



International Atomic Energy Agency

# GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(XXVI)/OR.246

May 1983\*

GENERAL Distr.

ENGLISH

TWENTY-SIXTH REGULAR SESSION: 20-24 SEPTEMBER 1982

RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-SIXTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna,  
on Friday, 24 September 1982, at 2.45 p.m.

President: Mr. SIAZON (Philippines)

## CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda**</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
-	Oral report by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on the following items:  The Agency's accounts for 1981 The Agency's programme for 1983-88 and budget for 1983 Scale of assessment of Members' contributions for 1983 Staffing of the Agency's Secretariat The financing of technical assistance Amendment of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute	1 - 15
16	Election of Members to the Board of Governors	16 - 18
15	Examination of delegates' credentials	19 - 62
16	Election of Members to the Board of Governors (resumed)	63 - 79
-	Closing of the session	80 - 81

\*/ A provisional version of this document was issued on 13 October 1982.

\*\*/ GC(XXVI)/674.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document GC(XXVI)/INF/208/Rev.4.

ORAL REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

1. Mr. COPITHORNE (Canada), Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, presented the report of the Committee on items 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of the agenda, which had been referred to it for initial discussion.
2. The Committee of the Whole recommended that the General Conference adopt the following draft resolutions:
  - The draft resolution contained in Part I of document GC(XXVI)/665 (item 9 - The Agency's accounts for 1981);
  - The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVI)/671 with the Annex reproduced in document GC(XXVI)/671/Mod.1 (item 11 - Scale of assessment of Members' contributions for 1983); and
  - The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVI)/679 (item 12 - Staffing of the Agency's Secretariat).
3. With regard to item 10, the Agency's programme for 1983-1988 and budget for 1983, the Committee recommended that the General Conference:
  - Adopt draft resolution A (Regular Budget appropriations for 1983) set out in Appendix 5 of document GC(XXVI)/666/Mod.1 on the understanding that the allocation of US \$362 000 for the international plutonium storage study was of a contingency nature and that it was subject to certain constraints which had been formulated in the Committee's decision on that matter. In that connection, the Committee had decided that the summary records of its discussion concerning the question of zero real growth in the Agency's Regular Budget should be transmitted to the Board of Governors;
  - Adopt draft resolutions B and C (Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund allocation for 1983 and the Working Capital Fund in 1983) set out in Annex VII of document GC(XXVI)/666;
  - Adopt the draft resolution concerning the Agency's work in the field of radioactive waste disposal set out in document GC(XXVI)/677; and
  - Adopt the draft resolution concerning a review of the Agency's

activities set out in document GC(XXVI)/678. In that connection, the Committee had decided that the summary records of its discussions on the question should be transmitted to the Board of Governors.

4. Concerning item 13, the financing of technical assistance, the Committee recommended that the General Conference adopt the draft resolution set forth in document GC(XXVI)/680. It had decided that the summary records of its discussions on the question should be transmitted both to the Board of Governors and to the Board's Technical Assistance and Co-operation Committee.
5. With respect to item 14, amendment of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute, the Committee recommended that the General Conference adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVI)/681. It had decided that the summary records of its discussions on that matter should be transmitted to the Board of Governors.
6. The PRESIDENT thanked the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole and suggested that the draft resolutions relating to the items of the agenda that had been referred to the Committee could now be considered by the General Conference with a view to their adoption.
7. It was so agreed.  
The Agency's accounts for 1981
8. The draft resolution contained in Part I of document GC(XXVI)/665 was adopted.  
The Agency's programme for 1983-1988 and budget for 1983
9. Draft resolution A contained in Appendix 5 of document GC(XXVI)/666/Mod.1 and draft resolutions B and C contained in Annex VII of document GC(XXVI)/666 were adopted.
10. The draft resolutions contained in documents GC(XXVI)/677 and GC(XXVI)/678 were adopted.  
Scale of assessment of Members' contributions for 1983
11. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVI)/671 and the Annex reproduced in document GC(XXVI)/671/Mod.1 were adopted.

Staffing of the Agency's Secretariat

12. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVI)/679 was adopted.

The financing of technical assistance

13. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVI)/680 was adopted.

Amendment of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute

14. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVI)/681 was adopted.

