

## 54th meeting

Wednesday, 27 October 1982, at 3.15 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Miljan KOMATINA (Yugoslavia)

E/1982/SR.54

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda (Zaire), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

### AGENDA ITEM 9

#### Regional co-operation (E/1982/111)

1. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the members of the Council to the report of the Secretary-General on the adequacy of the conference facilities of the Economic Commission for Africa at Addis Ababa (E/1982/111), which had been prepared in accordance with Council resolution 1982/60 of 30 July 1982.
2. Mr. ADEDEJI (Executive Secretary, Economic Commission for Africa) recalled that the Secretary-General had submitted to the Council, at its second regular session of 1982, a preliminary report on the expansion of ECA conference facilities at Addis Ababa (E/1982/83). At that time, the Council had decided to

consider at its resumed second regular session the final report promised by the Secretary-General. That report, which was before the Council, established clearly that the premises that the Government of Ethiopia had donated to the United Nations in 1970 were inadequate. He therefore wished to suggest that the Council should adopt the report and transmit it to the Fifth Committee, so that that Committee might consider it more closely, as anticipated in the document in question.

3. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia), Mr. ESAN (Nigeria), Mr. TUAN (Liberia), Mr. JOHNSON (Benin), Mr. RUMECI (Burundi), Mr. ELHASSAN (Sudan) and Mr. SANGARE (Mali) said that they supported the suggestion made by the Executive Secretary of ECA.

4. Mr. ATTAF (Observer for Algeria) said that, since it was only fair that ECA should receive greater support from the United Nations at a time when communications and meetings among African countries were becoming more frequent and intensifying, he wished to call on

members of the Council to join the African countries in deciding by consensus to refer to the report of the Secretary-General to the Fifth Committee, for consideration and action.

5. Mr. WORKU (Ethiopia) said that he wished to give an account of the question before the Committee from the outset. At the time when the Economic and Social Council, in its resolution 671 A (XXV) of 29 April 1958, had established the Economic Commission for Africa and laid down the Commission's terms of reference, there had been no secretariat or conference facilities at Addis Ababa. In fact, the Commission's first session had been held in the Parliament building. In 1961, in order to remedy that state of affairs, his Government had donated land and constructed a conference building and an office building at its own expense. At that time, there had been only 23 African States Members of the United Nations. Since then, as a result of decolonization, the continent of Africa had undergone a rapid transformation and there had been an extraordinary increase in ECA membership, in a period during which the United Nations system had been expanding and the number of regional and international institutions wishing to participate as observers in the Commission's meetings had been growing. It had been becoming obvious that the Commission's facilities were inadequate, and, in his report of 20 November 1969 (A/C.5/1265), the Secretary-General had noted that, owing to its growth, ECA had been experiencing great difficulty in adapting its premises to its meeting requirements, that, as further territories gained independence, ECA membership would probably continue to increase and that the Commission would therefore have to have expanded facilities.

6. The Economic and Social Council, in its resolution 1981/65 of 24 July 1981, had recommended to the General Assembly that a study on the adequacy of ECA conference facilities should be conducted. The General Assembly, in its resolution 36/176, had endorsed that recommendation and requested the Secretary-General to undertake the study in question, as a matter of urgency. Document E/1982/111 therefore simply complied with that resolution. However, it should be stressed that in his report, the Secretary-General strongly emphasized the acute lack of space and facilities and the pointlessness of merely expanding the existing facilities. It was therefore to be hoped that the Economic and Social Council, being aware of how serious the situation was, would adopt the report of the Secretary-General and transmit it to the Fifth Committee, in accordance with the requirements of the situation.

7. Mr. BOYD (United Kingdom) said that the report of the Secretary-General was clear and to the point. Paragraph 10 went straight to the heart of the problem, and paragraphs 12 and 13 gave a clear indication of the procedure to be followed.

8. Mr. DIECKMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) and Mr. FAURE (France) said that they endorsed the remarks made by the preceding speakers. The report should definitely be transmitted to the Fifth Committee for consideration of its financial implications. Their

delegations would pay due attention to the debate on that question.

9. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that he was in favour of transmitting the report to the Fifth Committee but felt that the Council had not had enough time to consider it, in view of its financial implications.

10. The PRESIDENT, speaking in his capacity of representative of Zaire, said that he wished to pay a tribute to the Executive Secretary and, through him, to the Secretary-General for the excellent report before the Committee. He supported all the observations made. Since he, himself, had lived at Addis Ababa, he knew how urgent it was to expand the facilities of ECA. The matter in question was extremely important, and it was to be hoped that, in response to a legitimate request, the General Assembly would take the appropriate decisions.

11. In his capacity of President, he proposed that the Council should consider the following draft decision:

"The Council took note of the report of the Secretary-General on the adequacy of the conference facilities of the Economic Commission for Africa at Addis Ababa (E/1982/111), prepared in pursuance of its resolution 1982/60 of 30 July 1982, and decided to transmit it, together with the views expressed by delegations during the resumed second regular session of 1982 of the Council, to the General Assembly for consideration at its thirty-seventh session."

12. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt that draft decision.

*It was so decided* [decision 1982/182].

## AGENDA ITEM 25

### **Transnational corporations (concluded) (E/1982/18 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1)**

#### *Draft resolution I: Establishment of an Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting*

13. The PRESIDENT, referring to draft resolution I in chapter I of the report of the Committee on Transnational Corporations on its eighth session (E/1982/18), proposed that paragraph 4 (d) should be replaced by the following text:

"That the members shall be elected for a period of three years, beginning on 1 January following their election, except that, for one half of the members elected at the first election, the term of membership shall be two years; members shall be eligible for re-election;"

*It was so decided.*

14. Mr. AKAO (Japan) said that the *Ad Hoc* Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting had just fulfilled its mandate and submitted a report to the Commission on Transnational Corporations (E/C.10/1982/8). He therefore believed, without wishing to block

a consensus on draft resolution I, that the Commission on Transnational Corporations should defer consideration of the matters in question, since it had a heavy programme of work. He pointed out that, in accordance with paragraph 1 (m) of its resolution 1982/50, entitled "Revitalization of the Economic and Social Council", the Economic and Social Council should, to the maximum extent possible, refrain from establishing new subsidiary bodies, and drew attention to the fact that draft resolution I was not in keeping with that provision.

15. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia) said that he wished to emphasize the need to find a way of solving the basic problem of how to finance participation by representatives of developing countries in the Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting. If a solution was not found, some representatives from developing countries would be unable to take part in the work of that group, which would then be mostly made up of representatives from developed countries, as had happened in the case of the *Ad Hoc* Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts, which had just fulfilled its mandate.

*Draft resolution I, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote [resolution 1982/67].*

16. Mr. VELLOSO (Brazil), speaking on behalf of the Latin American States, said that the Latin American States had joined in the consensus without prejudice to their position of principle with regard to the composition of the Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts. The breakdown given in paragraph 4 (b) of the resolution was not the usual one; it was acceptable, however, provided that it did not constitute a precedent.

17. The PRESIDENT announced that the election of the members of the Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts would be held at the same time as the other elections called for under agenda item 29 (Nominations and elections), that is, during the second week of November. He therefore requested all the regional groups to hold the consultations necessary for the election of their members. Since the resolution just adopted provided that in the initial stage, the term of membership of half the 34 members of the Working Group should expire after two years, he suggested that at the November elections, lots should be drawn to decide which countries should have a two-year term effective 1 January 1983, with the other members serving for three years. Consequently, he suggested that of the nine members to be chosen from African States, five should be drawn by lot to serve for two years, that of the seven members chosen from the Asian States, three should be drawn by lot to serve for two years, that of the three members chosen from the socialist States of Eastern Europe, one should be drawn by lot to serve for two years, that of the six members chosen from the Latin American States, three should be drawn by lot to serve for two years, and that of the nine members chosen from the Western European and other States, five should be drawn by lot to serve for two years.

*It was so decided.*

*Draft resolution II: Arrangements for completing the formulation of a draft code of conduct on transnational corporations*

*Draft resolution II was adopted without a vote [resolution 1982/68].*

18. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation was opposed to the allocation of additional funds under the regular budget to finance either the special session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations or the meeting of the Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting. If additional funds were required, there should be a redistribution of resources within the limits of approved appropriations.

