



**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL**

*Forty-second Session*  
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Tuesday, 23 May 1967,  
at 3.35 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 18:</i>	
<i>Town twinning as a means of international co-operation (continued) . . . . .</i>	21
<i>Agenda item 14:</i>	
<i>Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights (continued) . . . . .</i>	24

*President:* Mr. Milan KLUSÁK  
(Czechoslovakia).

*Present:*

Representatives of the following States, members of the Council: Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, France, Gabon, Guatemala, India, Iran, Kuwait, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Sweden, Turkey, 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: Argentina, China, Japan, South Africa, Yugoslavia.

The observer for the following non-member State: Switzerland.

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

AGENDA ITEM 18

Town twinning as a means of international co-operation (continued) (E/4309, E/L.1155/Rev.1)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the representative of the United Town Organization (UTO) to make a statement.
2. Mr. MONORY (United Towns Organization) said that it might be useful if he were to explain in greater detail what was meant by "town twinning". To give an example, as part of the twinning arrangement between his own town in France and Ouagadougou, Upper Volta, his town was helping to train personnel from Ouagadougou and sending specialists and medical supplies. Thus "twinning co-operation" had a clear economic and social function. Contacts at the level of individual towns helped to encourage an awareness of the economic imbalance between rich and poor countries and to counteract the natural egoism of people in the developed countries. It thus complemented the efforts of Governments.
3. He believed that town-twinning arrangements could be of assistance to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in its efforts. Naturally, a single

town could not compete with an international organization in terms of the size of its contribution, but it had a part to play. He hoped that the Economic and Social Council would decide to give moral support and technical aid to the town-twinning movement.

4. Mr. NDIMBIE (Cameroon) introduced a revised text (E/L.1155/Rev.1) of the draft resolution submitted by his delegation, Dahomey and the United Republic of Tanzania at the 1464th meeting. The original draft had attempted to take into account the wishes expressed by the General Assembly in resolution 2058 (XX) of 16 December 1965 by proposing concrete steps to encourage the largest possible number of twinning arrangements between towns in developed and developing countries, at minimum cost to the United Nations. The sponsors, joined by Morocco, had, however, revised their text in order to take into account the suggestions that had been made and to achieve a consensus.

5. In operative paragraph 2, for example, the reference to the participation in, and implementation of, twinning projects had been extended to cover all appropriate non-governmental organizations and all forms of inter-municipal co-operation, in order to avoid any suggestion of a wish to preserve a monopoly. The new text also took into account the responsibility of Governments in fixing priorities for UNDP assistance. The proposal for an international inter-community co-operation fund had been abandoned. The revised text was thus a compromise, but it represented an effort to achieve unanimous or near-unanimous support.

6. His delegation was disappointed by the attitude shown by many States towards the question of assistance to developing countries. The rich countries of the world should remember that their wealth had often been obtained through the slave trade or through the cheap labour of the less developed countries. There appeared to be a notion now circulating in the developed countries that the developing countries were doing little for themselves and relying on outside assistance. That was not the case; the developing countries were only asking for fair treatment to allow them to meet the needs of the new generation and attain the standards set by the richer countries. The efforts of the United Nations should be directed towards reducing the gap between rich and poor, the dangers of which had been stressed by world leaders.

7. The revised draft resolution contained no extraordinary proposals, and the sponsors commended it to the Council.

8. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) welcomed the efforts of the sponsors to produce a generally acceptable text. His delegation supported town twinning and other forms of inter-municipal co-operation and had therefore been anxious to find a particular text

through which it could express that support. It would vote for the draft resolution, but it would suggest one minor amendment. According to the established practice, UNDP was brought into action by means of requests from Governments. It was therefore for Governments rather than for the Economic and Social Council to take decisions regarding UNDP projects. He therefore suggested that the words "Decides to" in operative paragraph 1 should be replaced by a wording such as "Suggests to Governments that they".