15. Mr. SUAREZ de PUGA y VILLEGAS (Spain), referring to item 14, said that his delegation wished to make the same reservations it had expressed during the Committee of the Whole's discussion of the question.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS (GC(XXVI)/667, 676)

16. The PRESIDENT reminded the Conference that 11 Members had to be elected to the Board from the geographical areas specified in paragraph 2 of document GC(XXVI)/676 to ensure that the Board would be constituted in accordance with Article VI.A of the Statute.

17. At the invitation of the President, a member of the Tunisian delegation and a member of the United Kingdom delegation acted as tellers.

18. A vote was taken by secret ballot to elect 11 Members of the Board of Governors.

The meeting was suspended at 3.10 p.m. and resumed at 4.5 p.m.

EXAMINATION OF DELEGATES' CREDENTIALS (GC(XXVI)/682)

19. Mr. AL-KITAL (Iraq) pointed out that when the General Committee had met as a credentials committee seven delegates had rejected the credentials of the Israeli delegation and only six had accepted them. In those circumstances, he was surprised to see that Israel appeared on the list of delegations whose credentials had been considered to satisfy the requirements of Rule 27 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference. Israel had formally declared its annexation of the Golan Heights and of Jerusalem and was continuing to occupy the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Those annexations had been condemned by the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations. His delegation refused to consider Israel to be the legal representative of the peoples of that region. Given the circumstances, the case

of Israel was no different from that of South Africa, and the credentials presented by the delegation from the latter country had been rejected in the past on the same grounds. It was for those reasons that the Iraqi delegation proposed that the text of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 17 of document GC(XXVI)/682 be amended by adding the following phrase at the end of the operative paragraph: "with the exception of the credentials of the delegation from Israel".

20. Mr. DAVIS (United States of America) said that his delegation strongly opposed the amendment submitted by the Iraqi delegation, which was inspired by political considerations that had nothing to do with the Agency's work. To reject the credentials of the Israeli delegation would be contrary to the Statute and to practice. Such a decision would constitute a violation of Article V to the extent that it would be equivalent to suspending the privileges and rights of a Member. Under Article VI.E.3 and Article XIX, the suspension of the exercise of the privileges and rights of membership could only be decided by a two-thirds majority. Other principles would also be called into question by such a decision, including that of the universality of the organization, according to which every Member State had the right to express its views. The Government of the United States, which had condemned the Israeli attack on the Iraqi research reactor, deplored the attempt to impose political sanctions on Israel on the occasion of the examination of a purely technical question, namely that of determining whether delegations' credentials conformed with the rules laid down.

21. His delegation wished it to be clearly understood that, in the event of de facto suspension of the exercise by Israel of the rights and privileges of membership, which would be illegal, it would withdraw from the current session of the General Conference and that the Government of the United States would reconsider its participation in the Agency's work.

22. Mr. EILAM (Israel) said that the rejection of his delegation's credentials would be illegal, arbitrary and discriminatory. It would amount to depriving a Member State of its rights and would violate the principle of the universality of international organizations, a principle which had been confirmed by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The examination of

the credentials submitted by delegates was a purely technical process which should be entirely divorced from any political consideration. If the amendment proposed by the Iraqi delegation were put to a vote, he requested that the vote be by roll-call.

23. Mr. BADDOU (Morocco) said that he supported the arguments put forward by the delegation of Iraq, which were based on human, political and legal considerations. Israel was claiming to represent populations whose territories it had annexed by armed force. Despite the indignation that annexation had aroused in the international community, Israel had opted for scorn and indifference and was pursuing its policy of aggression. The Member States represented at the General Conference must respond by refusing to accept the credentials of the delegation of Israel.

24. Mr. PASHA (Pakistan) stated that he unreservedly supported the amendment tabled by the delegate of Iraq for the reasons clearly set forth by that delegation and by the Moroccan delegation. A Member State that annexed territories by force and thereby failed to comply with internationally accepted norms had no right to be represented at the General Conference.

25. Replying to a request for clarification by Mr. Davis (United States of America), the PRESIDENT explained that a "yes" vote on the amendment proposed by the delegate of Iraq would mean rejection of the credentials of the delegation of Israel and a "no" vote their acceptance.

26. At the request of Mr. Eilam (Israel), a roll-call vote was taken on the amendment proposed by the delegation of Iraq.