*Draft resolution III: Activities of transnational corporations in southern Africa and their collaboration with the racist minority regime in that area*

*Draft resolution III was adopted by 31 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions [resolution 1982/69].*

19. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria) and Mr. ALSHAMAA (Iraq) said that if they had been present during the voting, they would have voted in favour of draft resolution III.

*Draft resolution IV: Public hearings on the activities of transnational corporations in South Africa and Namibia*

20. Mr. GADEL HAK (Observer for Egypt) pointed out that the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa was continuing, as were the repressive policies practised by the South African minority régime against the African majority. Moreover, transnational corporations, supported by their home countries, were continuing to support that régime against the wishes of the international community and in defiance of the resolutions adopted by the United Nations. His delegation denounced the policy of the inhuman *apartheid* régime in southern Africa and all attempts to sustain that régime. It was the duty of the international community as a whole, and particularly of the countries directly involved, to denounce the racist régime and work towards its elimination. While they appreciated the positive steps taken by some Governments to terminate the activities of the transnational corporations operating under their authority in southern Africa, the African countries deplored the fact that some other countries were continuing to support the South African régime by increasing their investments in South Africa.

21. Against that background, draft resolutions III and IV submitted by the Commission on Transnational Corporations represented legitimate means of fighting the *apartheid* régime and were an integral part of the international campaign to mobilize public opinion, particularly in the countries where transnational corporations operating in South Africa had their home offices. Some delegations might feel that the draft resolutions merely repeated the terms of previous resolutions and were of doubtful value. That repetition was necessary, however, because the objective sought had not yet been achieved. Moreover, it was all the more fitting to adopt those draft resolutions now because the

General Assembly, in its resolution 36/172 B, had proclaimed the year 1982 the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions against South Africa, and had also adopted resolution 36/172 O, entitled "Investments in South Africa", in which it had urged the Security Council to consider the matter at an early date with a view to taking effective steps to achieve the cessation of further foreign investments in, and financial loans to, South Africa. By adopting the draft resolutions, the Economic and Social Council would be acting in conformity with the expressed desire of the entire international community.

*Draft resolution IV was adopted by 34 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions [resolution 1982/70].*

22. Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community which were members of the Economic and Social Council, said in explanation of vote that those States rejected *apartheid* and favoured a process of peaceful change in southern Africa. With regard to the activities of transnational corporations with headquarters in countries of the Community, they felt that the code of conduct for firms of EEC countries in South Africa, adopted in 1977 to increase the wages of black South African workers, improve their working conditions and guarantee their right of free association, had had a positive influence. However, the States members of the Community had been unable to vote in favour of draft resolutions III and IV because they contained references they found unacceptable and beyond the competence of the Council. He added that the States members of the Community which were members of the Commission on Transnational Corporations had explained their position on the draft resolutions when they had been adopted by the Commission.

23. Mr. AKAO (Japan), explaining his vote, said that it was needless to recall the opposition of the Japanese Government to the South African Government's *apartheid* policy and the measures it had taken to bring the strongest possible pressure on that Government. However, his delegation had abstained in the voting because, while it sympathized with the spirit of the draft resolutions, it considered that the Commission on Transnational Corporations was not competent to deal with the matter.

24. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote, reaffirmed the active support of his delegation for draft resolutions II, III and IV, which it had already expressed at the eighth session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations, and reiterated his reservations on the programme budget implications of all the Commission's recommendations and all the decisions which the Council had adopted or would adopt on the question.

25. Mr. CARLSON (Canada), explaining his vote, said that the Canadian delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution IV, not because it looked with favour on the *apartheid* régime but because it had doubts about the usefulness of holding official public hearings given the political nature of the question. It would have preferred

to have an *ad hoc* group meet and report to the Commission on Transnational Corporations. Furthermore, it felt that the draft resolution somewhat prejudged the question under discussion.

26. Miss MONCADA BERMUDEZ (Nicaragua) said that if she had been present during the voting, she would have voted in favour of draft resolutions III and IV.