*Mr. Rahnama (Iran), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

9. Mr. VIAUD (France) welcomed the information given by the representative of UTO regarding the forms of co-operation between towns in developed and developing countries which could be associated with town twinning. The General Assembly had given its support to the concept of town twinning, and it was now for the Council to suggest practical measures. He understood the interest of developing countries in the subject and their disappointment at the difficulties encountered by the original draft resolution. However, some of the developed countries, such as his own, were particularly concerned to preserve the basic principle of United Nations aid that it was for the developing countries themselves to choose the type of assistance which suited them best, in the light of their own development plans. The developed countries were therefore hesitant about making specific recommendations to organs such as UNDP in such matters. It was perhaps not for UNDP to encourage town twinning as such, but rather to give favourable consideration to requests for technical assistance related to town-twinning arrangements.

10. The revised draft resolution avoided many of the difficulties which had been raised by the earlier draft, but he wondered whether it took sufficiently into account the principle he had mentioned. Perhaps the question could be deferred and the sponsors allowed time to produce a new text which would stress the technical assistance aspect and the established principles governing such assistance.

11. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he had been impressed by the points raised by the representatives of the United States and France. The United States suggestion was useful, but he thought that the text still presented difficulties to some delegations. One possibility might be to amend the beginning of operative paragraph 1 further so that it would read: "Suggests to Governments that they should consider the possibility of encouraging the participation...". However, a better course might be to refrain from pressing the matter now and to take it up again at a later session when a generally acceptable formula could perhaps be found. Moreover, the whole question of the status of non-governmental organizations and their classification required consideration, and it would be unfortunate to give certain non-governmental organizations special recognition. He would therefore suggest to his fellow sponsors that they should not insist on a vote on the draft resolution at the present session. The question should certainly be deferred for the time being,

since it was less urgent than other matters before the Council.

12. Mr. TILINCA (Romania) said that the idea of town twinning seemed to meet with general support, as did the concept that the United Nations should seek ways of encouraging such arrangements. Town twinning was an important tool for the development of international co-operation and understanding, regardless of social, political and economic systems, and of peaceful relations among nations. The principles followed by UTO, as set out in annex I of the note by the Secretary-General (E/4309), including the principle that twinning was to take place in a spirit of equality and reciprocal friendship, in the interests of understanding among peoples, and that it should involve co-operation between towns in all aspects of civic life—had the full support of his delegation. The value of town twinning as a form of international co-operation had been recognized by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; in the work plan quoted in annex III, paragraph 6, of the same document, it was stated that attention would be given to encouraging the twinning of towns as a means of further co-operation and understanding between nations.

13. Romania had associated itself with the activities of UTO from the outset. Romania already had some twinned towns and its experience showed that the exchange of delegations at the municipal level and co-operation in a number of different areas were useful and could help to solve specific problems which were facing communities. His delegation considered that means had to be found for encouraging the activities of UTO, which deserved the widest possible support. He felt that some improvements should be made in the draft resolution to help to ensure such support.

14. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) stated that he would have no objection to a temporary postponement of the subject but would not wish the matter to be deferred to a later session.

15. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had been struck by a certain inconsistency between the preamble of the draft resolution and the operative part. The first preambular paragraph quoted General Assembly resolution 2058 (XX), in which the Economic and Social Council had been requested to prepare a "programme of measures", and spoke of "concrete steps to encourage further the achievement of the largest possible number of twinned towns". The approach adopted in the operative part was incompatible with the preamble. The General Assembly's resolution was binding on the Council, which accordingly must draw up a programme of measures; the question of financing could be considered later.

16. His delegation supported the concept of town twinning as a means of promoting international co-operation, but he would like to put certain questions to the sponsors of the draft resolution. First, what specific form would be taken by the assistance envisaged, and what projects and what towns would receive support? Secondly, did a programme of measures exist, such as that mentioned in the General

Assembly resolution, as a basis for such assistance? Thirdly, would assistance be given to all twinned towns, in developed and developing countries alike, or would it be granted only to certain towns, and, if so, on the basis of what criteria? Fourthly, was it not dangerous and perhaps discriminatory to grant assistance to one particular non-governmental organization and might such action not lead to similar requests from all the other non-governmental organizations? Finally, what was the relationship between the non-governmental organizations, the towns and the Governments of the countries concerned, bearing in mind that it was normal practice for requests for assistance to come from Governments? It seemed from operative paragraph 2 that non-governmental organizations would be encouraged to request towns to ask for UNDP assistance; that sounded as if they were being asked to try to impose a policy.

