

Commission on Freedom of Association of the ILO under the provisions of Council resolution 277 (X).

56. At the same meeting the Council had decided to transmit the communication from WFTU to the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts of the Commission on Human Rights and to request it to include its findings on the matter in its report to be submitted to the Council at its fifty-eighth session. When taking that action, the Council had not had before it the reply of the Government of Bahrain to the Secretary-General's inquiry, but the reply had since been received and circulated as document E/5588/Add.1. The Government of Bahrain had stated, *inter alia*, that the issue was a domestic matter involving breaches of the peace and security of the island, and that it was unable to grant its consent for transmission of the communication to the ILO.

57. A further communication from WFTU had been received and circulated as document E/5588/Add.2; in it WFTU made a further appeal to the Commission on Human Rights to take urgent and effective action to help the workers of Bahrain who had allegedly been unjustly imprisoned.

58. In view of the new communications received, he suggested that the Council should transmit the two communications of WFTU and the reply of the Government of Bahrain to the Commission on Human Rights for consideration and appropriate action at its forthcoming session. The Council would thus receive the Commission's report at its fifty-eighth session and be in a position to carry out its functions under Council resolution 277 (X).

59. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested the President to explain the procedure for the transmission of such communications to the Commission on Human Rights.

60. The PRESIDENT said that Council resolution 277 (X) established the procedure for dealing with such communications. When the country involved was a member of the ILO, the communication was to be transmitted in the first instance to the ILO. When the country involved was not a member of the ILO, the Secretary-General of the United Nations was directed to request the permission of the Government to refer the matter to the ILO. In the case under consideration, the Government of Bahrain had not given its consent and the Council had to decide what course it wished to follow.

61. Mr. SHARAF (Jordan) said that his delegation regretted that a domestic incident in a traditionally liberal-minded and stable country such as Bahrain should receive undue publicity and become open to distortion in the minds of delegations. Bahrain, a newly independent country, was pursuing a democratic course and should be encouraged. He therefore proposed that the Economic and Social Council take note of both WFTU communications and of the reply of the Government of Bahrain. His delegation was confident that the Government of Bahrain would handle the matter in accordance with the rule of law and in a democratic spirit.

62. Mr. SHEMIRANI (Iran), Mr. FASLA (Algeria), Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) and Mr. HUTAGALUNG (Indonesia) supported that proposal.

63. The PRESIDENT invited the observer for Bahrain to comment on the item.

64. Mr. AL-SAFFAR (Observer for Bahrain) thanked the representative of Jordan for having made his proposal and also thanked the representatives who had expressed support for it.

65. He said that the arrested workers had been released once the investigation carried out by the authorities had been completed. As could be seen from the list of persons arrested annexed to document E/5588, a number of those persons were not workers at all, but had infiltrated the movement in order to instigate others to continue the strike.

66. Freedom of expression and the right to strike were guaranteed in Bahrain, provided they did not involve breaches of the peace or the destruction of property. A century and a half of colonialism had left many gaps in his country's legislation and his Government was taking steps to remedy that situation. A new Constitution had been adopted in 1972 and a bill to legalize the existence of trade unions was currently before Parliament. Bahrain was endeavouring to follow a democratic course, and he hoped that the members of the Council would take that circumstance into account in taking a decision on the matter.

67. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Council decided to adopt the proposal of the representative of Jordan.

The decision was adopted [decision 56 (LVII)].

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

1932nd meeting

Tuesday, 10 December 1974, at noon

President: Mr. Aarno KARHILO (Finland).

E/SR.1932

AGENDA ITEM 8

Establishment of an International Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation (E/5593 and Add.1, E/AC.24/L.506)

1. The PRESIDENT said that since the Policy and Programme Co-ordination Committee had just com-

pleted its work, the report of the Committee¹ was not yet available. The Council would not debate the matter; however, it could vote on draft resolution E/AC.24/L.506, which had been adopted by the Committee.

2. Miss PETIGURA (Deputy Secretary of the Council) announced that draft resolution E/AC.24/L.506, as it stood, would have no financial implications for the United Nations budget, as posts and the associated

¹ Issued on 16 December as document E/5601.

resources would simply be transferred from one organizational unit to another. The Council should be aware, however, that should the site of the Foundation be elsewhere than at Headquarters, and should there be a consequent transfer of staff, there would be additional costs.

3. The PRESIDENT, replying to a question from Mr. HOHLER (United Kingdom), said that the site of the Foundation would be determined by Governments, either in the General Assembly or in the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The question could be discussed further in the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly.

4. Mr. HOHLER (United Kingdom) said that his delegation did not consider the statement of financial implications to be adequate.

5. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft resolution E/AC.24/L.506.

The draft resolution was adopted by 41 votes to 1 [resolution 1914 (LVII)].

6. Mr. KLEIN (United States of America) said that his delegation had been compelled to vote against the draft resolution. He acknowledged that the proposal was logical, in that it provided that the Centre for Housing, Building and Planning should continue its pre-investment and research activities and that the Foundation would be concerned with financing. Moreover, the language of the draft resolution was fair; it maintained the *status quo* in general, as there would be little disruption of the personnel, status and authority of the Centre.

7. However, the draft resolution was impractical and unwise. It failed to provide the Foundation with technical assistance capability, without which it would be unable to operate. Moreover, it was reasonable to expect that the Foundation would seek funds from the Fund of UNEP in order to engage the services of

subcontractors to carry out technical assistance activities, in which case a conflict would arise in the Governing Council between those delegations which preferred UNEP to concentrate on operational activities and those which preferred it to be a global operation. That conflict could have been avoided by transferring technical assistance activities from the Centre for Housing, Building and Planning to the Foundation.

8. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, which reflected the views of various delegations, including his own.

9. Paragraph 1 of the draft resolution should be discussed further in the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly. A more detailed statement of the financial implications than that provided by the Deputy Secretary was required. His delegation interpreted paragraph 3 to mean that the Economic and Social Council would confine itself to an exchange of views on the subject, and that any further decisions would have to await the results of the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Elections

10. The PRESIDENT recalled that at its 1897th meeting, on 16 May 1974, the Council had decided to postpone the election of members to certain of its committees to the fifty-seventh session. The vacancies were listed in the annotated agenda of the resumed fifty-seventh session (E/5581). No candidates had been nominated, and if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council agreed to postpone consideration of the item to the organizational session to be held early in 1975.

The decision was adopted [decision 60 (LVII)].

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.

1933rd meeting

Monday, 16 December 1974, at 11.15 a.m.

President: Mr. Aarno KARHILO (Finland).

E/SR.1933

REVISION OF THE AGENDA

Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda: item proposed by the Secretary-General (E/L.1617)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to comment on the Secretary-General's recommendation to include in the agenda an item entitled "*Ad hoc* authorization to the Executive Director of the World Food Programme to give food assistance to peoples in colonial Territories in Africa and their national liberation movements".

2. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) said that he was reluctant to speak on the proposed item; the note by the Secretary-General (E/L.1617) had been distributed so recently that he had not been able to consult his Government regarding its position on the

draft authorization reproduced in paragraph 10, concerning which some members of the Council of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) had expressed reservations. His Government's position might have changed since the sixty-fourth session of the FAO Council. He therefore suggested that the item should be dealt with at the fifty-eighth session of the Economic and Social Council or, if it was felt to be urgent, that it should be added to the agenda of the organizational session for 1975.

3. Mr. ROUGET (Federal Republic of Germany) supported the suggestion of the representative of the United Kingdom.

4. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) supported the recommendation of the Secretary-General that the item should be added to the agenda of the current session. He was surprised that some delegations should have suggested