



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Resumed Forty-eighth Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 26 May 1970,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. J. B. P. MARAMIS (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 4

**Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights
(continued) (E/4791, E/4819, E/4838; E/L.1324)**

1. Mrs. GAVRILOVA (Bulgaria) said that the report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts (E/4791) not only brought to light new facts concerning flagrant violations of trade union rights in southern Africa, particularly in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia, but also testified to an assault on the most elementary human rights and freedoms and the debasement of human dignity. Such a course of action was, of course, logical from the viewpoint of the racist régimes in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia: régimes which advocated *apartheid*, genocide and racial discrimination could hardly be expected to adopt any other policy concerning trade union organization among the indigenous populations of their territories. The struggle of the working people in southern Africa to defend their trade union organizations, rights and freedoms was therefore closely linked with the national liberation struggles as a whole and with the fight against *apartheid* and racial discrimination in general. The struggle to uphold trade union rights and freedoms in southern Africa was a part of the struggle against the transformation of the rich and flourishing African lands into reservations of a concentration-camp type for African workers. In that connexion she endorsed the comments made at the previous meeting by the representatives of the World Federation of Trade Unions and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. The movement of the African peoples in defence of their political and national rights and interests and their right to self-determination and independence was inseparable from the movement to defend their economic, social and cultural rights and freedoms.

2. It was regrettable that, owing to the continued assistance given by the imperialist Powers to the colonial régimes in southern Africa, it had not proved possible to implement relevant United Nations resolutions. The economic partners of the racist régimes deserved to be condemned just as much as those régimes themselves; the United Nations should mobilize the international community for a concerted struggle against *apartheid* in South Africa and racial persecution in Southern Rhodesia and for the strict implementation of all its resolutions calling for economic and other sanctions against those régimes. It should launch an appeal for international solidarity among workers throughout the world in support of the African workers and against the racist régimes' discriminatory policy concerning trade unions.

3. Her delegation felt that the question of the alarming situation with regard to the violation of the trade union

rights and freedoms of the indigenous working population in southern Africa should be raised not only in the Economic and Social Council but also in the General Assembly, and should be considered together with the question of the struggle against *apartheid*. It should also be brought before the Security Council, which had been requested by the General Assembly at its twenty-third and twenty-fourth sessions to take up the question of *apartheid* in general. Her delegation therefore believed that documents E/4791, E/4838 and E/4819 should be submitted for study to the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa and to the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly at the twenty-fifth session.

4. Her delegation would support draft resolution E/L.1324.

5. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that the report in document E/4791 confirmed his delegation's view that steps should be taken immediately to rectify the conditions of repression of human rights prevailing in southern Africa and the Territories under Portuguese administration. His delegation regretted that no firm action had been taken, and felt that the responsibility for failure to do so rested mainly with the major trading partners of the racist régimes in that area.

6. In his view, the report of the ILO was too mild in tone; it was confined to technical aspects of trade union rights, whereas the question of infringements of those rights was an inseparable part of the whole question of racial discrimination and *apartheid*. The ILO should be commended, however, for having made some progress in that field, and the Council should recommend that the ILO continue to study the situation in its broader aspects.

7. The broad question of *apartheid* was not at stake in the Council's consideration of steps to be taken to put an end to infringements of trade union rights; the Council should, at the present stage, consider only what action to take in the light of the reports before it. The *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts should continue to study the situation in southern Africa and other parts of the world. In that connexion, he noted that draft resolution E/L.1324 contained a proposal that the Working Group's mandate should be extended to include consideration of the Portuguese colonies in Africa. His delegation, however, doubted that the Working Group of Experts could do anything to improve the lot of the African inhabitants of those Territories. When the Council had, at the ILO's request, agreed to consider alleged infringements of trade union rights in South Africa, that country had no longer been a member of the ILO; Portugal, however, was still a member, which meant that the matter fell within the ILO's terms of reference, and his delegation accordingly questioned

whether the Council could take it up. He noted that according to document E/4819 the condition of workers in the Portuguese colonies had improved somewhat. His delegation would urge the Council to request the ILO to broaden the scope of its present study in order to take into account human as well as technical aspects of the problem. In that connexion, he endorsed the suggestion made by the representative of the World Federation of Trade Unions. If the ILO did not undertake such a broad study, the Council should consider what further action it could take.

8. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded the general debate on that agenda item. If he heard no further comment, he would take it that the Committee wished to consider draft resolution E/L.1324 at a subsequent meeting.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Work programme of the United Nations in the economic, social and human rights fields (concluded)* (E/4787, E/4793 and Corr.1-4, E/4793 (annex), E/4837 and Corr.1 and Add.1, E/4846 and Add.1 and 2, Add.3 and Corr.1, Add.4-15; E/L.1318/Rev.1, E/L.1321)

9. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that his Government had reservations on two points in draft resolution E/L.1318/Rev.1. Until the United Kingdom representative had proposed the addition of the word "unnecessary", the text of the sixth preambular paragraph had been totally unacceptable to his delegation, which took the view that considerations relating to programming should not be given more weight than budgetary considerations. His delegation still felt that the wording was not completely satisfactory, for one Member State or another might claim with regard to any limitation that it was unnecessary. He would therefore request a separate vote on that paragraph, and would abstain in the voting.

10. With regard to operative paragraph 3, his delegation questioned the logic of requesting the Secretary-General to review his programme projections for 1972 when there were so many factors of which the Secretary-General would not be aware until the next session of the General Assembly. His delegation would therefore request a separate vote on that paragraph too, and would abstain when it was put to the vote.

11. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that he endorsed the remarks of the French representative, particularly with regard to operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution; that paragraph proposed action which, in his delegation's view, would be premature. He could not understand the implications of the word "unnecessary" in the sixth preambular paragraph and wondered if the United Kingdom representative could offer a clarification.

12. His delegation had submitted a draft amendment (E/L.1321) which proposed the addition of the words "in principle" to operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution,

for it was not prepared to support without qualification a text that would have the effect of steering the Council in a direction which his delegation could not unquestioningly accept and causing it to adopt certain priorities to which his delegation could not subscribe.

13. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1318/Rev.1, after careful consideration of the Greek delegation's amendment, felt that to alter operative paragraph 2 in the way it proposed would render it meaningless; they therefore regretted that they could not accept it.

14. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation endorsed the French representative's observations concerning the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution E/L.1318/Rev.1. It had already expressed its view that budgeting should remain within certain limits. If a separate vote was taken on that paragraph, his delegation would vote against it. With regard to operative paragraph 2, the Council should, in his delegation's view, approach the subject of budgetary implications with caution; document E/4793 and Corr.1-4 envisaged considerable increases in staff resources and man-months—in other words, a rapidly expanding bureaucracy. If a separate vote was taken on operative paragraph 2, his delegation would vote against it.

15. The French representative's request for a separate vote on operative paragraph 3 was supported by his delegation, which would vote against that paragraph as well.

16. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) said that his delegation rejected the Greek delegation's amendment in document E/L.1321, for two reasons. Firstly, the addition of the words "in principle" might be taken to imply that the General Assembly, especially the Fifth Committee, had a major reason for not supporting the work programme submitted by the Secretariat. Secondly, since the United Kingdom representative had been satisfied by the addition of the word "unnecessary", his delegation felt that the amendment would be superfluous. He found it difficult to commend the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, and thought the paragraph should state clearly that the Committee's efforts had not come up to the Council's expectations. He would not, however, propose any amendment to that effect.

17. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said, in reply to the Greek representative's request for a clarification regarding the word "unnecessary" in the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, that he would hesitate to give any interpretation of that word. All he could say, therefore, was that the fact that the word was not preceded by the definite article meant that only some limitations were unnecessary, whereas others were necessary.

18. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that, since the amendment in document E/L.1321 did not command overwhelming support, his delegation would withdraw it. However, he requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 2, and said that his delegation would vote against it.

19. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) said that his delegation was prepared to vote in favour of draft resolu-

* Resumed from the 1688th meeting.

tion E/L.1318/Rev.1 on the understanding that the texts of operative paragraphs 5, 9 and 10 meant that Governments would approve the work programme of the Secretary-General in the light of views which had already been expressed at the 1687th meeting during the general debate. With regard to operative paragraphs 9 and 10, he referred to his delegation's earlier comments concerning financial implications. In his delegation's view, programme formulation should properly be integrated with budgetary considerations.

20. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote separately on the sixth preambular paragraph, operative paragraph 2 and operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution E/L.1318/Rev.1.

The sixth preambular paragraph was adopted by 23 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 24 votes to 3.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 23 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

21. The CHAIRMAN put draft resolution E/L.1318/Rev.1 as a whole to the vote.

Draft resolution E/L.1318/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 25 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

22. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of his vote, emphasized the importance which his delegation attached to paragraph 5 concerning the proposed interdisciplinary planning advisory teams. A careful re-examination of the whole financial basis of such teams was clearly needed. There was much to be said for delaying new action in that connexion until the experience gained by the team now operating in the Caribbean area had been evaluated. Furthermore, the endorsement of the Economic Commission for Africa and the Governments concerned should be obtained before a decision was taken on teams for Africa.