17. His delegation agreed that support should be given to twinned towns, but thought that it would need to be on a rather different basis. The present text, despite the explanations given by the sponsors, seemed to him somewhat ambiguous in parts. He therefore felt that the consideration of the matter could perhaps be deferred until after, in compliance with General Assembly resolution 2058 (XX), a draft programme of measures had been prepared. That could then be taken up at a later session of the Council.

18. Mr. KRIEM (Morocco) agreed with the suggestion that the sponsors should be allowed time to review the text in the light of the objections raised by members of the Council.

19. Mr. OWONO (Cameroon) also favoured that course. He had been a little surprised that the Tanzanian delegation, which was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, should have suggested, without first consulting the other sponsors, that the matter be dropped. However, the debate could certainly be adjourned temporarily.

20. He would attempt to reply to some of the points raised by the USSR representative. With regard to the inconsistency between the preamble of draft resolution E/L.1155/Rev.1 and the operative part, the latter had, of course, been revised in order to take into account points raised by delegations. However, it seemed to him that the measures envisaged in the General Assembly resolution would necessarily take many years to implement. The General Assembly resolution enunciated the principle of United Nations encouragement for town twinning, but the sponsors of the present draft had felt obliged to take into account the fact that there was a limit to what could be done at the current session. In that connexion, he was prepared to accept the amendment suggested by the United States to operative paragraph 1.

21. With regard to the USSR representative's fear that operative paragraph 2 would give the impression that non-governmental organizations were to impose decisions on towns, he stressed that the reference was to towns which had "prepared plans for twinning co-operation or other forms of inter-municipal co-operation". It was only a matter of submitting to their Governments plans which they had already prepared. The revised text took into account

the fact that it was for Governments to put proposals to UNDP. It should also be clear from operative paragraph 3 that States were not being asked to approve the granting of resources for activities which had not yet proved their value.

22. In his view, the operative paragraphs of the revised draft represented the minimum action that the Council could take without ignoring the General Assembly's request in resolution 2058 (XX), and he did not think that the matter could be deferred to a later session.

23. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that it was still not clear to him whether a programme of measures had been prepared as a basis for practical action by the Council to promote town twinning and whether all towns and countries would be eligible to receive assistance. Moreover, singling out one specialized agency might set a dangerous precedent. He agreed with the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania that the decision on the draft resolution should be deferred; considerably more time was needed for consideration on the issues involved, particularly the legal implications. His delegation was very sympathetic towards town-twinning activities and had taken note of the useful work of UTO, but UNDP resources were limited and governed by a strict order of priority.

*Mr. Klusák (Czechoslovakia) resumed the Chair.*

24. Mr. NDIMBIE (Cameroon) said that the preparation of a detailed estimate of the expenditure implied by the draft resolution would be no easy undertaking, entailing as it would a survey of the towns affected and consultations with the non-governmental organizations concerned. In that connexion, an indication of the cost of town-twinning activities in the Soviet Union might be relevant. Moreover, the draft resolution was based on a General Assembly resolution and such texts did not usually set forth detailed measures of implementation.

25. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) agreed with the USSR representative that there was an unfortunate disparity between the operative and preambular parts of the draft resolution. His delegation regretted the absence of any provisions for concrete steps and had sought to include such provisions when introducing the original text of the draft resolution. Unfortunately, however, they had had to be progressively removed in face of opposition from many members of the Council. General Assembly resolution 2058 (XX) implied a large number of implementation measures which he hoped would be adopted eventually; members of the Council had been reluctant to accept them at the present session. The original draft had proposed the establishment of a fund to finance town-twinning activities but, there again, opposition had forced the withdrawal of that proposal, although the fund would have been financed from voluntary contributions. The draft resolution could hardly set forth detailed criteria as to which pairs of towns should receive assistance although, if such a provision could be included without hampering the adoption of the draft resolution, his delegation would be the first to welcome it. He doubted whether the resolu-

tion would set a precedent in regard to the direct financing of non-governmental organizations. The sponsors had originally intended that such assistance should be channelled through Governments in response to specific requests from them.

26. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that the position of his delegation was dependent upon the answers to the question he had raised. The explanations given thus far had not provided sufficient clarification. They had not taken into account the deeper significance of the resolution, nor was it clear what criteria would be applied in financing projects, how much assistance would be involved and what specific action would be taken in regard to town twinning. He had calculated that a very considerable sum indeed would be required to finance the town-twinning activities proposed in the original draft resolution.

27. His delegation felt that the private character of town-twinning activities should be preserved but, if non-governmental organizations participated, that character would disappear and the question would arise as to the legal status of the twinned towns. Furthermore, there would have to be some form of supervision of the town-twinning activities, and that would not be desirable. While the Council should give moral support to those activities it must obviously devote much more thought to the problem and attempt to consider it from the standpoint of the towns themselves.

28. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking on a point of order, moved the adjournment of the debate under rule 50 of the rules of procedure.

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 14

Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights (continued)\* (E/4305, E/L.1156, E/L.1157)

29. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania), introducing his delegation's amendments (E/L.1157) to the USSR draft resolution (E/L.1156), said that it had not been his delegation's intention to delete paragraph 3 of the draft and that the six new operative paragraphs proposed by the Tanzanian delegation should be renumbered accordingly. The main purpose of the amendments was to refer the matter to the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts, which had been established by the Commission on Human Rights in its resolution 2 (XXIII) <sup>1/</sup> to investigate a related phenomenon in South Africa, namely, the torture and ill-treatment of prisoners, detainees and persons in police custody. The infringements of the rights of trade unionists and the total denial of freedom of association were a manifestation of the policy of apartheid and should be examined by the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts.

30. He supported the USSR draft resolution and added that his own amendments had been endorsed by the African and Asian members of the Council.

\*Resumed from the 1463rd meeting.

<sup>1/</sup> See Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-second Session, Supplement No. 6, para. 268.

31. Mr. ATTIGA (Libya) recalled that when the item had been introduced, his delegation had pointed out the need for a careful examination, since any decision taken might well constitute a precedent. His delegation would therefore have been happier if the note by the Secretary-General (E/4305) had been accompanied by a paper containing the opinion of legal experts. As a result of consultations among members, his delegation wished to suggest the following amendments to the Tanzanian text: the words "not later than the end of June 1967" should be added at the end of what had become operative paragraph 4; in operative paragraph 5, the words "if any" should be inserted between the word "comments" and "received". It had been felt that a time-limit should be set, since six months had elapsed before the Secretary-General had received the reply of the Government of South Africa, and that the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts should be enabled to act in the event that no reply was received from the South African Government by the end of June.

32. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) remarked that seventeen years previously, the Council had established a fact-finding procedure with the International Labour Organisation (ILO) with the essential aim of safeguarding trade union rights. That procedure had failed in the present instance because it had been rejected by the Government of South Africa, which was not a member of the ILO, as resolution 277 (X) of 17 February 1950 anticipated it might in the case of non-members of the ILO. The Council was therefore obliged to establish an alternative fact-finding procedure. In that context, it was quite logical to follow the suggestion of the African-Asian group and refer the matter to the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts. His delegation accordingly supported the Tanzanian amendments. If he had any lingering doubts, they related to the parts of the USSR draft resolution which remained unaffected by those amendments. In his view, it was necessary to determine the facts of the situation before taking a decision. It would be inappropriate for the Council to state, as did operative paragraph 1 of the USSR draft resolution, that it fully supported the specific accusations contained in the complaint by the World Federation of Trade Unions, since they had not been investigated. However, the Council should certainly express its concern at the manifestation of the iniquitous policy of apartheid in trade union legislation in South Africa.

33. He therefore suggested that operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution should begin with the words "Takes note of", and that in operative paragraph 2, the words "and the unlawful prosecution of trade union workers in" should be replaced by the words "reflected in the legislation and practice of".

34. Mr. AKYAMAC (Turkey) thought that there was no doubt that the two alleged cases of infringements of trade union rights of South Africa workers were part and parcel of the deplorable policy of apartheid of the Government of South Africa. That policy had been condemned time and again by the United Nations which was currently engaged in a serious effort to put an end to it. The refusal of the South African Government to consent to the complaint of the World



Federation of Trade Unions being referred to the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission on Freedom of Association of the International Labour Office and the basis for that refusal provided clear evidence that the Government of South Africa was enforcing the policy of apartheid systematically in all spheres of life. In order to check and to reverse that co-ordinated effort of the part of the South African Government, the United Nations must act in a correspondingly concerted manner.