27. Mr. ESAN (Nigeria), explaining his vote, pointed out that he had voted for draft resolutions III and IV because they reflected the opposition of his Government to the evils of *apartheid* and racism in southern Africa. The result of the vote on those texts clearly showed that the vast majority of the international community believed that the struggle against *apartheid* should be vigorously pursued and that the activities of transnational corporations in southern Africa were a legitimate sphere of interest of the Commission on Transnational Corporations. His delegation looked forward with interest to the public hearings to be organized by the Commission at its tenth session.

28. Mr. TUAN (Liberia), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation fully supported draft resolutions III and IV. Transnational corporations contributed directly or indirectly to the maintenance of the South African Government's inhuman policy of *apartheid*, and the Commission on Transnational Corporations was fully competent to deal with such matters.

29. Mr. St. AIMEE (Saint Lucia), speaking in explanation of vote, said that no effort should be spared to end the deplorable situation obtaining in southern Africa, and the two resolutions which had just been adopted were conducive to that goal. It had been said that transnational corporations contributed not only to the economic development of developing countries but also to the development of the international community as a whole. Since South Africa was part of that international community, the activities of transnational corporations therefore promoted its development and thus hindered its political evolution. It was with that in mind that his delegation had voted in favour of the two draft resolutions.

*Draft decision I: Date of the ninth session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations*

30. The PRESIDENT said that, in view of the provisions of Council resolution 1982/50 on the revitalization of the Economic and Social Council, and in an attempt to end the practice of holding resumed sessions of the Council, the Bureau recommended that the ninth session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations should be held at Headquarters from 20 to 29 June 1983.

31. Mr. SCHILLER (Observer for Sweden) said he was afraid that if the dates of the ninth session of the Commission were brought forward as proposed by the Bureau, the interval between the special session on the code of conduct and the ninth regular session would be too short for the Secretariat to prepare the necessary documentation. He therefore proposed that the draft

decision should be adopted as it appeared in the Commission's report.

32. Miss DANIELSEN (Norway) agreed with the observer for Sweden that draft decision I should be adopted as it stood. As she had no instructions from her Government concerning any change in the dates of the Commission's ninth session, she proposed that a decision should be deferred until November.

33. Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark) said that he found the Bureau's proposal entirely logical. The current practice should be ended, and the Commission on Transnational Corporations should try to finish its work before the Council's second regular session of 1983, or, in other words, by late June or early July. In his view, a decision in principle should be taken forthwith. He did not doubt that the Commission had had valid reasons for postponing the dates of its ninth session, and it might be advisable to ascertain what those reasons were before taking a final decision. If the new dates proposed by the Bureau would cause difficulties for the Commission, perhaps it would be possible to make an exception for 1983 or at least to wait until the Council's first regular session of 1983 before taking a final decision.

34. Mr. VELLOSO (Brazil) said all the countries of Latin America agreed that the Council should not arrange its programme of work for the convenience of its subsidiary bodies; rather, they should organize their work around the Council's programme. The Bureau's proposal was therefore quite logical, and nothing would be gained by waiting until the first regular session to take a decision on the matter. A decision should be taken forthwith.

35. Mr. LAVROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he fully agreed with the remarks of the representative of Brazil. He did not see why the decision on the dates of the ninth session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations should be deferred. It was important to know the dates of that session now, so that the experts could make the necessary preparations. Moreover, he failed to see why the holding of a special session should hinder preparations for the regular session, since the two sessions were concerned with different matters. In any event, it seemed preferable to him that the sessions of subsidiary bodies should be scheduled in such a way as to facilitate the work of the Council, not to complicate it.

36. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia) agreed with the representative of Brazil that subsidiary bodies should adjust their schedules to that of the Economic and Social Council, and not the reverse. It was essential to return to the former practice and ensure that the Commission on Transnational Corporations met before the second regular session of the Council.

