



**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL**

Thursday, 3 March 1966,  
at 3.10 p.m.

*Fortieth Session*  
**OFFICIAL RECORDS**

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 10:</i>	
<i>Measures for the speedy implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (continued) . . . . .</i>	77
<i>Agenda item 20:</i>	
<i>Question of the establishment of an international institute for documentation on housing, building and planning. . . . .</i>	79
<i>Agenda item 6:</i>	
<i>Question of a meeting of the ad hoc Working Group on the Question of a Declaration on International Economic Co-operation. . . . .</i>	81
<i>Agenda item 16:</i>	
<i>Confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council. . . . .</i>	81
<i>Agenda item 13:</i>	
<i>Non-governmental organizations (continued) . . . . .</i>	81

*President:* Mr. Tewfik BOUATTOURA (Algeria).

*Present:*

Representatives of the following States: Algeria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ecuador, France, Gabon, Greece, India, Iran, Iraq, Luxembourg, Morocco, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela.

Observers for the following Member States: Australia, Austria, Cuba, Denmark, Ghana, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mauritania, Mexico, Poland, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, United Arab Republic.

Observers for the following non-member States: Federal Republic of Germany, Switzerland.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; World Health Organization; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Measures for the speedy implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (continued) (E/4146/Rev.1 and Corr.1; E/L.1111 and Corr.1, E/L.1112, E/L.1114)

1. The PRESIDENT invited comments on draft resolution E/L.1111 and Corr.1.

2. Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) said that the subject dealt with in the draft resolution in question was a highly important one and, in that it concerned dependent and colonial territories, the resolution closely affected his Government. The United Kingdom was also affected by some of the resolutions mentioned in the preamble. He would therefore like the rule that resolutions should not be voted on less than twenty-four hours after they were circulated to be observed. On such a matter, his delegation would need time to receive instructions.

3. Regarding the draft resolution itself, he noted first that, whereas the subject was the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, the operative paragraphs were broader in scope and referred to human rights in general. He thought it preferable to concentrate on the specific target of racial discrimination. Secondly, it should be borne in mind that the Commission on Human Rights had a very heavy agenda for its coming session and would probably not even be able to complete consideration of the items already before it. In asking the Commission to consider the question of the violation of human rights in colonial territories "as a matter of importance and urgency", the draft resolution appeared to imply that it should be given priority over the items already before the Commission. The Commission was already seized of an item concerning periodic reports on human rights, which covered the questions of racial discrimination and human rights in dependent territories, and the matter raised in the draft resolution could be discussed under that item. To give the specific question raised in the draft priority over other items would have the effect of excluding consideration of racial discrimination elsewhere—in South Africa, for example. He wondered whether that was really what the sponsors intended.

4. The PRESIDENT noted that, under rule 56 of its rules of procedure, the Council could not vote on draft resolutions less than twenty-four hours after they had been circulated, unless it decided otherwise.

5. Mr. BOULLET (France) associated himself with the request of the United Kingdom representative for observance of the twenty-four hour rule.

6. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that, even if the vote was postponed, discussion of the draft resolution might continue at the present meeting.

*It was so agreed.*

7. Mr. WILLIAMS (Sierra Leone) said that the question of racial discrimination in colonial territories was of great concern to his country and he could agree with most of the substance of the draft resolution. He felt, however, that it was unduly limited in scope; racial discrimination in South Africa, for example, had been referred to in many General

Assembly resolutions and it would seem desirable that such discrimination there should be covered by any draft resolution on the subject. He therefore proposed three amendments (E/L.1114) to the draft resolution.

8. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) said that his delegation wished to become a co-sponsor of the amendments just introduced by the previous speaker. He believed that it might be very difficult for the Commission on Human Rights to include a new item in its agenda at such a late stage; the question referred to in the draft resolution would certainly be considered under the item concerning periodic reports. He hoped that the sponsors could accept the three amendments.

9. The PRESIDENT suggested that further consideration of the question should be deferred until the next meeting.

*It was so agreed.*

10. The PRESIDENT invited comments on draft resolution E/L.1112.

11. Mr. BELEOKEN (Cameroon) said that, as co-sponsor of the draft resolution, he supported the remarks made by the USSR representative in introducing the text at the previous meeting. He hoped that the draft resolution might be adopted unanimously.

12. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) asked the Secretariat to indicate whether operative paragraphs 3 and 4 would have financial implications.

13. Mr. HUMPHREY (Secretariat) said, with regard to operative paragraph 3, that, assuming that the seminar proposed would be part of the regular programme of advisory services in the field of human rights, it would have no financial implications. He would point out, however, that the holding of a seminar would necessarily be dependent on the receipt of an invitation from a Government.