35. In the present case, his delegation believed that the Council could and should take appropriate action under its resolution 277 (X). The Council could endorse the action initiated by the World Federation of Trade Unions and his delegation believed that operative paragraph 1 of the USSR draft resolution had been included with that end in mind. Furthermore, the draft resolution should condemn the refusal of the South African Government to co-operate with the Secretary-General. In addition, the Council should take such positive action as circumstances allowed. A number of alternatives were open to it. It could, for example, decide to refer the matter to the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa for consideration and appropriate action, a course advocated by the draft resolution. It could also decide to expose and demonstrate the grossly discriminatory nature of the laws under which the African workers had been prosecuted. A third possibility would be for the Council to transmit the complaint to the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts for its consideration and recommendations. His delegation would be prepared to support a draft resolution along any of those lines.

36. Mr. ZORRILLA (Mexico) said that the situation before the Council was entirely new and should be dealt with very carefully, since the decision taken in the matter might set a precedent. It would be well to request the Secretary-General to obtain an opinion from his legal advisers on the issues involved. His delegation was, however, prepared to consider the USSR proposal that the complaint should be referred to the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa.

37. The Tanzanian amendments did not introduce any new elements aimed at a solution on the trade union problem in itself, but proposed a procedure which had already been tried and had produced negative results. In addition, it introduced notions which, although they were closely related with the present case and deserved the Council's attention, required a different kind of action. The torture and ill treatment of workers in police custody in South Africa violated rights other than trade union rights, and was being dealt with by other bodies.

38. The United States amendments were acceptable to his delegation.

39. Mr. RZA (Pakistan) warmly supported the Tanzania  amendments and commended them to the Council.

40. He was not completely convinced by the reasons which the United States delegation had given. The World Federation of Trade Unions had addressed

certain allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights in South Africa to the ILO, which had not been in a position to investigate those allegations. The Government of South Africa was not to be expected to co-operate with a subsidiary body of the United Nations. The Council should not hesitate to support allegations which seemed to be justified, and he thought operative paragraph 1 of the USSR draft resolution fully appropriate. However, in order to meet the United States representative's point, the word "specific" might be deleted. He was opposed to the United States amendments and supported the text of draft resolution E/L.1156 in its present form.

41. Mr. BAL (Belgium) said that his country attached great importance to freedom of association, which had been formally guaranteed by its Constitution for more than a century.

42. Belgian law effectively protected the exercise of trade union rights and his Government's position in that regard had frequently been expressed in the United Nations and in other international bodies, such as the ILO. His Government's views regarding racial discrimination and the policy of apartheid in South Africa were well known. His delegation was therefore in a position to support any draft resolution or measure dealing with the general problem of racial discrimination manifested in South African labour legislation. The documents before the Council left no doubt that the situation existing in South Africa in that regard was not in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations or with the many recommendations adopted in the United Nations; the Council should express its disapproval through the adoption of a formal text.

43. His delegation based its position largely on the conclusions of the Committee on Freedom of Association of the International Labour Office, in particular, the recommendation contained in paragraph 13 (b) of the Committee's report (E/4305, annex I), which seemed on the whole to be justified. On the other hand, the question arose whether the Council could take a decision on all aspects of the individual cases mentioned in the complaint of the World Federation of Trade Unions solely on the basis of the documents before it. According to paragraph 8 of the above-mentioned conclusions, it was not clear from the complaint whether the fact that the accused persons had been on strike in 1961 had been the basis for their conviction in 1965. The Council should therefore exercise caution in making any judgement on the relative importance of the various factors which might have led to that conviction. In addition, there was a more general question of principle relating to the competence of the Council and its subsidiary bodies to take a decision as a quasi-judicial body concerning the fact brought to their attention.

