



## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Forty-sixth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 6 June 1969,  
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

Page

## Agenda item 14:

*Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights (concluded)* . . . . . 1

President: Mr. Raymond SCHEYVEN (Belgium).

## AGENDA ITEM 14

*Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights (concluded)* (E/4610, E/4613, E/4646, E/L.1257/Rev.1)

1. The PRESIDENT requested the Council to consider the revised version of the draft resolution now before it (E/L.1257/Rev.1).

2. Mr. JHA (India) pointed out that, at the previous meeting, the discussion of the draft resolution, and in particular of the second part of operative paragraph 15, had been marked by some confusion, since several delegations thought that, at its resumed forty-seventh session, the Council should consider in detail the report of the International Labour Organization (ILO) on the position concerning the infringements of trade union rights in the Portuguese colonies, and then decide, if it so desired, to transmit it to the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts, whereas the sponsors of the draft resolution, including the Indian delegation, thought that the Council should decide forthwith that, at its resumed forty-seventh session, it would confine itself to receiving the ILO's report and transmitting it to the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts for possible future consideration. That second view was reflected in the present wording of operative paragraph 15 and there were a number of arguments in its favour. Firstly, at its resumed forty-seventh session, the Council might not have the necessary time to study the ILO's report in depth and to express an opinion on it in full knowledge of the facts. That argument had been put forward by the ILO representative himself at the previous meeting. Secondly, all delegations appeared to agree that it was essential to investigate the situation of trade unionism in the Portuguese colonies in Africa. In fact, during its visit to Africa, the Group had been able to collect a certain amount of evidence attesting to the existence of infringements of trade union rights in those Territories, but its mandate did not allow it to pursue an investigation: for example, the working conditions of the Africans employed on large hydro-electric project in Mozambique were akin to slavery. Furthermore, several documents submitted by the Commission on Human Rights established the fact that each year Portugal sent a large number of African workers from Mozambique to work in the mines of South Africa in return for a certain amount of gold. When those workers returned to Mozambique, they had,

in addition, to pay taxes on the pittance they had laboriously earned in South Africa while working in conditions of real slavery, after having been coerced and forced to go there by the Portuguese Government. A third argument underlying operative paragraph 15 of the draft resolution was that the Council should inform the ILO now what would happen to the report it had asked the ILO to prepare. Lastly, in the Portuguese colonies in Africa not only were there infringements of trade union rights; there might also be certain categories of workers who did not even have the right to form trade unions, as was the case for instance of agricultural workers in the rebellious colony of Southern Rhodesia. The international organizations responsible for watching over trade union freedoms were then powerless. How could they investigate the position of trade unions which did not exist? In the circumstances, the Ad Hoc Group would make it possible to obtain information on the situation of workers who were denied the right of association.

3. Those were the various considerations underlying operative paragraph 15 of the draft resolution and he thought that to delete the second part of the paragraph might delay the urgently needed investigation into infringements of trade union rights in the Territories under Portuguese administration.

4. Mr. OLDS (United States of America) recalled the position taken by his delegation at the previous meeting and said that the draft resolution contained three different categories of recommendations. The first, which included the recommendations contained in operative paragraphs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 12, could have the unreserved support of his delegation. In fact, the measures recommended in those paragraphs were long overdue and followed logically from the results of the investigation carried out by the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts. They were directly linked to allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights and were absolutely within the competence of the Council. On the other hand, the other two categories of recommendations gave rise to more or less serious reservations on the part of his delegation. One category was addressed either to specific organizations or to nations, and it was impossible for the United States delegation to take a stand on them without further clarification. Operative paragraph 15, for example, raised a problem of competence which was of crucial importance. For many years it had been part of the ILO's mandate to deal with allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights, particularly in the Portuguese colonies. One of the Council's responsibilities was to settle questions of competence between the various United Nations organizations and to ensure co-ordination of their activities. That responsibility was, of course, made increasingly difficult and complex by the considerable expansion of the scope of activities of the United Nations and the

proliferation of organizations in all fields, but nevertheless it should remain a central concern of the Council. Duplication and overlapping resulting from a lack of co-ordination led to unnecessary expenditure and reduced the effectiveness of the whole Organization. The recommendations addressed to nations, and in particular to the United Kingdom, fell within the same category, and his delegation would need further particulars before determining whether the Council was competent to recommend the measures in question.