23. Mr. KITI (Kenya) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because of the importance it attached to paragraph 2 approving the work programme for 1971, which, despite some shortcomings, was sound. The reference to "unnecessary limitations" in the sixth preambular paragraph was highly appropriate in view of the desire on the part of some to limit the growth of the United Nations by the imposition of unnecessary restrictions. His delegation would also like to stress the usefulness of paragraph 7; a clear statement of objectives in the preparation of programmes by subsidiary organs and programme managers was important if charges of duplication of work were to be avoided.

24. Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation had voted against the sixth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 2 and 3 for reasons which he had stated during the Council's 1688th meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Transport questions (concluded)*:

(a) Review of the activities of the United Nations system of organizations in the transport field (E/4794 and

Add.1, E/4795 and Add.1-4, E/4846/Add.4; E/L.1320);

(b) Transport of dangerous goods (E/4783);

(c) Question of convening a United Nations meeting on containerization (E/4796 and Add.1 and 2, E/4846/Add.4)

25. Mr. JHA (India), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, introduced a draft resolution (E/L.1320) which was non-controversial and might even be described as procedural. The main purpose of the draft was to ensure that the whole question of activities in the transport field received due attention; to neglect it would not be to the advantage of the developing countries. With regard to the operative part of the text, he said that the words "which would be for the development of land transport only" in paragraph 2 were to be deleted, while, in paragraph 3 "land transport" should be replaced by "inland transport".

26. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to operative paragraph 1, proposed the deletion of the words "with appreciation". The Council could not say that it noted the reports in question with appreciation because the arguments put forward in them for the establishment of the proposed transport Centre were inadequate. Also, the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination should not be excluded from the action proposed in operative paragraph 2.

27. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) said that his delegation was concerned at the magnitude and complexity of the questions to be considered by the Council at its forty-ninth and resumed forty-ninth session. If the item now before the Council was to receive the consideration it warranted, it should be deferred until the fiftieth session. He proposed that operative paragraphs 2 and 4 should be amended accordingly.

28. Mr. NONOYAMA (Japan), noting that under operative paragraph 4 consideration of item 10 (a) would be deferred, said that since that item related to both the establishment of the proposed Centre and the proposed meeting of ministers responsible for transport, he wondered why operative paragraph 3 specified that any decision on the latter was to be postponed.

29. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) endorsed the United States proposal to defer consideration of the item before the Council until its fiftieth session.

30. The wording of operative paragraph 2 was not satisfactory because it implied that the Council had decided in principle to establish the proposed Centre. His delegation's understanding was that the Council had decided merely to consider the question of establishing such a Centre. He agreed with the USSR representative that the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination should study that question further.

31. Mr. JHA (India), replying to the USSR representative, observed that the word "appreciation" in operative paragraph 4 was a form of courtesy which did not imply approval. In the light of the USSR remarks, however, he proposed that it should be changed to "satisfaction". As to operative paragraph 2, the sponsors had also considered the

* Resumed from the 1688th meeting.

possibility of routing the question through the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination but, to expedite matters, had decided on the present wording, which did not preclude the Council's acting on the USSR suggestion at a later stage. The CPC had considered the question only two weeks previously and, while it had requested more information, it had given no indication that it was anxious to take it up again. The matter could be referred back to the CPC after the Council had examined the information requested from the Secretary-General in operative paragraph 2.

32. Replying to the Japanese representative, he suggested that, in operative paragraph 4, the words "of item 10 (a)" should be replaced by the words "the question of the proposed Centre", thereby avoiding any misunderstanding.

33. The sponsors could accept the United States proposal regarding operative paragraphs 2 and 4.

34. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that care should be taken when translating the amendments into French, particularly the amendment to operative paragraph 3.

Draft resolution E/L.1320 as a whole, as orally amended, was adopted unanimously.

35. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) emphasized the importance which his delegation attached to the resolution. He wished to state that paragraphs 1, 3 and, especially, 4 should not be interpreted as prejudging the question of establishing the proposed Centre.

AGENDA ITEM 9

The role of the co-operative movement in economic and social development (concluded)* (E/4807 and Corr.1, E/L.1314/Rev.1)

36. Mr. RAHMAN (Pakistan) introduced the revised draft resolution contained in document E/L.1314/Rev.1. The sponsors had tried to clarify certain points raised in the Council's discussion of draft resolution E/L.1314 and to take account of the suggestions made. The following new second preambular paragraph should be inserted in document E/L.1314/Rev.1:

"Taking note of recommendation No. 127 on the role of co-operatives in the economic and social development of developing countries adopted by the International Labour Conference at its fiftieth session at Geneva in 1966."