44. His delegation would find it difficult to support, without a further examination of the facts, the accusations contained in the complaint by the World Federation of Trade Unions. However, he could endorse the suggestion that the communication received from the Director-General of the International Labour Office regarding infringements of trade union rights in the Republic of South Africa should be transmitted to



the Government of that country with a request for a reply and comments. He could also support operative paragraph 2 of the USSR draft resolution if it was amended as suggested by the United States representative.

45. A more difficult question of a procedural nature arose in connexion with one of the amendments proposed by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania that the communication received from the Director-General of the International Labour Office and the comments received from the Republic of South Africa thereon should be submitted to the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts established by resolution 2 (XXIII) of the Commission on Human Rights. The Social Committee had discussed that resolution, but had taken no decision. In fact, it still had to decide on a Tanzanian draft resolution calling for approval of the Commission's resolution. In those circumstances, he wondered whether it would be appropriate to take a decision forthwith on the question of referring the matter to the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts.

46. Mr. OWONO (Cameroon) remarked that all United Nations efforts over the previous twenty years to induce the South African Government to abandon the policy of apartheid had been fruitless. The debate at the fifth special session of the General Assembly had been no exception. The countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America were chided for being impatient and unrealistic and told they must not recommend anything which could not be carried out. In the present instance, however, the draft resolution was the result of a communication from an international organization—which was not given to rashness. He supported both the USSR draft resolution and the Tanzanian amendments to it and further suggested that a new operative paragraph should be inserted before operative paragraph 1, as follows:

"Congratulates the World Federation of Trade Unions and the International Labour Organisation on their diligence in bringing to the attention of the Economic and Social Council the flagrant infringements of trade union rights in the Republic of South Africa."

47. Mr. TREMBLAY (Canada) said that his delegation could never, in any circumstances, accept that a country should translate a philosophy of racial discrimination into its national legislation. The problem referred to the Council by the ILO concerned specific cases of workers imprisoned on the pretext that the exercise of their trade union rights constituted a danger to the State. The ILO had referred the matter to the Council because South Africa had withdrawn from the agency and had refused to co-operate in the investigation of the allegations. In addition to the infringement of trade union rights as such, there was also the political question of labour legislation based on racial discrimination.

48. His legation supported the amendments proposed by  United Republic of Tanzania since the

Council must study all aspects of the infringement of trade union rights and the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts established by the Commission on Human Rights would be an appropriate body to undertake such a study.

49. He also supported the United States amendments and agreed with the Belgian representative that there should be vigorous action to end racial discrimination in labour matters.

50. Mr. JHA (India) said that his delegation wholeheartedly supported the USSR draft resolution and the amendments proposed by the United Republic of Tanzania. It had never been in any doubt as to the validity of the accusations, which followed the pattern of violation of human rights in South Africa. The fact that an international organization had brought forward the accusations added credence to them.

51. Mr. SCHREIBER (Secretariat) recalled that the representatives of Mexico and Libya had earlier asked for guidance on the legal aspects of the problem before the Council. When the Council had first taken up the matter, he had drawn its attention to possible courses of action under its resolution 277 (X), which stated that when a Government refused to co-operate it was for the Council to decide on further measures to protect the right of association. Since the Republic of South Africa had refused to co-operate, it was hardly for the Secretary-General to tell the Council what measures would be appropriate. He wished, however, to draw attention to the ILO's report to the fortieth session of the Council<sup>2/</sup> dealing with organizational and procedural arrangements for the implementation of conventions and recommendations in the field of human rights. The United Nations itself had no parallel procedure, and that was why the Council's examination of the matter was so important.

52. Mr. TEVOEDJRE (Dahomey) said that the views which accorded most closely with his own were those of the Canadian representative. Whereas the South African Government's policies of apartheid were a problem of long standing, the specific accusations brought by the ILO raised a new issue. While apartheid itself must be condemned, there was an obvious need for further consideration of the legal aspects of the allegations in regard to South Africa's labour legislation. It was therefore appropriate that the Council should note the specific accusations with grave concern—as the United States representative had suggested—while condemning the legal aspects of the infringement of trade union rights which stemmed from the policy of apartheid. The USSR draft resolution, as amended by the representatives of the United Republic of Tanzania and the United States, offered a sound basis for general agreement.

*The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.*

<sup>2/</sup> Ibid., Fortieth Session, Annexes, agenda item 9, document E/4144.