5. Lastly, the third category of recommendations gave rise to very serious reservations on the part of his delegation. That category included operative paragraphs 2, 14, 16, 17 and 19 of the draft resolution, bearing on the renewal of the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts. His delegation had no intention whatsoever of opposing the search for the truth on infringements of trade union rights, but the results of the investigation carried out by the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts were generally conclusive and the supporting evidence was sufficiently convincing to establish the existence of such infringements and to prompt the Council to take the necessary decisions. It would therefore be completely superfluous to renew the mandate of the Group, which could only embellish the facts which it had already drawn to the attention of the Council, without modifying them in substance, and his delegation was opposed to the renewal of its mandate.

6. In view of those observations, he requested a separate vote on operative paragraphs 2, 9, 10, 11 and 13 to 23 of the draft resolution.

7. Mr. SHAHEED (International Labour Organization), replying to the question raised by the representative of India at the previous meeting concerning the measures taken by the ILO with regard to workers in Southern Rhodesia who, under the 1959 Industrial Conciliation Act, did not have the right to form trade unions, drew the Council's attention to the report of the Committee on Freedom of Association of the International Labour Office contained in an annex to the note of the Secretary-General (E/4610). Paragraph 4 of the report stated that the Committee had disposed of certain allegations of infringements of trade union rights, but that one of the questions still outstanding concerned the organizing rights of agricultural workers and domestic servants. In that connexion, he also referred to paragraph 46 of the report, according to which the ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations had stated that it would be glad if the Government of Southern Rhodesia would indicate the measures which it was proposed to take to guarantee the right of persons employed in farming operations (including forestry), or of domestic servants in private households to associate for all lawful purposes. The same paragraph pointed out that, during the forty-fifth session of the International Labour Conference in 1961, a representative of the Government of Southern Rhodesia, intervening at the request of the representative of the United Kingdom had stated before the Conference Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations that the question of including agricultural workers and domestic servants within the Industrial Conciliation Act would be further considered

in the light of the observations of the Committee of Experts. In paragraph 52, sub-paragraph (7), the Committee recommended the Governing Body of the ILO to reaffirm that agricultural workers and domestic servants should be guaranteed the right to associate for all lawful purposes. Lastly, he drew the Council's attention to paragraph 7 of the report of the Committee on Freedom of Association, which clearly indicated the position taken by the ILO towards the authorities in Southern Rhodesia following the adoption of a resolution by the Governing Body at its 163rd session in November 1965<sup>1/</sup> and resolution 217 (1965) adopted by the Security Council on 20 November 1965.

8. Referring to operative paragraph 15 of the draft resolution (E/L.1257/Rev.1) and to the Indian representative's remarks, he said that the ILO would endeavour to submit as quickly as possible the report which the Council had asked it to prepare, but that it would then be for the Council to decide what action to take on it, since the ILO was not competent to make such a decision.

9. He observed, moreover, that some of the draft resolution's provisions, particularly operative paragraphs 6 and 12, seemed incompatible with some of the broad principles of trade unionism recognized by the ILO and set forth in relevant international instruments. For one thing, trade unions had to be freely constituted and not created by an outside body. For another, trade union organizations must be able to act in complete freedom and subject to no outside influence, governmental or otherwise. The Council might put suggestions or recommendations to them, but had no right to give them orders.

10. Lastly, in view of the ILO's primary responsibility concerning allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights in Southern Rhodesia, he felt that the draft resolution should, *inter alia*, provide expressly that the reports of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts should be forwarded to the ILO Governing Body.