27. Lebanon, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Albania, Algeria, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait

Against: Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Guatemala, Holy See, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya

Abstaining: Sri Lanka, Turkey, Egypt, Greece, Ivory Coast, Republic of Korea.

28. The PRESIDENT announced that there were 40 votes in favour and 40 against, with 6 abstentions, and that, in accordance with Rule 78 of the Rules of Procedure, the amendment proposed by the delegation of Iraq was not adopted.

29. At the request of the delegate of Iraq and on the instructions of the President, the SECRETARY read out the list of countries voting and the votes which they had cast.

30. Mr. ANDRIANASOLO (Madagascar) explained that he had been present at the time of the vote and that he wished his vote to be recorded. His delegation voted "yes".

31. Responding to a request from the President for advice on whether the vote of the Malagasy delegation should be recorded or not, Mr. HERRON (Director, Legal Division) recalled that a similar situation had occurred at a meeting of the Board the previous year. One Governor had returned to the room before the

end of the ballot. His advice on that occasion had been that the Governor's vote should be regarded as valid, so as not to deprive a delegation of its sovereign right to vote and in accordance with the principle of international law whereby a defect of form - in that case the late recording of a representative's vote - should not invalidate substance, in other words the vote of the representative in question. In the United Nations organization, the practice was also based on the desire not to deprive a delegation of its right to vote. The vote of the Malagasy delegation should, therefore, be counted in the result.

32. Rising to a point of order, Mr. DAVIS (United States of America) observed that the present situation was different because the results of the vote had already been announced. In the present case, the recording of an additional vote amounted to a reconsideration of the ballot which had already taken place, and a decision to hold a fresh ballot required a two-thirds majority.

33. Mr. BADDOU (Morocco) pointed out that the President had requested the opinion of the Director of the Legal Division, who had duly given his view. It would, therefore, not be appropriate to reconsider a decision which was motivated by the desire to avoid an injustice.

34. Mr. VAN BARNEVELD KOOY (Netherlands) observed that, in the opinion of the Director of the Legal Division, a vote could be counted after the close of the ballot and announcement of the results. He wished to know up to what time a delegate who was absent for a ballot could still have his vote recorded.

35. The PRESIDENT declared that, in the General Assembly of the United Nations, a delegation could still take part in a vote before the results were announced. In the present case the decision was a difficult one. Whichever way the decision went, the rights of one State would be affected. However, basing himself on the opinion of the Director of the Legal Division, he considered that the vote of the Malagasy delegation was valid.

36. Mr. DAVIS (United States of America) said that, in accordance with Rule 56 of the Rules of Procedure, he wished to appeal against the President's ruling.

37. Replying to a request for clarification from the President, Mr. HERRON (Director, Legal Division) explained that, under Rule 56 of the Rules of Procedure, a decision on an appeal against the ruling of the presiding officer required only a simple majority.

38. At the request of Mr. Davis (United States of America), a roll-call vote was taken on his appeal against the President's ruling.

39. Ghana, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Guatemala, Holy See, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Zaire, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany

Against: Ghana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Albania, Algeria, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, German Democratic Republic

Abstaining: Greece, Ivory Coast, Mexico, Romania, Sri Lanka, Turkey, Venezuela, Ecuador, Egypt.

40. There were 37 votes in favour and 40 against, with 9 abstentions. The appeal against the President's ruling was rejected.

41. In accordance with the President's ruling, the amendment proposed by the delegation of Iraq to the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVI)/682 was adopted by 41 votes to 40 with 6 abstentions.

42. Mr. VAN BARNEVELD KOOY (Netherlands) repeated that he wished to know from the Director of the Legal Division up to what time a delegation could still have its vote recorded after the closure of a ballot.

43. The PRESIDENT explained that he had made a ruling after consulting the Director of the Legal Division and that the appeal against that ruling by the United States delegation had not been upheld. The General Conference had, therefore, decided to adopt the amendment proposed by the delegation of Iraq, and the question by the delegate of the Netherlands was purely academic.

44. Mr. DAVIS (United States of America) declared that he would vote against the draft resolution as amended and urged the other delegations to do likewise.