14. With regard to operative paragraph 4, he recalled that the procedure for the studies of discrimination established by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and approved by the Commission on Human Rights and by the Economic and Social Council provided that, as a first step, country monographs should be prepared for each Member State of the United Nations or member of the specialized agencies, as a basis for the analytical report to be prepared by the special rapporteur. Each country monograph required at least the time of one professional officer for one month, with the necessary secretarial assistance. At present, four staff members in the Division of Human Rights were assigned to the preparation of the studies of discrimination. Three of them were fully occupied with the study of discrimination against persons born out of wedlock which was scheduled for completion in January 1967 and one was assigned to the study of equality in the administration of justice which had been initiated by the Sub-Commission several years previously. When the study of discrimination against persons born out of wedlock was completed, the staff released would be transferred to work on the other study.

15. In the course of 1966, the special rapporteur appointed by the Sub-Commission to carry out the study of racial discrimination would prepare a draft outline, which would be considered by the Sub-Commission at its January 1967 session. The work of collecting information for use in the study should begin immediately after that. However, staff members could be assigned to the new study only at the expense of the study of equality in the administration of justice. In view of the work-load in other programmes of the Division of Human Rights, it was not feasible to transfer staff from those programmes.

16. Under those circumstances, it would seem that the study of racial discrimination could not be completed before 1973. If the term "speedy completion" meant that the study should be completed before that time, it would be necessary to provide additional staff for the purpose. The Secretary-General felt that, in order to complete the study within three years, the following additional staff would be required in 1967 and subsequent years: four professional officers and two secretaries, involving an annual cost of \$82,000. Should completion of the study in that time be approved, the Secretary-General would include such an additional provision in his initial estimates for 1967.

17. Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) said that he could not vote on a resolution involving such expenditure without instructions from his Government. He thought that the seminar suggested in operative paragraph 3 was an excellent idea, and that it should take priority over less urgent subjects, if necessary. Perhaps, however, that question could be dealt with in a broadened version of the draft resolution previously discussed (E/L.1111 and Corr.1).

18. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the draft resolution added nothing to what was already contained in General Assembly resolution 2017 (XX) of 1 November 1965. It would be ultra vires for the Council to decide not to implement that resolution. If the agenda of the Commission on Human Rights was heavy, that was because it had a number of questions before it which it had been considering for years and which were not very urgent. Studies concerning children born out of wedlock and the administration of justice could well be delayed a little, if necessary, to make time for the implementation of a specific request by the General Assembly on a matter as urgent as that of racial discrimination. It was for the Commission on Human Rights to make arrangements to comply with the Assembly's request, and there need not be any additional expenditure; the Secretariat could reorganize its work and postpone other questions if necessary. The procedure for carrying out the necessary research was a matter for the Commission on Human Rights to decide.

19. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the Secretariat would simply have to reorganize its work in order to comply with the General Assembly's request. He would have thought that the Secretariat would realize that the question of racial discrimination should take priority over other matters which, although important, were not of comparable importance. The Council

could give specific instructions regarding the reorganization of the Secretariat's work if that was deemed necessary.

20. His delegation supported the draft resolution because it wished to see the maximum attention given to the practices of racial discrimination which continued to exist in some countries despite the condemnation of those practices by the United Nations.

21. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should proceed to vote on the draft resolution (E/L.1112).

*It was so decided.*

22. The PRESIDENT asked whether the Council was in a position to adopt the draft resolution unanimously.

23. Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) requested that the draft should be put to the vote.

*At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Romania, Sierra Leone, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Algeria, Cameroon, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Gabon, India, Iran, Iraq, Morocco, Pakistan, Philippines.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Canada, France, Greece, Luxembourg, Panama.

*Draft resolution E/L.1112 was adopted by 16 votes to none with 9 abstentions.*

24. Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote, said that although his delegation fully approved the principles underlying the resolution, it had been unable to support it in the vote because of the brevity of the debate and the insufficient attention given to the financial implications and to the other two studies being carried out by the Division of Human Rights. Equality in the administration of justice, for example, was an essential prerequisite for the elimination of racial discrimination. In his view it was not enough simply to adopt resolutions without a consideration of the broader aspects.

25. Mr. ELMENDORF (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained not because of any lack of concern with racial discrimination but because it attached importance to the present work programme of the Division of Human Rights. He did not believe that work on the existing studies should be disturbed in favour of the proposed study on racial discrimination. His delegation was also unable to support the resolution because of its financial implications.

26. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking in explanation of vote, said that the elimination of racial discrimination was of such

urgency and importance that it could not be relegated to the level of mere academic study. His delegation's vote in favour of the resolution had been an expression of its desire to see the matter of racial discrimination given the highest priority in the work programme of the Division of Human Rights.

27. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) associated himself with the views of the Tanzanian representative. There must be no delay in the very important task of eradicating racial discrimination, and he hoped that the Secretariat would take all the necessary steps for the full and speedy implementation of the resolution.

28. The PRESIDENT recalled that the adoption by the General Assembly of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (resolution 2106 (XX)) had been of the greatest significance in the promotion of human rights. The Secretary-General had sent a memorandum dated 7 February 1966 to States Members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies, States Parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice, and other States which the General Assembly had invited to become parties to the Convention, pointing out that the Convention was open for signature from 7 March 1966. However, only a few Governments had so far signified their willingness to sign the Convention, and he therefore appealed to all Governments to demonstrate their support for United Nations action in the important matter of the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination by becoming parties to the Convention.

## AGENDA ITEM 20

Question of the establishment of an international institute for documentation on housing, building and planning (E/4159)

29. Mr. BOULLET (France) said that, at the present stage, the Council had no other course than to adopt the draft resolution contained in paragraph 2 of document E/4159 so as to enable the Secretary-General to hold consultations under the most favourable conditions with the Italian Government and with the other governments and organizations in a position to assist the future institute.

30. The French Government, which was prepared to study the means of its participation, would like the board of governors of the proposed institute to consist of at least six government representatives, rather than the three representatives suggested by the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning (see E/4126, appendix, para. 5).

31. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) noted that two Governments had offered host facilities for the proposed institute, and he hoped that the Governments in question might reach some agreement so that the Council could take up the question of the location of the institute again at its forty-first session. The immediate adoption of the draft resolution contained in document E/4159 might prejudice the issue, since it mentioned only one of the countries involved. He therefore proposed that the entire question of the establishment of the

international institute, including the adoption of the draft resolution, should be postponed.

32. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) said that his delegation supported the establishment of the proposed institute and in the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning had voted in favour of the draft resolution reproduced in document E/4159. However, he supported the view that it would be premature for the Council to take a decision at the present stage, in view of the preliminary nature of the Secretary-General's report and the need for further information. He hoped that the Secretary-General would be in a position to submit to the Council, at its next session, a comprehensive report which might include, *inter alia*, a clear definition of the terms of reference of the proposed institute, its method of operation, staffing and costs, the relationship of the institute, its method of operation, staffing and costs, the relationship of the institute with other interested organizations such as the International Council for Building Research, Studies and Documentation, and potential sources of financing.

33. Mr. FIGUEROA (Chile) supported the suggestion of the French representative that the Council should adopt the draft resolution contained in document E/4159. While the Council could clearly not take a decision regarding the headquarters of the institute, a statement by the Council that it endorsed the establishment of the institute would give the Secretary-General a solid basis on which to continue his consultations and submit a report to the next session. He drew attention to the fact that operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution contained the words "Approves in principle"; the Council would therefore not be taking any irrevocable decision.

34. Mr. KUDRIAVTSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that a number of questions still remained unresolved: the financial implications, as well as the possible sources of funds, were still very uncertain, and the Secretary-General was still continuing his consultations and negotiations regarding the organization and administration of the proposed institute. His delegation therefore supported the view that it would be inappropriate for the Council to take any decision at present or to adopt the proposed draft resolution.

35. At the resumed thirty-ninth session of the Council (1400th meeting), his delegation had indicated that it could not support paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, and was categorically opposed to the use of funds from the regular United Nations budget for the establishment and maintenance of the institute. The Centre for Housing Building and Planning should perhaps first explore all the available possibilities offered by the many international institutions in Europe and elsewhere which provided technical information and documentation, before deciding to establish a new institution.

36. Mr. BELEOKEN (Cameroon) pointed out that since an offer to establish the institute at New Delhi had been made by the Government of India subsequent to the preparation of the draft resolution contained in document E/4159, the Council should give the Secretary-General specific instructions to continue

his consultations not only with the Government of Italy but also with that of India, and to study the financial implications of establishing the institute in either capital.

37. Mr. PARRY (Canada) favoured postponement of discussion of the item until the forty-first session of the Council. He agreed with the representative of the Soviet Union that the institute should be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations.

38. With regard to the staffing of the institute, the Canadian delegation considered that, in view of the recent restriction of its terms of reference, there should be eleven professional and seven clerical staff members, rather than the twenty professional and seven clerical staff members suggested by the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning (see E/4126, annex, para. 55).

39. Mr. ASTROM (Sweden) said that housing, building and planning were priorities of social development and were especially urgent for the developing countries. It was essential to provide homes within the economic reach of the masses in those countries. Other social measures would not have the desired effect if low-income groups continued to have poor standards of housing. Progress in that regard had to be based on research and the exchange of information. The Swedish delegation therefore saw merit in the idea of an international institute for documentation on housing, building and planning. The Council should postpone a decision on the matter, however, because the proposals before it left unanswered a number of organizational and financial questions.