37. Mr. FAURE (France) said that in substance he shared the view expressed by the Brazilian and other representatives. It did seem desirable for subsidiary bodies to take account of the Council's calendar of meetings, but he wondered whether it was possible to take a decision on the matter there and then, before even ascertaining the reasons why the Commission on

Transnational Corporations had once again set unusually late dates for its 1983 session. Perhaps, therefore, the Council could wait until November before taking a final decision, since it would be meeting then to consider other items and to hold elections. While it seemed undesirable to postpone a decision until the Council's first regular session, no great inconvenience would be caused by waiting another week or two.

38. Mr. CARLSON (Canada) endorsed the views expressed by the Brazilian and French delegations. Deferring the decision on the dates of the ninth session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations would be contrary to the revitalization effort decided on by the Council. It should also be borne in mind that the experts involved had to know the dates as soon as possible in order to prepare their work. He therefore agreed with the Bureau's proposal.

39. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) pointed out that if the Council had to hold a resumed second regular session in 1983, as would be the case if the dates proposed in the Commission's report were retained, that might adversely affect the work of the General Assembly itself, and in particular of the Second Committee. Moreover, if the members of the Council decided to wait until the first regular session, which would be held in May 1983, to take a final decision on the dates of the ninth session of the Commission, they should not overlook the documentation problem, namely that the relevant documents had to be submitted to the Secretariat at least six weeks in advance. In other words, if the ninth session of the Commission was to be held in June, the documents would have to be ready by 11 April at the latest. There should not, therefore, be too long a delay in taking a decision.

40. Mr. DIECKMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said he would like to know whether the Commission had postponed its ninth session until late August or early September for technical reasons.

41. Mr. SAHLGREN (Executive Director, United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations) said that the reasons why the members of the Commission on Transnational Corporations had recommended that their ninth session should be held in late August were, firstly, that the Commission had on two or three occasions in the past, held its regular session in the autumn, and, secondly, that the members of the Commission had not wanted the special session and the regular session to be too close together, even though the report of the special session was in fact to be submitted directly to the Economic and Social Council and not to the Commission at its regular session. A third reason had been that the Secretariat wanted more time to submit to the Commission the third integrated study on transnational corporations in world development. The study involved quite an amount of work every four years, and the Commission had requested the Secretariat to submit it four months before the session. Thus, if the Council decided that the ninth regular session of the Commission should be held in June, the Secretariat—that is to say, the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations—

would have to hurry to get the study out in time, and some of its other work might suffer.

42. Mr. DIECKMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said he agreed with the French representative's suggestion that it would be advisable to wait until November before taking a decision, especially as that would give him time to obtain instructions from his Government. Nevertheless, in substance, he still agreed with the representative of Brazil.

43. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said he agreed with the representative of Brazil that it was important to put some order into the meeting arrangements of the Council's subsidiary bodies. The question of the dates for the ninth session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations provided the Council with an immediate opportunity to do some restructuring. As the Executive Director of the Centre on Transnational Corporations had pointed out, the report of the Commission's special session on the draft code of conduct would be submitted directly to the Economic and Social Council, and not to the Commission at its ninth session. The Commission's programme of work would thus be less heavy than usual and it could easily hold its regular session in late June, or even earlier, because, if it met at the end of June, as proposed by the Bureau, it would not have time to submit a very detailed report to the Council at its second regular session. It would therefore be preferable for it to meet even earlier than was proposed by the Bureau, so that it could prepare a fuller report. Apart from that, he entirely agreed with the position taken by the Bureau and the representative of Brazil.

44. Mr. LAVROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reviewed the provisions of draft resolution II relating to completion of the formulation of a draft code of conduct on transnational corporations and the holding of a special session of the Commission, which the Council had adopted earlier in the meeting, and noted that the resolution at no point called upon the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations to prepare a report for the Commission, the Centre was simply requested to ensure that all States were provided with the necessary documentation—which already existed—in order to facilitate their participation in the special session. He did not, therefore, believe that the special session would substantially increase the Centre's workload and did not see why the holding of the ninth regular session of the Commission should be delayed. He accordingly agreed with other delegations that the Bureau's recommendation should be approved.

45. The PRESIDENT said that the Bureau had made its recommendation with due regard to all aspects of the question and after lengthy consultations with the members of the Council. He therefore suggested that, if there were no major objections, draft decision I, as orally amended, should be adopted.