45. At the request of Mr. Davis (United States of America), a roll-call vote was taken on the draft resolution in paragraph 17 of document GC(XXVI)/682, as amended.

46. Burma, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.<sup>1/</sup>

The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Albania, Algeria, Bangladesh

<sup>1/</sup> As the delegate of Burma was not present, the first vote was cast by the delegate of Bulgaria.

Against: Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Guatemala, Holy See, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil

Abstaining: Egypt, Greece, Ivory Coast, Romania, Turkey.

47. There were 41 votes in favour and 39 against, with 5 abstentions. The draft resolution in paragraph 17 of document GC(XXVI)/682, as amended, was adopted.

48. Mr. KELLY (United Kingdom) said that he was disquieted by the use of procedural means to achieve a political end, by the ruling of the President and by the opinion given by the Director of the Legal Division. He remembered that the previous year in the Board the vote of one Governor had been accepted late, but the case had been different. In the circumstances he felt, and a number of delegations felt similarly, that it would not be proper to participate further in the current session of the General Conference. It was with regret that he notified the President that his delegation would now leave the hall.

49. Mr. DAVIS (United States of America) declared that he deplored the President's ruling and was appalled by the opinion rendered by the Director of the Legal Division. The credentials of the delegation of Israel should be accepted as they were absolutely in accordance with the established rules. An item such as the examination of delegates' credentials must not be used as a pretext for re-opening a debate which had already been closed by the decision of the General Conference to reject a draft resolution on the suspension of Israel from the exercise of the privileges and rights of membership. The extent to which the Agency had become politicized, as evidenced by the resolution just adopted, was wholly unacceptable to his Government. The Agency had been founded as a technical body to promote the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Instead, it had become a forum for political debates. The persistent abuse of the United Nations system for the pursuit of political vendettas was an exceptionally

dangerous course. The politicization of the Agency must cease. In the circumstances, his delegation must withdraw from the General Conference. His Government would reassess its policy regarding United States support for and participation in the IAEA and its activities.

50. Mr. YAMATO (Japan) said that, in the view of his delegation, the purpose of the examination of credentials was to ascertain whether their form satisfied the requirements of the Agency; any considerations extraneous to that purpose - for example, considerations regarding the policies of a particular government - had no place in the examination of credentials. His delegation had therefore voted against the proposal to reject the credentials of the Israeli delegate. He considered it regrettable that such an important question had been decided by a voting procedure which itself had raised much controversy.

51. Mr. COPITHORNE (Canada) observed that the credentials of delegations should be examined only from the point of view of their conformity with the rules. A delegation whose credentials satisfied the rules should not be prevented from taking its seat. The procedure which had been followed amounted to recourse to devious means in order to bring about a result which could not be achieved directly. His delegation had voted against the draft resolution as amended.

52. Mr. RUGGIERO (Italy) stated that his delegation had been surprised by the ruling given by the President on the advice of the Director of the Legal Division. Its surprise was such that the Italian delegation felt obliged to leave the hall and not to take any further part in the twenty-sixth session of the General Conference.

53. Mr. THABAULT (France) said that the acceptance of an additional vote after the results of the ballot had been officially announced was without precedent. On that point, and that point alone, he was in profound disagreement with the manner in which the proceedings had been conducted.

54. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia) declared that he was deeply concerned by the illegal situation in which the General Conference had been placed as a result of the present debate. At the plenary meeting that morning the General Conference had rejected a draft resolution on the suspension of Israel from the exercise of its privileges and rights of membership.

55. Mr. SCHACK LARSEN (Denmark) explained that his position was based solely on legal considerations. The credentials of a delegation should be examined only from the point of view of their conformity with the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference and the Statute. No political considerations should enter into the examination of a delegation's credentials. The decision which had been taken was tantamount to the suspension of a Member of the Agency by a simple majority when in fact a two-thirds majority was required for such a decision. An organization which did not respect its statute or rules of procedure became very vulnerable.

56. Mr. AL-KITAL (Iraq) reported that the Malagasy delegate had been in the hall<sup>2/</sup> at the time of the ballot and that he had notified the Secretariat of the General Conference that he would register his vote. He thanked the President for his courage in defending legality.