11. Mr. HAQUE (Pakistan) said that a compromise text had been prepared, and that the sponsors whom he had consulted had agreed to it. Paragraph 15 of draft resolution E/L.1257/Rev.1 should therefore be amended; the phrase "further decides to transmit this report thereafter" should be replaced by the phrase "decides to consider at that session the necessity of transmitting the report". In addition, the phrase "regarding the existence of racial and other discriminatory factors in the situation pertaining to trade unionists in the above-mentioned colonies" should be deleted from the end of the paragraph.

12. He recalled that a number of minor drafting changes had been proposed orally at the previous meeting.

13. Mr. JHA (India) said that his delegation was fully aware of the importance of the role played by the ILO in the efforts to improve the situation of non-union workers or of workers belonging to unregistered organizations; it had simply wished to know how the machinery of investigation was set in motion.

<sup>1/</sup> See International Labour Office, *Official Bulletin*, vol. XLIX, No. 1 (January 1966), pp. 27-28.



14. The ILO representative's remark concerning paragraph 6 of the draft resolution was highly relevant; he proposed that, in order to take account of it, that paragraph should be amended by replacing the phrase "and replace it by freely constituted trade unions" by the phrase "and enable freely constituted trade unions to be established". Furthermore, the draft resolution must mention that the reports of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts should be forwarded to the ILO Governing Body; that was a most regrettable omission. He therefore proposed that the phrase "and further decides to transmit the above reports to the Governing Body of the International Labour Organization" should be added—at the end of paragraph 8, for example.

15. Mr. HAQUE (Pakistan) said that the phrase which the Indian representative had just read out would be better as a new paragraph 19 rather than as an addition to the end of paragraph 8. The subsequent paragraphs would then have to be renumbered, and the paragraph number mentioned in the new paragraph 23 (former paragraph 22) would have to be amended accordingly.

16. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) requested clarification of the meaning of the words "consider... the necessity" in the new text proposed by the Pakistan representative for paragraph 15. Was the inference that the necessity already existed, or that its existence was to be ascertained?

17. Mr. HAQUE (Pakistan) said that his delegation was by no means trying to prejudge the Council's intentions; the words "the necessity" could be replaced by the words "whether it would be necessary".

18. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he was not prepared to accept that amendment; the text agreed to by the sponsors was "decides to consider... the necessity", and he wished that wording to be maintained.

19. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) said that his delegation could hardly vote in favour of a paragraph whose meaning was not clear to it.

20. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) replied that the text was absolutely clear and unambiguous. The original wording should be maintained.

21. Mr. HAQUE (Pakistan) confirmed that there was no intention of prejudging the Council's decision; in any case, the question was solely one of semantics.

22. Mr. JHA (India) appealed to the Norwegian representative not to press for an alteration of the wording; it had been very difficult to reach a compromise formula to which everyone could agree and it would be highly inadvisable to reopen discussion of paragraph 15. In his view, the text did not prejudice the Council's intentions but rather hinted at possible future action.

23. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council), at the request of the President, read out the draft resolution (E/L.1257/Rev.1) as orally amended during the meeting, namely: with the Pakistan amendment to paragraph 15, the Indian amendment to paragraph 6 and the addition of a new paragraph 19 (proposed by India and taken up by Pakistan).

24. The PRESIDENT called on the Council to vote on paragraphs 2, 9, 10, 11 and 13 to 24, on which the United States representative had requested separate votes.

