



## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Resumed Forty-eighth Session  
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Thursday, 28 May 1970,  
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

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

## AGENDA ITEM 5

**Report of the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning (concluded) (E/L.1323)**

1. The PRESIDENT recalled that the Council had to vote on draft resolution E/L.1323.

2. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) announced that the sponsors of the draft resolution had revised their text in order to take account of the objections raised by certain delegations, in particular, those of the Soviet Union, Italy and the United Kingdom. The third preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 had been deleted. The former operative paragraph 3 had become the new operative paragraph 1. Operative paragraph 2 had been retained, but the word "Also" had been deleted from the first line. The former operative paragraph 4 had been renumbered paragraph 3 and reworded to read:

*"Requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with the specialized agencies concerned, to submit to the Council at its fiftieth session reformulated proposals for the campaign to focus world-wide attention on and mobilize public and government support for housing, building and planning, taking into account the views of Member States in document E/C.6/92 and the suggested objectives in the report of the Council to the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session;"*

The former operative paragraph 5 had been renumbered operative paragraph 4 and revised as follows: the words "discussed in document E/C.6/98" should be inserted between the words "his comments on the proposed new international institution" and "to support domestic savings". The former paragraph 6 had been deleted. However, the sponsors would like the two passages which had been deleted to be reproduced in the report of the Council to the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session, so that the Secretary-General, in the report which he was to prepare in accordance with resolution 1170 (XLI), could take into account the objectives suggested in former paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

3. Mr. BOURGOUIN (France) said that he welcomed the changes in the draft resolution but would like the words "on the proposed new international institution discussed in document E/C.6/98 to support domestic savings" in paragraph 4 to be replaced by "on the various international solutions which would make it possible to strengthen national savings".

4. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said, in reply to the representative of France, that the intention was that the draft

resolution should only mention the institution which had been discussed in document E/C.6/98.

5. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he appreciated the changes made to the draft resolution but intended to request a separate vote on the new operative paragraph 4.

6. Mrs. GAVRILOVA (Bulgaria) said that her delegation appreciated the efforts made by the sponsors of the draft resolution. Nevertheless, it would be difficult for her to vote in favour of the draft. The question was very complex and it would have been better if the Council had postponed a decision and referred the question to the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning.

7. Miss CAO PINNA (Italy) pointed out that new operative paragraph 3 dealt with the "suggested objectives contained in the report of the Council to the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session". But the report to the General Assembly would probably be a report by the Secretary-General and not by the Council. As for the "suggested objectives", she would like to know what they were.

8. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) hoped that the Secretary-General would take into account the comments made in the Committee and in the Council when he made proposals regarding ways of encouraging housing construction. Furthermore, his delegation attached some importance to the words "*inter alia*" in the new paragraph 4, as they implied that the Secretary-General's report should not be confined to the proposed new international institution but should also deal with other ways of encouraging housing construction.

9. Mr. BOURGOUIN (France) also considered that the words "*inter alia*" were necessary and that it would have been advisable to add the words "and on the various international solutions which would make it possible to strengthen" after the words "on the proposed new international institution" in order to make it clear that the new international institution was not the only possible solution. It was unfortunate, moreover, that the Council had before it a technical draft resolution that had not been studied beforehand by the competent technical organ, namely, the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning.

10. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan), replying to the representative of Italy, said that the report of the Council referred to in the new paragraph 3 was the report in which were recorded the discussions and decisions of the Council during its two sessions of the year. The suggested objectives were those listed in the former paragraph 4 of the draft resolution and they should be recorded in the report of the Council to the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session so that the

Secretary-General might refer to them when preparing his report for the fiftieth session and reformulating the objectives of the forthcoming campaign.

11. In reply to the representative of the United Kingdom he said that the United Kingdom delegation's interpretation of the new paragraph 4 was in keeping with the views of the sponsors. But they had thought it natural that the Secretary-General should stress international solutions although those were not the only ones.

12. Miss CAO PINNA (Italy) pointed out that the Council's report was prepared by the Secretariat. She would like to know whether the Council's discussions on that agenda item as well as the list of objectives suggested in the former paragraph 4 of the draft resolution would be recorded in the report.

13. The PRESIDENT, replying to the representative of Italy, said that although the Council's report was prepared by the Secretariat it was countersigned by the President and Vice-President of the Economic and Social Council.

14. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan), replying to the representative of Italy, said that the sponsors understood that when the Secretary-General prepared a report he took into account the debates that had taken place in the Council, otherwise those debates would be pointless.

15. In reply to the representatives of France and the United Kingdom, he said that other solutions besides the proposed new international institution would be discussed in the Secretary-General's report.

16. The PRESIDENT stated that, at the request of the delegation of the Soviet Union, a separate vote would be taken on paragraph 4 of draft resolution E/L.1323.