57. Mr. BRENNAN (Ireland) declared that his delegation was traditionally opposed to the use of a vote on the credentials of a delegation in order to achieve what could not be achieved by a vote on the suspension of a Member State. Such a procedure was regrettable since it ran counter to the smooth functioning of the Agency and could only bring harm to its reputation.

58. Mr. PREVEDOURAKIS (Greece) said that his delegation had abstained from voting. The General Committee and the General Conference should not bring political considerations into play when examining the credentials of delegations. By doing so, they might infringe the Agency's Statute and harm its credibility. The Israeli attack on the Iraqi reactor also threatened the Agency's Statute, and the aggressive policy which the Israeli Government had since pursued certainly did nothing to allay fears. His delegation had abstained because it wished firmly to express its opposition to that policy without contributing to a trend which rendered the Agency more vulnerable.

59. Mr. DERPSCH BARTSCH (Chile) declared that he was also opposed to the procedure that had been followed. The resolution which had been adopted was contrary to the Statute.

60. Mr. BADDOU (Morocco) said that the votes that had taken place were in conformity with the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference since the

---

<sup>2/</sup> The delegate used the word 'hall'.

President's ruling had been made on the advice of the Director of the Legal Division. He was disappointed by the reactions to those votes, which were also in accordance with the rules of democracy applied in Western Europe, rules which his country admired and sought to emulate. He paid tribute to the courage of the President.

61. Mr. GHAZALI bin Hj. Abd. RAHMAN (Malaysia) explained that he had voted for the draft resolution as amended since it was an attempt to stem the erosion of moral values throughout the world.

62. Mr. BARUTÇU (Turkey) stated that he had abstained because two quite separate issues had been put to the vote: firstly, the suspension of Israel, which his delegation had supported at the previous meeting and, secondly, the examination of credentials.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS (GC(XXVI)/667, 676) (resumed)

63. The PRESIDENT informed the General Conference of the results of the voting:

64. The result of the election of two Members from the area of Latin America was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	19
<u>Valid votes:</u>	218
<u>Required majority:</u>	37
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Brazil	72
Mexico	73
Venezuela	73

65. Having obtained the required majority, Brazil, Mexico and Venezuela were elected to the Board.

66. The result of the election of two Members from the area of Western Europe was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	19
<u>Valid votes:</u>	139
<u>Required majority:</u>	35
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Denmark	71
Portugal	68

67. Having obtained the required majority, Denmark and Portugal were elected to the Board.

68. The result of the election of one Member from the area of Eastern Europe was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	4
<u>Valid votes:</u>	75
<u>Required majority:</u>	38
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Bulgaria	75

69. Having obtained the required majority, Bulgaria was elected to the Board.

70. The result of the election of two Members from the area of Africa was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	23
<u>Valid votes:</u>	135
<u>Required majority:</u>	34
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	69
Zaire	65
Kenya	1

71. Having obtained the required majority, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Zaire were elected to the Board.

72. The result of the election of one Member from the area of the Middle East and South Asia was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	4
<u>Valid votes:</u>	74
<u>Required majority:</u>	38
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Pakistan	38
Syrian Arab Republic	36

73. Having obtained the required majority, Pakistan was elected to the Board.

74. The result of the election of one Member from the area of South East Asia and the Pacific was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	7
<u>Valid votes:</u>	71
<u>Required majority:</u>	36
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Thailand	71

75. Having obtained the required majority, Thailand was elected to the Board.

76. The result of the election of one Member from the area of Africa, or of the Middle East and South Asia or of South East Asia and the Pacific was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	10
<u>Valid votes:</u>	69
<u>Required majority:</u>	35
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Kenya	69

77. Having obtained the required majority, Kenya was elected to the Board.

78. The PRESIDENT, after congratulating the 11 Members so elected, recalled that under Article VI.D of the Statute they would hold office from the end of the current session until the end of the twenty-eighth regular session of the General Conference, i.e. for a period of two years.

79. He thanked the delegations of Tunisia and the United Kingdom, which had provided tellers, the two tellers themselves, and their Secretariat assistants.

#### CLOSING OF THE SESSION

80. After the customary acknowledgements and expressions of appreciation, the PRESIDENT, in accordance with Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedure, invited the delegates to observe a minute's silence for prayer or meditation.

All present rose and stood in silence for one minute.

81. The PRESIDENT declared the twenty-sixth session of the General Conference closed.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