*Paragraph 2 was adopted by 18 votes to none with 6 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 9 was adopted by 18 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 10 was adopted by 17 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.*

*Paragraphs 11 and 13 were adopted by 22 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 14 was adopted by 19 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 15 was adopted by 18 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 16 was adopted by 18 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.*

*Paragraphs 17 and 18 were adopted by 19 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 19 (new paragraph) was adopted by 20 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

*Paragraphs 20, 21 and 22 (former paragraphs 19, 20 and 21) were adopted by 19 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 23 (former paragraph 22) was adopted by 18 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 24 (former paragraph 23) was adopted by 18 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.*

25. The PRESIDENT then called on the Council to vote on the draft resolution (E/L.1257/Rev.1) as a whole.

*The draft resolution as a whole, as orally amended, was adopted by 22 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

26. Mr. DEJAMMET (France) said that his delegation had followed the discussion with keen interest and fully appreciated the gravity of the question. His delegation wished to make quite clear how strongly it disapproved of the policy of apartheid and to condemn the violations of trade union rights inspired by that policy. For that reason it particularly regretted that the draft resolution had been presented in a form that was bound to engender doubts and reservations. He recalled the position taken by his delegation, namely that, on purely legal grounds, it could not endorse a decision giving a United Nations organ quasi-judicial powers of investigation over and above the obligations traditionally assumed by Member States. The French delegation had therefore abstained from voting on the paragraph of the draft resolution relating to the establishment of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts and had maintained the same position on the question defining the Group's functions and extending its mandate. Apart from that legal reservation France also had reservations concerning the provisions authorizing the Ad Hoc Group to continue its investigations into the infringements of trade union rights in Territories for which the United Kingdom and Portugal were responsible. Since those two States were members of the ILO, his delegation felt that the only organ com-

petent to investigate the situation with regard to trade union rights in those Territories was the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission on Freedom of Association of the ILO.

27. Despite the improvements that had been made to the text his delegation had had to abstain from voting on it, since the legal and constitutional difficulties it presented had not been solved.

28. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) said that while his delegation shared the misgivings of the French delegation in many respects it had voted for the draft resolution because of the great importance which his Government attached to trade union rights. Nevertheless it had serious reservations on some points, particularly with regard to paragraphs 9 and 10. He wished to make it clear that in voting on paragraph 15 he had understood that paragraph to mean that the necessity for transmitting the ILO report to the Ad Hoc Working Group had not yet been established and should be discussed further. An important question of interpretation could hardly be settled by treating it as a problem of semantics.

29. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that, first of all, his delegation had only received the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts (E/4646) a week ago, and had consequently not been able to study it as thoroughly as the delegations which were represented on the Ad Hoc Working Group; it was unfortunate that the Council had had to take a decision on it so hastily.

30. The resolution just adopted by the Council had been submitted primarily by the delegations which were represented in the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts and which were, in essence, asking the Council to congratulate them on the work they had done and request them to continue it. His delegation held the experts of the Working Group in high esteem but felt bound to point out that the effect of that procedure would be to diminish the scope of some parts of the resolution somewhat and almost to transform them into unilateral decisions taken by the very parties who stood to benefit by their adoption. From that point of view, the resolution could appear to be not wholly impartial because the members of the Working Group were simultaneously acting as judge, jury and prosecuting counsel, to borrow an image from Alice in Wonderland. Despite that handicap, some parts of the document bore witness to the wisdom and experience of its authors.

31. He was grateful to the representative of Pakistan for having drawn attention to the fact that the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group was not the only document before the Council, which also had the report of the Committee on Freedom of Association of the ILO (E/4610, annex) to consider. The United Kingdom delegation fully shared the concern expressed by other delegations with regard to infringements of trade union rights in southern Africa; nevertheless those infringements were only one facet of the racial policies which were being pursued by the régimes of that region and which the United Kingdom Government had always categorically condemned, whether it was the policy of apartheid of the Government of South Africa or its attitude to Namibia, or the racist policy of the illegal regime in Southern Rhodesia.

32. His delegation, which had voted in favour of paragraphs 4 and 5 of resolution 1302 (XLIV) at the Council's forty-fourth session, would have liked to support the corresponding paragraphs of the resolution which the Council had just adopted. But if the Council's recommendations were to be all useful they must rest on a sound juridical basis and must be practical. His delegation had studied the report and the draft resolution before the Council with that principle in mind.