*Paragraph 4 was adopted by 22 votes to 2.*

*The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 21 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

17. Mr. BOURGOUIN (France) explained that his delegation had voted for paragraph 4 because it was sure that other solutions besides the new international institution could be explored. It had voted for the draft resolution as a whole because it endorsed the spirit of the text, although it regretted that the Council should have had to consider a technical resolution which had not first been studied by a technical committee.

18. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, after voting against paragraph 4, because it considered that the time was not yet ripe for the creation of the proposed new international institution and that, in any case, there were many other ways of solving the problem. The creation of a new institution for a very limited area of international co-operation should be viewed with extreme caution. Many other international bodies were already dealing with housing, building and planning, not to mention the Council and the Committee. His delegation also regretted that certain basic aspects of the problem, such as the increase in international housing

activities, had not been dealt with in paragraph 3. On the other hand, it endorsed the sponsors' request that the Council's report should include the list of objectives enumerated in the former paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

## AGENDA ITEM 15

### Natural disaster in Romania and Hungary (E/L.1327)

19. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) submitted draft resolution E/L.1327, co-sponsored by his delegation. As he had already stated, and as the members of the Council would have learnt from reading the press, the floods in Romania and Hungary following torrential rains had caused the death of hundreds of people and tremendous material damage. The international community had already offered help and the Romanian and Hungarian Governments had taken emergency measures to bring relief to the stricken populations but much still remained to be done. In the draft resolution, the Council would express its deep sympathy to the people and Governments of Romania and Hungary, invite Member States and non-governmental organizations to consider ways and means of rendering whatever urgent assistance they might be in a position to offer to the Governments of Romania and Hungary and request the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the heads of the secretariats of the specialized agencies and of various bodies, in the light of the funds available, to render urgent assistance to the people of Romania and Hungary. He emphasized the urgency of the matter.

20. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said that the situation was already extremely serious in Romania and Hungary but that the worst was still to be feared. The Council should therefore take urgent measures. His delegation would like to become a sponsor of draft resolution E/L.1327.

21. Mr. ARVESEN (Norway) said that his delegation would also like to become a sponsor of the draft resolution. He announced that his Government had received a request for assistance from the Romanian Government and intended to take certain urgent measures to bring relief to the stricken populations. The Norwegian Red Cross had already given the Romanian Red Cross assistance in cash and in kind amounting to \$21,000.

22. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, he would consider that the Council adopted draft resolution E/L.1327 unanimously.

*It was so decided.*

23. Mr. DIACONESCU (Romania) conveyed his Government's warmest thanks to the Bulgarian representative for his initiative and to all the members of the Council for their sympathy. The Romanian people would be glad to learn of the support offered them by the entire international community.

24. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) warmly thanked the members of the Council and particularly the Bulgarian delegation and the other sponsors of the draft resolution. It was encouraging to find that the community of nations was quick to join forces and give support in an emergency.

25. The PRESIDENT expressed the hope that the combined efforts of the international community would succeed in alleviating the suffering of the victims of the catastrophe.

#### AGENDA ITEM 4

##### Allegations regarding infringements of trade-union rights (concluded) (E/4791, E/4819, E/4838; E/L.1324, E/L.1325)

26. Mr. JHA (India) announced that the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1324 had made minor changes in the text to take into account the comments made by the ILO representative at the preceding meeting. In operative paragraph 5, the words "other concerned specialized agencies" should be added after the words "in co-operation with the ILO". The same addition should be made in paragraph 6. Also in paragraph 6, the words "taking due account of the latter's primary responsibility in the matter" should be deleted.

27. Mr. SHAHEED (International Labour Organisation) thanked the sponsors for taking his suggestions into account. The draft resolution, as currently worded, expanded the terms of reference of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts to cover the general conditions of a sector of the population in the Territories concerned including economic, social, health and other aspects. In addition, the *Ad Hoc* Working Group would investigate factors leading to discrimination in the social field. Thus the intention of the sponsors was not to duplicate the work being done by ILO organs in accordance with the terms of reference of the Organisation. The draft resolution went far beyond the specific question of trade-union rights and working conditions. Those two matters were within the competence of the ILO, which had submitted three reports on the first matter. No report had been requested from it on the second matter. That being understood, there should be no risk of any overlapping of activities.

28. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution. However, it maintained the reservations it had already expressed on the subject of the ILO report, which was based on the study by the Committee on Freedom of Association: that Committee was not a representative body and its conclusions were mostly of secondary importance, since they did not deal with the crux of the matter—the struggle against the racist and colonial régimes in Africa and the aid provided by South Africa's economic and trading partners.

