

EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE UNITED NATIONS  
CHILDREN'S FUND (E/L.1741)

22. The PRESIDENT observed that the Council had to elect 10 States Members of the United Nations or members of specialized agencies to the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund for a three-year period starting on 1 August 1977. In accordance with General Assembly resolution 1038 (XI) the members would be elected "with due regard to geographical distribution and to the representation of the major contributing and recipient countries".

23. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) read out the list of candidates. The African States supported the candidature of one member: Zambia; the Asian States had submitted a list of four members without supporting their candidatures: Afghanistan, Jordan, Pakistan and Thailand; the Latin American States supported the candidatures of two members: Barbados and Chile; the Western European and other States supported the candidatures of three members: Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany and Norway; the Eastern European States supported the candidature of one member: Yugoslavia. The total number of vacancies was 10.

24. Mr. AMIRDZHANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in connexion with the candidature of the Chilean junta, he wanted the record to show that his delegation had not taken part in that designation and would vote against it. His delegation also wished the record to show that it did not accept that candidature.

25. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) said that in her delegation's view, when agreement had been reached within a particular group, especially in view of the clear stipulation that due regard must be given to the question of geographical representation, the Council should accept the proposal made by that group. One delegation had expressed reservations and the wish that those reservations should be mentioned in Secretariat documents, but as she understood

it, no member of the Council thus far had made a formal proposal to put the entire question to a vote by secret ballot. Accordingly, she proposed that the reservations should be accepted and that the Council should continue its consideration of the item before it.

26. The PRESIDENT, after recalling the relevant provision of the rules of procedure (rule 68), said that the Council could decide not to put the question to a vote by secret ballot and could proceed instead to elect by acclamation the candidates of those groups whose lists did not exceed the number of vacancies.

27. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) proposed that the Council should immediately take a decision concerning whether or not it would elect by acclamation the candidates proposed by those groups whose lists did exceed the number of existing vacancies.

28. Mr. ALFONSO MARTINEZ (Cuba) said that in order to facilitate the work of the President and the delegations and in accordance with the provisions of rule 68 of the rules of procedure, he proposed that the Council should take a vote by secret ballot on all the candidates proposed for membership in the UNICEF Executive Board, for the same reasons which he had already stated in connexion with the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. That position of his delegation eliminated any need for consultation by the Council as a whole whenever anyone simply invoked the prerogative granted to any Member State under rule 68 of the Council's rules of procedure.

29. Mr. WASILEWSKI (Poland) said that in the particular case of the election in question, due regard must be given not only to geographical distribution but also to the representation of the principal contributing and recipient countries.

30. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) said that rule 68 had been invoked and that while his delegation would in no way oppose the application of its provisions, it would bear in mind that particular use being made of rule 68. However, Poland had injected into the question before the Council some new criteria which he did not consider appropriate; consequently, with all due respect to the representative of Poland, he asked the Council to disregard the Polish intervention, which did not contribute anything useful to the debate.

31. Miss RICHTER (Argentina) said that when regional groups gave their support to candidates for a committee or any other body, they were helping the work of that committee in a manner that could not be disregarded; for that reason, her delegation considered it harmful to abide by the letter of rule 68 as a matter of priority and to disregard the practice of respecting the proposals made by regional groups, which had proved so useful.

32. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) reminded the Council that it seemed to be deviating from a practice it had followed in recent years. In suggesting that the positions adopted by the regional groups should be respected, her delegation was not defending anyone in particular; it was making that suggestion simply as a matter of principle. Furthermore, if the Council wished to strike down that principle at the

present time, it would have to accept in the future the position of any delegation that acted in accordance with the Council's decision. What was favourable now to some delegations might be unfavourable to them at a later time. She wished the record to show that her delegation, speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, had stated that the positions of the regional groups should be respected in so far as possible.

33. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) pointed out that, as document E/L.1741 made clear, the terms of only three of the Asian States would expire on 31 July 1977, whereas those States had proposed four candidates.

34. The PRESIDENT, after reading out rule 68 of the rules of procedure of the Council, proposed that the Council should proceed by secret ballot to elect 10 candidates to fill 10 vacancies on the Executive Board of UNICEF.

35. Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil) said that he disagreed with that procedure because he considered it incorrect, particularly in the present case, when it was stipulated that in filling the vacancies due regard should be given to geographical distribution.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Hachami (Tunisia) and Mr. Nakamura (Japan) acted as tellers.*

*A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	54
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	54
<i>Required majority:</i>	28

<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Norway . . . . .	53
Zambia . . . . .	53
Barbados . . . . .	51
Canada . . . . .	50
Pakistan . . . . .	47
Germany, Federal Republic of . . . . .	46
Yugoslavia . . . . .	45
Jordan . . . . .	42
Afghanistan . . . . .	41
Chile . . . . .	32
Thailand . . . . .	31
India . . . . .	2
Japan . . . . .	1

*Having obtained the largest number of votes and the required majority, Afghanistan, Barbados, Canada, Chile, Germany, Federal Republic of, Jordan, Norway, Pakistan, Yugoslavia and Zambia were elected members of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund.*

#### GOVERNING COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (E/L.1752)

36. The PRESIDENT said that 16 members of the Governing Council of UNDP were to be elected for a term of three years which would begin on 1 January 1978.

37. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that three members were to be elected from African States and the candidatures of the Ivory Coast, Kenya and Senegal had been proposed. Three members were to be elected from Asian States and Yugoslavia, and the candidatures of Fiji, Democratic Yemen, Indonesia and Jordan, had been proposed. Three members were to be elected from Latin American States, and the candidatures of Argentina, Ecuador and Trinidad and Tobago had been proposed. Five members were to be elected from Western European and other States, and the candidatures of Finland, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland and Turkey had been proposed. The Council also had to elect two members from Eastern European States, and the candidatures of Czechoslovakia and Poland had been proposed.

38. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take a vote by secret ballot to elect the members of the Governing Council from Asian States and Yugoslavia and from Western European and other States, since for those groups the number of candidates exceeded the number of vacancies. He also suggested that the candidates from the other groups should be elected by acclamation by the Council.

*Argentina, the Ivory Coast, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Kenya, Poland, Senegal and Trinidad and Tobago were elected members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme by acclamation.*

39. Mr. PAPOULIAS (Greece) said that the candidatures of Spain and Turkey had been proposed as representatives of the Mediterranean subgroup within the Group of Western European and other States. Those candidatures were based on the principle of rotation among subgroups within the regional groups and on the provisions of paragraph 1(c) of General Assembly resolution 2813 (XXVI). Since the Mediterranean subgroup had been insufficiently represented in the UNDP Governing Council, he hoped that the Council would support those candidatures.

40. Mr. SOUSA SOARES (Portugal) endorsed the remarks made by the representative of Greece.

41. Mr. CAMILLERI (Observer for Malta), speaking at the invitation of the President, supported the candidatures of Spain and Turkey for membership in the UNDP Governing Council. The General Assembly had established the principle that the composition of seats within each group should at all times reflect adequate subregional representation. Of the 17 seats allocated to the Group of Western European and other States in the UNDP Governing Council, the Mediterranean subgroup had received only one. That meant that each member of the Mediterranean subgroup could participate in the work of the Governing Council only once every 15 years, a situation which was contrary to both the letter and the spirit of General Assembly resolution 2029 (XX). He was convinced that an allocation of two seats to the Mediterranean subgroup would bring the representation on the UNDP Governing Council into stricter conformity with the provisions of that resolution.

42. During the past three years, Malta had served on the UNDP Governing Council for the first time; the experience had been particularly helpful to his delegation and had enabled it to play a part in the deliberations of one of the most vital organs of the United Nations. At the end of its term as a member of the Governing Council, his delegation recognized its responsibility to give an opportunity to other countries to participate in the work of that body.

43. Mr. DE PINIES (Observer for Spain), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that resolution 2813 (XXVI) was possibly one of the most precise resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. Among its provisions he singled out paragraph 1(c) which, in his opinion, included a very sensible criterion for determining the composition of the UNDP Governing Council.

44. The delegation of Spain, which was a contributing, not a recipient country, considered that it was in a position to make a useful contribution to the deliberations of the Governing Council and appreciated any support that its candidacy might receive in the Economic and Social Council.

45. Mr. TÜRKMEN (Observer for Turkey), speaking at the invitation of the President, supported the statements made by the previous speakers and considered that, in view of the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2813 (XXVI), it was clear that the Mediterranean subgroup had for a long time been inadequately represented in the Governing Council of UNDP. That situation needed to be rectified and he hoped that the Council would approve his country's candidacy.