33. With regard to Southern Rhodesia, he wished again to inform the Council that his Government was not in a position to ensure that the recommendations in the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts were carried out; it would therefore be unrealistic for him to support those recommendations. The conclusions in paragraph 160 of the report (E/4646) corresponded neither to the facts nor to the contents of the communication which the United Kingdom had addressed to the ILO, as quoted in paragraph 109 of the same document. On the other hand, his delegation accepted the conclusions of the report of the ILO Committee on Freedom of Association (E/4610, annex) which was unquestionably a document of great value which took account of legal realities and showed great impartiality.

34. It was for those reasons that his delegation had voted against operative paragraphs 9 and 10 of the draft resolution, which failed to take account of the fact that the United Kingdom Government was at present quite unable to implement the provisions of those paragraphs. Moreover, he was not convinced of the need to extend the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts, especially for an additional period of two years, and could not agree that the Group should be given tasks which were within the competence of the ILO.

35. His delegation had abstained from voting on paragraph 17 of the draft resolution because of its possible financial implications and had been unable to vote for the last paragraph, which interfered with the Secretary-General's right to assign the staff of the Secretariat as he saw fit and which might even to some extent be understood to imply a criticism of the Secretary-General. For all those reasons, the United Kingdom delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

36. Mr. JHA (India) observed that the sarcastic remarks of Mr. Allen, who had said that some members of the Council were acting as judge, jury and prosecuting counsel at the same time, were difficult to reconcile with the compliments addressed to the Ad Hoc Working Group at Geneva by the representative of the United Kingdom Government, who had specifically complimented the members of that group on the quality of their work and on the impartiality they had shown.

37. Mr. DEBERGH (Belgium) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution (1216 (XLII)) authorizing the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts to investigate allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights because it attached great importance to respect for the principle of freedom of association, and in particular, to the right of workers to form trade associations without interference from the authorities.



38. His delegation had abstained during the vote on Council resolution 1302 (XLIV), extending the field of competence of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts, because it felt that the extension of the Group's mandate to cover territories with different constitutional systems gave rise to complex problems for which no adequate preparation had been made.

39. The resolution which the Council had just adopted suffered from the same defects.

40. In particular, his delegation could not agree with the view underlying the paragraphs dealing with Southern Rhodesia, which laid the blame for infringements of trade union rights in that region upon the United Kingdom. That view was inconsistent with the carefully worded recommendations of the Committee on Freedom of Association on trade union rights (E/4610, annex, para. 52).

41. Consequently, while the Belgian delegation might have been able to accept the operative paragraphs of the resolution in so far as they were of a humanitarian nature and represented a real attempt to protect trade union rights, it had been unable to support them as a whole.

42. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania), exercising his right of reply, said that it was untrue that the members of the Ad Hoc Working Group had acted simultaneously as judge, jury and prosecuting counsel or that the resolution just adopted by the Council and the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group (E/4646) were unilateral documents, as the United Kingdom representative had alleged. One had only to read the mandate given to the Ad Hoc Working Group to see that the United Kingdom had been requested to co-operate with the Group to enable it to discharge its mandate in respect of Southern Rhodesia. The Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts had asked the United Kingdom to co-operate, but its request had not been heeded.

43. Why should the United Kingdom be unable to take action to rectify the situation in Southern Rhodesia? The United Kingdom Government had always maintained that Southern Rhodesia was a rebel colony under its exclusive jurisdiction and that the United Kingdom was responsible for restoring law and order there. If that were the case, why had it not put an end to that rebellion as it had done in the past in many other African and Asian countries and, more recently, in Anguilla? It was true that the people of Anguilla were mostly of African origin, which possibly explained why the United Kingdom had been able to suppress the rebellion on that island, while it had been unable to do the same in Southern Rhodesia, where the rebels were whites of British origin. That seemed to be the only real explanation for the powerlessness of the United Kingdom which, in the past, had never lacked the means or the determination to crush a rebellion in any territory or colony under its jurisdiction. The United Kingdom's cynicism in the present situation clearly showed that racial considerations kept it from taking action.