29. The *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts had already done useful work; it should now complete its task as quickly as possible and produce a report on the Portuguese Territories without delay. The *Ad Hoc* Working Group and the Secretariat should organize their work so as to gain time without incurring unnecessary expense. He asked that his comments should be recorded in the Council's report.

30. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom), commenting on the draft resolution before the Council, said that he had no serious objections to the report of the *Ad Hoc* Working

Group of Experts (E/4791), referred to in operative paragraph 1, except on one point: in paragraph 138, the *Ad Hoc* Working Group emphasized the urgent need for intervention by the United Kingdom Government in Southern Rhodesia. The United Kingdom Government was not in a position to intervene in Southern Rhodesia and therefore could not accept the conclusion of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group. Those comments also applied to operative paragraph 3. His delegation had no hesitation in endorsing paragraph 2 and thanked the ILO for its report. His delegation supported the first part of paragraph 4 but pointed out that the second part of that paragraph might be interpreted by some people as meaning that the United Kingdom should intervene in Southern Rhodesia. He requested a separate vote on paragraphs 5 and 6. In his opinion, it was the ILO that should conduct investigations in the Portuguese Territories. The *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts would only duplicate the efforts of the ILO and incur considerable expense. Moreover, the terms of reference given to the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts in paragraph 6 were far too broad. His delegation would therefore be obliged to vote against those two paragraphs.

31. Mr. DØRUM (Norway) said that his delegation supported all United Nations efforts to end infringements of trade-union rights. However, it would have to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution, since it felt that the matters entrusted to the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts should be studied by the ILO Committee. Furthermore, the investigation suggested in operative paragraph 6 did not seem the best way of improving the lot of workers in the Portuguese colonies. If operative paragraphs 5 and 6 were put to a separate vote, his delegation would abstain in the vote.

32. Mr. NAMON (Ghana) asked why the United Kingdom representative was reluctant to accept the second part of operative paragraph 4. He wondered whether it was because the United Kingdom had relinquished all responsibility in Southern Rhodesia and whether the United Kingdom would change its position if the circumstances were different.

33. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) observed that it was difficult to reply to a hypothetical question and repeated that, as matters stood, his Government could not intervene in Southern Rhodesia.

34. Mr. BOURGOUIN (France) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the resolution establishing the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts. Its decision had been motivated neither by considerations of substance nor by a value judgement on the usefulness of the Group's work; it had questioned the advisability of giving a new body such broad terms of reference. Accordingly, it would abstain again in the vote on the draft resolution before the Council.

35. Operative paragraphs 5 and 6 of the draft resolution authorized the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts to carry out investigations in the Portuguese colonies. However, Portugal was a member of the ILO, which had the necessary competence to conduct any investigations that might be required. The ILO representative had said that the terms of reference proposed for the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts were broader than those of the ILO itself, which

definitely showed that the agency continued to consider itself competent in the matter. Thus, either the ILO and the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts would work together, with completely useless duplication, or they would divide the work between them with the ILO dealing solely with trade-union rights and the *Ad Hoc* Working Group dealing with all other matters. Since that would simply be a reversion to the previous situation, it was quite unnecessary to broaden the terms of reference of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts.

36. Mr. KITI (Kenya) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, since it was convinced of the need to stop infringements of trade-union rights and, above all, to wage a struggle against racist and colonialist régimes. It did not understand why some delegations seemed to be experiencing difficulties, since any danger of duplication would be averted by the proposed consultations.

37. He was concerned to note that the United Kingdom appeared to be relinquishing its responsibilities towards its colonies.

38. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said he had no desire to enter into a constitutional discussion, particularly since other bodies were considering the question of Southern Rhodesia. However, the representatives of Kenya and Ghana had apparently misunderstood his delegation's remarks about operative paragraph 4. He repeated that he had no difficulty in accepting the first part of the sentence, which related to southern Africa as a whole, including Southern Rhodesia. It was therefore incorrect to say that the United Kingdom delegation refused to condemn the persistent erection of obstacles to the exercise of trade-union rights in Southern Rhodesia.

39. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on operative paragraphs 5 and 6 of draft resolution E/L.1324.

*Operative paragraphs 5 and 6 were adopted by 13 votes to 4, with 8 abstentions.*

*At the request of the representative of Ghana, a vote on draft resolution E/L.1324, as amended, was taken by roll-call.*

*France, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Ghana, Greece, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Pakistan, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Sudan, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Ceylon.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* France, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Brazil.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.*

40. Mr. STILLMAN (United States of America) said that by abstaining in the vote on draft resolution E/L.1324 as a

whole and voting against operative paragraphs 5 and 6, his delegation had not passed judgement on the substance of the matter. While it was clear that the erection of obstacles to the exercise of trade-union rights in southern Africa should be condemned, the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts was not a suitable body to investigate the matter. His delegation had abstained in the vote on resolutions which established the Group and renewed its mandate. Other United Nations bodies were responsible for studying the situation of the peoples of southern Africa and infringements of trade-union rights were the special concern of the ILO. The *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts was duplicating the work of that agency.

41. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on operative paragraphs 5 and 6, since it had noted from the reports in documents E/4791 and E/4819 that the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts had made no progress since the previous year. It had merely reiterated the conclusions on South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia contained in its earlier report. Since other United Nations bodies were studying these problems, the adoption of similar resolutions every year achieved nothing. However, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, since there had been no substantial change in the situation in southern Africa.

42. Miss CAO PINNA (Italy) said that her delegation had abstained in the votes on operative paragraphs 5 and 6 and on the draft resolution as a whole, because it felt that the United Nations was an integrated system of organizations and that, since the ILO was primarily responsible for work on the subject under discussion, there was no need to allocate \$35,000 to an *ad hoc* group of experts doing the same work.

43. Mr. BOURGOUIN (France) said that in his earlier statement he had explained the reasons why his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. It had voted against operative paragraphs 5 and 6, since it felt there was no reason to question the ILO's competence, working methods or objectivity, and it wished to reaffirm its confidence in the agency.

44. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said that his delegation, like the delegation of the Upper Volta, had some reservations about the draft resolution. Nevertheless, it had voted in favour of operative paragraphs 5 and 6 and of the draft resolution as a whole.

45. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that his delegation had reservations about operative paragraphs 5 and 6 of the draft resolution. In particular, it felt that the terms of reference of the *Ad hoc* Working Group of Experts relating to the Portuguese colonies in Africa were too broad and that the goals of the proposed investigations and studies were not clear. However, his delegation had voted for paragraphs 5 and 6 and for the draft resolution as a whole.

46. Mr. GOUAMBA (People's Republic of the Congo) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution, of which it had been a sponsor, because it attached particular importance to certain points. He regretted that some delegations were describing the work of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts as useless and referring to its

high cost. He felt that the functions of the Group should have been defined precisely at the time when it was established and that the arguments advanced against it were merely excuses used by the enemies of African development who wished to maintain colonialism in Africa.

47. Mr. AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that, although his delegation had abstained in the vote, it nevertheless endorsed fully the conclusions in document E/4791 regarding trade-union rights and related matters in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia.

### AGENDA ITEM 3

#### Report of the Commission on the Status of Women (E/4870)

48. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take a decision on the Social Committee's recommendation which appeared in paragraph 7 of the Social Committee (E/4870).

*The Social Committee's recommendation was adopted by 13 votes to 3, with 10 abstentions.*

49. Mr. REFSHAL (Norway) said that his delegation had voted against the recommendation both in the Economic and Social Council and in the Social Committee because it attached great importance to the draft resolution in question and hoped that the Commission on the Status of Women would consider it at its next session and refer it to the Council.

50. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should vote on the draft resolutions which appeared in paragraph 9 of the report of the Social Committee on the report of the Commission on the Status of Women.

*Draft resolution I was adopted by 21 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

51. At the request of Mr. YEVDOKHEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), a separate vote was taken on the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 6 of draft resolution II.

*The fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 6 of draft resolution II were adopted by 18 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution II was adopted by 25 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*Draft resolution III was adopted unanimously.*

*Draft resolution IV was adopted unanimously.*

*Draft resolution V was adopted unanimously.*

52. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) asked to explain his vote before the vote on draft resolution VI was taken. Although his delegation approved of the humanitarian character of the draft resolution, it could not accept paragraph 3 (a) or paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution. It felt that the Commission on the Status of Women was not a suitable body to consider that question and would accordingly abstain in the vote.

*Draft resolution VI was adopted by 22 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

53. Mr. YEVDOKHEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), supported by Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta), Mr. GOUAMBA (People's Republic of the Congo), Mr. PIPARSANIA (India), Mr. EL HUSSEIN (Sudan) and Mr. NAMON (Ghana), proposed that draft resolution VII should be referred back to the Commission on the Status of Women for more detailed consideration. The Indian representative proposed that the draft resolution should also be transmitted to Governments represented on the Commission on the Status of Women, in order to ascertain their views on the question.

*The proposal of the Soviet Union representative was adopted by 15 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions.*

54. Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) said his delegation failed to see the point of draft resolution VIII, which added nothing new. Although it had no particular objection to the operative part of the draft resolution, it could not endorse it.

*Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.*

55. Mr. KAZUHARA (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolutions VI and VIII because they merely reverted to questions which had already been considered by the Commission on Human Rights and other United Nations bodies.

*Draft resolution IX was adopted unanimously.*

*The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.*