40. Mr. RIOS (Panama) said that his delegation viewed the draft resolution sympathetically. The problem of housing was one of the most serious being dealt with by the United Nations. The proposed institute would be important and directly useful to countries with housing problems. In the light of the comments made by other delegations, however, his delegation agreed that the Council should defer action on the matter.

41. Mr. BOULLET (France) said that the Secretary-General should continue his consultations, but the Government of India should make its offer more specific.

42. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) said that his delegation, which had been active in the preparation of the draft resolution in the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning and attached considerable importance to the establishment of the institute, nevertheless thought that the Council should postpone a decision until its forty-first session when more information would be available.

43. Mr. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) also favoured postponement of Council action. The Secretary-General would submit a report to the forty-first session of the Council, which should include an outline of the the documentation facilities already available at international, regional and national housing institutes. It would then be possible to see that there was no duplication of facilities.

44. Mr. UMRATH (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions) said that the establishment of

the proposed institute would permit more efficient use of the knowledge and resources available in the field of housing, building and planning and would make it possible to avoid much duplication in research and experimental work. That would result in sizable savings for the countries concerned and the institute would therefore be a sound investment. The existing sources of information were inadequate at a time when many Governments were reformulating their housing policies. Only a relatively small staff would be needed for the institute if it concentrated on a limited number of fundamental questions and left the more technical matters to existing organizations. Since housing, building and planning were late-comers in United Nations activities, no more time should be lost.

45. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take note of the Secretary-General's note (E/4159) and request the Secretary-General to continue the consultations envisaged in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution proposed by the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning, taking into account the discussions held at the Council's fortieth session, and to submit a report to the forty-first session.

*It was so decided.*

46. Mr. SINGH (India) thanked the members of the Council who had expressed appreciation of the offer made by the Government of India to provide for the institute's location at New Delhi. He suggested that a reference should be made in paragraph 5 of the Secretary-General's note (E/4159) to that offer by his Government, and that the Government of India should also be mentioned in operative paragraphs 2 and 4 of the draft resolution reproduced in paragraph 2 of the note. Paragraph 4 of the note should then make appropriate reference to the Secretary-General's consultations with the Governments of India and Italy. He hoped that the documentation to be issued on the subject before the forty-first session of the Council would reflect the views expressed by his delegation and those of other friendly delegations which had been appreciative of India's offer.

#### AGENDA ITEM 6

Question of a meeting of the ad hoc Working Group on the Question of a Declaration on International Economic Co-operation E/4147)

47. Mr. KUDRIAVTSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the question of the principles of economic and commercial relations was being considered in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and would be discussed at the fourth session of the Trade and Development Board. He therefore proposed the deferment until the forty-third session of a decision concerning the question of the ad hoc Working Group.

48. Mr. BENSID (Algeria) and Mr. VIAUD (France) supported the USSR representative's proposal.

*The USSR representative's proposal was adopted.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 16

Confirmation of members of functional commissions of the Council E/4149 and Add. 1 and 2)

49. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should confirm the members listed in documents E/4149 and Add.1 and 2.

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 13

Non-governmental organizations (continued)\*  
(E/4136; E/L.1110)

50. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), introducing draft resolution E/L.1110, said that the enlargement of the membership of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations from seven to thirteen would reflect the changes in the membership of the Council itself.

51. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) observed that the draft resolution called for the Council to approve an amended text of one of its rules of procedure. According to rule 88 of the rules of procedure, the rules might not be amended until the Council had received a report on the proposed amendment from a committee of the Council. The Council should therefore appoint a committee, which could be a committee of the whole. It would be useful to have the views of the Legal Counsel on the substance and drafting of the proposed revision of rule 82.

52. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the item had been discussed earlier in the session (1403rd meeting) and delegations had therefore already had an opportunity to express their views. There was therefore no need to appoint a committee. He saw no need to obtain the opinion of the Legal Counsel.

53. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the United States representative had correctly interpreted the rules of procedure. It was perhaps inappropriate to provide for amendment of the rules of procedure in the draft resolution.

54. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should suspend its plenary meeting and reconvene as an Ad Hoc Committee of the Whole to consider the amendment to rule 82 of the rules of procedure which was proposed in draft resolution E/L.1110.

*It was so decided.\*\**

*The meeting was suspended at 6 p.m. and resumed at 6.30 p.m.*

55. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should adjourn its meeting.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

\*Resumed from the 1403rd meeting.

\*\*The summary record of the meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Whole was circulated as document E/AC.53/SR.1.