46. Mr. GJESDAL (Norway), speaking also on behalf of Denmark, supported the re-election of Finland for the seat traditionally held by the Nordic countries in the UNDP Governing Council. In paragraph 5 of its resolution 2029 (XX), the General Assembly had requested the Economic and Social Council to provide for equitable and balanced representation of the economically more developed countries, having due regard to their contribution to UNDP. The support for Finland was based not only on the criterion of its contribution but also on that of its active participation in the work of the UNDP Governing Council.

47. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should elect, by secret ballot, three members of the UNDP Governing Council for the Group of Asian States and Yugoslavia and five members for the Group of Western European and other States.

*At the invitation of the President, Ms. Kongshem (Norway) and Mr. Pierce (Jamaica) acted as tellers.*

*A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	54
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	54
<i>Required majority:</i>	28

*Number of votes obtained:**Asian States and Yugoslavia:*

Indonesia . . . . .	42
Jordan . . . . .	40
Democratic Yemen . . . . .	37
Fiji . . . . .	34

*Western European and other States:*

Finland . . . . .	46
Spain . . . . .	45
Netherlands . . . . .	43
Switzerland . . . . .	41
Germany, Federal Republic of . . . . .	40
Turkey . . . . .	32

*Having obtained the greatest number of votes and the required majority, Democratic Yemen, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Indonesia, Jordan, the Netherlands, Spain and Switzerland were elected members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme.*

#### AD HOC INTERGOVERNMENTAL WORKING GROUP ON THE PROBLEM OF CORRUPT PRACTICES

48. The PRESIDENT said that the following vacancies needed to be filled on the *Ad Hoc* Intergovernmental Working Group on the Problem of Corrupt Practices: one for African States, two for Eastern European States and three for Western European and other States, whose term would begin immediately.

49. Miss ST. CLAIRE (Assistant Secretary of the Council) said that no candidacies had been submitted for the Asian States or for the Eastern European States. The Western European and other States proposed the candidacy of Belgium, Canada, Italy and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

50. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) said that the Western European and other States had not been able to present an agreed list of candidates to fit the number of vacancies allocated for the Group. After considering ways and means of ensuring effective participation, they had therefore decided to achieve it by means of a large number of observers. He suggested that the *Ad Hoc* Group should be expanded or at least that the number of members should not be limited, so that the representatives of Western European and other States, which had shown great interest in the work of the *Ad Hoc* Group, could continue to participate in that work. The Western European and other States hoped to be able to continue to contribute as before, and that the Council shared their point of view.

51. The PRESIDENT suggested that the election should be postponed until a later session.

*It was so decided.*

#### COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS (continued) (E/L.1747)

52. The PRESIDENT recalled that at the previous meeting the election of three members from African States had been postponed.

53. Mr. KOROMA (Observer for Sierra Leone), speaking at the invitation of the President and on behalf of the Chairman of the Group of African States, said that he had been instructed to state the position of the African Group regarding candidacies for the Commission on Human Rights. The African Group supported the candidacy of Burundi for the central African region, of the Ivory Coast for the west African region, and of Ethiopia for the east African region. During consideration of those candidacies, two delegations which did not belong to any of the regions mentioned had decided to enter reservations concerning the Group's decision or insisted on maintaining their candidacies, and those positions had been duly noted by the African Group.

54. Mr. BENGELLOUN (Observer for Morocco) pointed out to the Council that, regardless of the decision of the African Group, Morocco maintained its candidacy and consequently requested a vote by secret ballot, in accordance with rule 68 of the rules of procedure. He had definite reservations concerning the African Group's decision and would like the Secretariat specifically to place on record the fact that Morocco continued to be a candidate for one of three vacancies on the Commission on Human Rights assigned to African States, in view of the expiry of the terms of Egypt, Senegal and the Upper Volta.

55. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) quoted from paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 2813 (XXVI) and said that the allocation of posts for each group must duly and at all times reflect adequate subregional representation. Speaking on behalf of the Group of African States which were members of the Economic and Social Council, she said that the Council should not waste time on such a patently clear question. The Group of African States had already included the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya among the candidates for the Commission on Human Rights to represent the north African region, and she therefore wondered how some delegations could try to occupy a seat that belonged to another subregion. Neither on behalf of her own delegation nor on behalf of the Group of African States was she questioning the right of every State to seek to obtain a seat, but she believed that, as a matter of principle, the representation of a group should conform to the decisions taken within that group concerning subregional representation. The committee of the whole of the Group of African States had made a recommendation which had been submitted to the Council at the previous meeting and which the Group of African States had reaffirmed. Therefore, on behalf of her delegation, she suggested that the Council should take a decision on the question and declare that the proposals submitted by the Group of African States reflected the position adopted by consensus in the Group and that it supported the candidacies of the three countries proposed, namely, Burundi, Ethiopia and the Ivory Coast.