37. It had been pointed out in the debate that many developing countries were in the pre-co-operative stage, and, accordingly, in operative paragraph 3, the words "to co-operative movements in" had been deleted after the words "support and assistance" so as not to restrict such assistance to individual co-operative movements. Operative paragraph 4 had been entirely redrafted but still reflected the sponsors' original idea. The sponsors did not feel that the revision involved any very substantive changes and they commended the draft resolution for unanimous approval.

* Resumed from the 1688th meeting.

38. Mr. BRECKENRIDGE (Ceylon) said that his Government attached great importance to the co-operative movement and endorsed most of the ideas set forth in the draft resolution. Accordingly, his delegation would like to be included among the sponsors of the draft resolution.

39. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) felt that the new wording of operative paragraph 4 was even more restrictive than the original wording and he questioned the usefulness of including that paragraph at all. The revised text of operative paragraph 3 was to a large extent a repetition of ideas already expressed in the resolutions referred to in the first preambular paragraph. Moreover, paragraph 3 as now worded was a very broad generalization and was perhaps superfluous.

40. Mr. RAHMAN (Pakistan) explained that the words "Member States" in operative paragraph 4 had been replaced by the words "developing countries" because the question of assistance from developed countries was now fully covered in the revised text of operative paragraph 3. The new wording of operative paragraph 4 was not to be interpreted in a restrictive sense. The sponsors felt that operative paragraphs 3 and 4, as revised, expressed essentially the same ideas as those stated less clearly in operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of the original draft resolution. He hoped that his explanation would dispel the misgivings expressed by the Upper Volta representative.

Draft resolution E/L.1314/Rev.1 was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 1

Social Development (E/4864)

The recommendations in paragraphs 16 and 17 of the report of the Social Committee (E/4864) were adopted.

41. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the five draft resolutions recommended by the Social Committee for adoption by the Council, which were contained in paragraph 18 of the report.

42. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) proposed that the word "status" in the title of draft resolution I should be deleted, since it added little to the meaning.

It was so decided.

Draft resolution I, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

Draft resolution II was adopted unanimously.

43. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution II and interpreted operative paragraph 5 as meaning that a special item relating to the subject of the resolution would be included in the agenda of the General Assembly at its next session.

44. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation did not interpret the words "injustice emanating from existing colonial régimes" in operative paragraph 3 of draft

resolution II as referring to any of the United Kingdom's few remaining colonial Territories.

Draft resolution III was adopted unanimously.

45. Mr. FEDOROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution III with the reservation that it did not interpret the reference in operative paragraph 3 to the bodies to be charged with the implementation of the strategy of the Second Development Decade as including the Preparatory Committee for the Second United Nations Development Decade.

46. Mr. HASSAN (Pakistan) recalled that, although his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution III, it maintained the reservations which it had expressed in the Social Committee.

47. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) recalled that, in voting in favour of draft resolution III in the Social Committee, his delegation had expressed reservations concerning some of the views set forth in the report of the Group of Experts on Social Policy and Planning in national development (E/CN.5/445), which were endorsed by the Council in operative paragraph 1 of the resolution. His delegation also wished to make it clear that it did not interpret operative paragraph 8 as meaning that the General Assembly's consideration of the proposed new item at its twenty-fifth session would provide an opportunity for reopening the whole question of the strategy for the Second Development Decade.

48. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) felt that the draft resolutions recommended for adoption by the Council, in particular draft resolutions II and III, contained a number of platitudes and unnecessary repetitions. He cited, in particular, operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution II and

operative paragraphs 1 (b) and (e) of draft resolution III. Prolixity and jargon, which could only lead to ambiguity and misunderstanding, were at all costs to be avoided in Council resolutions.

49. Mr. FEDOROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested that a separate vote should be taken on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution IV.

Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution IV was adopted by 24 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution IV as a whole was adopted by 25 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

50. Mr. FEDOROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution IV but had abstained in the separate vote on operative paragraph 4. It attached great importance to the question of land reform and generally supported the recommendations contained in draft resolution IV. However, the understanding of the term "land reform" differed from country to country, and it was only in the socialist countries that it was interpreted in a radical way as meaning the distribution of land to the peasants and the establishment of adequate living conditions for the rural population. Since there was no general agreement as to the meaning of the term, the recommendation in operative paragraph 4 that the Secretary-General should appoint "a highly qualified specialist in the social aspects and over-all planning of land reform" was premature. Moreover, the nature of the functions and activities of such a specialist were not made clear. Operative paragraph 4 would also entail certain financial implications.

Draft resolution V was adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.