44. There was no doubt that the United Kingdom had abdicated its responsibilities in Southern Rhodesia. The United Kingdom Government was fully aware of the situation in the Territory and had done virtually

nothing to remedy it, apart from calling Smith a rebellious traitor to the Crown. Yet, that traitor had been regally received aboard two warships of the British Navy. He noted that it was not the practice of Governments to deal with traitors or to hold consultations with them and recalled that several years earlier, when a "rebellion" had broken out in Cyprus, the United Kingdom Government had invited Archbishop Makarios to enter into negotiations concerning the country's constitutional future and had taken that opportunity to deport him to the Seychelles. The traitor Ian Smith had been aboard a British warship twice, and nothing of the sort had ever happened to him.

45. The United Kingdom representative had stated that his Government was not in a position to apply the provisions of paragraph 10 of the resolution that the Council had just adopted. But could he explain why his Government had authorized the promulgation of the Emergency Powers Act in 1960? Rhodesia had not been a rebel colony at that time. Nor could it be forgotten that the Industrial Conciliation Act of 1959 had been approved by the British Parliament. What had the United Kingdom Government done to prevent the promulgation of those laws or to repeal them?

46. It was not surprising that the United Kingdom delegation welcomed the report of the Committee on Freedom of Association of the ILO, since that body blindly accepted the United Kingdom Government's fallacious arguments in support of its inaction. The truth of the matter was that the United Kingdom neither wished nor intended to restore the legitimate rights of the African population of Southern Rhodesia and sought only to perpetuate rule by the white majority of British origin. It was easy to declare opposition to apartheid and racism; however, if that opposition was genuine, it must be translated into action. There was still time to act in Southern Rhodesia, and the United Kingdom was able to do so. It asserted that it alone held constitutional authority in Southern Rhodesia, where it was the administering Power. If that was the case, why did it not use its powers? If it was unable to do so, it should admit that openly and cease pretending to be an "administering" Power.

47. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) associated himself whole-heartedly with the comments made by the representatives of India and the United Republic of Tanzania in response to the deplorable attacks by the United Kingdom delegation.

48. It was a pity that the United Kingdom representative had not seen fit to address himself to the specific cases mentioned in the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts and had chosen once again to plead "powerlessness" on the part of his Government. As the Tanzanian representative had pointed out, the United Kingdom appeared to be "powerless" only when it came to intervening in Southern Rhodesia, as the people of Anguilla had just learned to their cost.

49. Lastly, it would be noted that, although all delegations without exception condemned apartheid and racism and periodically made eloquent statements on the subject, some representatives of great or medium-sized Powers cast negative votes or abstained when it came to taking decisions which might yield positive

results. In so doing, those Powers were standing in the way of the attainment of the objectives of the United Nations Charter. Upper Volta, for its part, would relentlessly continue to fight for those objectives and for the full enjoyment by the African people of their legitimate rights.

50. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that he fully understood the feeling aroused among the African countries when such subjects were discussed; however, the Economic and Social Council was not the appropriate forum for a discussion of Southern Rhodesia's constitutional problems. He was sincerely sorry if his remarks had offended anyone and he wished to assure the Council that he had by no means sought to question the good faith or impartiality of the members of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts.

51. In any event, his delegation had not alleged that the report of the Group of Experts was a unilateral document; it had simply feared that some parts of the resolution might give the impression that it was a unilateral document.



52. Mr. CALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) said that, as a member of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts and a sponsor of the resolution which the Council had just adopted, he felt obliged to refute the uncalled for and offensive remarks made by the United Kingdom representative in his first statement. He hoped that those unfortunate comments were merely the result of an error of judgement concerning the questions which the Council had just considered.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*