*Draft decision I, as orally amended, was adopted without a vote* [decision 1982/183].

*Draft decision II: Provisional agenda and documentation for the ninth session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations*

46. Mr. VELLOSO (Brazil) said he would like to know what the report mentioned under item 3 of the provisional agenda for the ninth session of the Commission would cover, in view of the fact that it had just been stated that the report on the special session of the Commission would be submitted directly to the Economic and Social Council and not to the Commission at its ninth regular session.

47. Mr. SAHLGREN (Executive Director, United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations) said that, while it was true that at its ninth session the Commission would not deal substantively with the work of the special session, it would nevertheless take note of the progress made in the negotiations at that session.

48. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft decision II.

*Draft decision II was adopted without a vote* [decision 1982/184].

*The Council took note of the report of the Commission on Transnational Corporations on its eighth session* [decision 1982/185]

## AGENDA ITEM 20

### International co-operation and co-ordination within the United Nations system (*continued*) (E/1982/85, E/1982/87)

49. The PRESIDENT invited the Vice-Chairman of the Third (Programme and Co-ordination) Committee to report on the negotiations he had conducted.

50. Mr. ELHASSAN (Sudan) said that the question was a very complex one, requiring lengthier consultations than had been held so far. It had nevertheless been possible to draft an informal text, which was ready to be circulated to the members of the Council. However, he was sure that if the Council authorized him to continue negotiations until the second week in November, it would be possible by then to produce a final text. That extra time would also allow delegations wishing to do so to obtain further instructions from their Governments.

51. The PRESIDENT said he agreed with the representative of the Sudan, and suggested that the Council should resume its consideration of the question of the strengthening of the co-ordination of information systems in the United Nations system at its next meeting.

*It was so decided.*

52. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the report of ACC on expenditures of the United Nations system in relation to programmes (E/1982/87) and said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to take note of that report.

*It was so decided* [decision 1982/186].

## AGENDA ITEM 2

### Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (*continued*) (E/1982/15 and Corr.1 and 2)

53. The PRESIDENT recalled that, in its decision 1982/177, the Council had taken note of the report of the

Committee for Development Planning on its eighteenth session (E/1982/15 and Corr.1 and 2). Referring to paragraph 111 of the report, he said that it was now proposed that the meeting of the working group on development patterns and styles, which had originally been scheduled for Headquarters in early December 1982, should take place at Santiago from 10 to 14 January 1983.

54. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that the change of venue for the meeting of the working group in order to take advantage of the expertise of the Economic Commission for Latin America in that field would entail no additional expenditure; since the working group would use only one language in its discussions, there would be no interpretation costs, and ECLA would provide the necessary facilities without additional cost. The increased travel expenses arising from the change of venue could be met from the resources released through the cancellation of a number of meetings in 1982.

55. Mr. LAVROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he regretted that the information provided by the Secretary had not been given to delegations earlier. He was not flatly opposed to the Secretary's proposal but would prefer to wait until November before taking a final decision on the question, since the proposal was new and required careful consideration.

56. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to defer consideration of the matter until its next meeting, to be held in November.

*It was so decided.*

57. The PRESIDENT noted that, under article 4 of the regulations governing the United Nations Population Award, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 36/201, the Council was to elect, as members of the Committee for the United Nations Population Award, 10 representatives of States Members of the United Nations for a period of three years, with due regard to the principle of equitable geographical representation and the need to include those Member States that had made contributions for the Award. Following their informal consultations on the question, the regional groups concerned had reported that the following allocation of seats had been agreed upon, without prejudice to the respective positions of the regional groups on the principle of equitable geographical distribution: three seats for the African States; two and a half seats each for the Asian States and the Latin American States, to be apportioned as decided by the groups themselves; one seat for the Western European and other States; one seat for the socialist States of Eastern Europe. He asked the regional groups to inform the Secretariat as soon as possible of the names of their candidates, so that the elections could be held in November 1982.

58. He announced that the next meeting of the resumed second session, at which all outstanding questions, including agenda item 29, would be considered, would be held on Tuesday, 9 November 1982.

*The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.*