56. Mr. OULD SID'AHMED (Mauritania) said that he had no intention of opposing a consensus which had been reached in the Group of African States and to which the representative of Nigeria had referred. There had been an apparent consensus but reservations had been expressed. He did not think that it was for the Council to make a ruling on questions that should be decided by a particular group. He for his part supported the candidacy of Morocco and did not feel that there was any other course but to put the

matter to a vote by a secret ballot, as requested by one delegation.

57. Mr. BENHOCINE (Algeria) supported the statements made by the representatives of Sierra Leone and Nigeria. He considered that two principles were involved in the entire issue: one was respect for the rules of procedure of the Council, and the other was respect for a decision taken by a group, and in that particular instance a decision adopted by consensus in the Group of African States. That second principle involved a question of a political nature. His delegation wished to respect the decision of the Group of African States. It was for the Council to decide whether or not it wished to apply its rules of procedure.

58. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria), after reading out rule 72, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure, said that she did not believe that Morocco had been invited to take the floor and, even if that had been the case, Morocco would have no right to propose that a vote should be taken on any question unless a member of the Council so proposed. She asked the Council to support the decision submitted by the Group of African States at the morning meeting.

59. Mr. SOBHY (Observer for Egypt), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that Egypt understood that there had actually been no consensus in the Group of

African States. It was not raising that question in the Council but merely reiterating that Egypt had officially offered its candidacy and had not withdrawn it. The Egyptian delegation would oppose any attempt to prevent the Council from following the proper procedure in accordance with its request.

60. Mr. MUBAREZ (Yemen) suggested that a vote should be taken by secret ballot to elect the members of the Commission on Human Rights to represent the Group of African States.

61. Miss BALOGUN (Nigeria) insisted that no official proposal had been made to the Council that would prevent it from electing the three candidates proposed by the Group of African States. She therefore urged the Council to act accordingly.

62. The PRESIDENT suggested that the election of three members of the Commission on Human Rights to represent the African States should be postponed until the next meeting of the Council.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.*

## 2057th meeting

Thursday, 12 May 1977, at 11.15 a.m.

*President: Mr. Ladislav ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia).*

E/SR.2057

### AGENDA ITEM 15

#### Elections (*concluded*) (E/L.1747 and Corr.1)

#### COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS (*concluded*) (E/L.1747)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to proceed to the election of three members from African States to the Commission on Human Rights for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1978.

2. Mr. SIMBANANIYE (Observer for Burundi), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that he had not wished to take part in the debate because his country was one of the candidates for a seat on the Commission. However, there seemed to be some confusion, which he would like to clear up. The Group of African States had reached a consensus on its candidates for the three seats on the Commission and had made its choice known to the Council on two occasions. It had always been agreed that the three African posts should go to representatives of the three regions of Africa. Furthermore, it was the practice of the United Nations, as reaffirmed in General Assembly resolution 2813 (XXVI), to ensure that the composition of seats in each group should at all times give due expression to adequate subregional representation.

3. He wished to pay a tribute to the delegations of the Upper Volta, Senegal and Egypt, which had rendered the Commission a service of which they could be proud. His delegation had supported their election for the term that was about to expire, and it appreciated the democratic gesture of those States which could have sought re-election but had refrained from doing so in order to leave room for others. He appealed to the other African States which had submitted their candidatures to withdraw them in order to allow the Council to elect the candidates that had been endorsed by the African Group and to maintain the cohesion of the Group.

4. Mr. KOROMA (Observer for Sierra Leone), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that, if the Council decided to vote, he wished to reserve the right to speak before the vote.

5. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia) drew the attention of the Council to summary record No. 13 of the 1974 session of the Organization of African Unity, in which it was indicated that the Permanent Representative of Gabon, endorsed by the representative of Zaire, had informed the Group that the two delegations were ready to yield the seat allotted to the central region to the delegation of Egypt. They had also emphasized that the seat, which should be occupied by Egypt, should go back to the central region at the end of the latter's mandate.