

give decisive support to Mozambique so that it received all the help it needed in overcoming the problems created by the sanctions. Mozambique's decision to impose sanctions must be fully supported by the international community, as a contribution to stamping out racism in southern Africa.

34. Mr. ROSSI (Italy) said the report of the Mission to Mozambique provided an excellent basis for a programme of financial and technical assistance to that country, designed to help it to implement its development programme and fully enforce sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. He therefore hoped that the Council would adopt draft resolution E/L.1716 unanimously.

35. It had been an act of courage for Mozambique to impose sanctions against the minority régime in Southern Rhodesia, and it was for the international community, in its turn, to match that courage with a massive assistance effort. The problems of transforming Mozambique's economy, which was a legacy from colonial days, were dramatically aggravated by the need to offset the cost of applying sanctions.

36. His country had shown political and economic solidarity with FRELIMO before and after Mozambique's independence and was ready to examine possible forms of financial and technical assistance in numerous fields, particularly education, consulting services for development projects and feasibility studies for agricultural projects, those being the sectors to which the Government of Mozambique itself gave the highest priority.

37. Draft resolution E/L.1716 would be useful in mobilizing and co-ordinating assistance by multilateral

organizations and the United Nations. The Foreign Ministers of EEC had already expressed themselves in favour of multilateral action at a meeting in Luxembourg on 23 February 1976.

38. The people of Mozambique were enduring tremendous sacrifices for a cause which went beyond their national borders and interests, since it was a common cause of Africa and the entire international community. It was thus the duty of the international community to respond accordingly.

39. Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria) said that Mozambique was faced with a grave economic situation as a result of severing all relations with Southern Rhodesia, and urgently required assistance in meeting its immediate and long-term needs. It was only fair that the burden it must carry as a result of complying with the decisions of the United Nations should be shared by the international community as a whole, and the report of the Mission to Mozambique provided a basis for co-ordinated assistance efforts by Member States. The Secretary-General had responded promptly and effectively to Security Council resolution 386 (1976) and it was now for the Governments of Member States to implement, in accordance with that resolution, a programme of financial, economic and technical assistance enabling Mozambique to carry out its economic development programme and apply the system of sanctions in full. His Government was ready to contribute to that programme in response to the appeals by the Secretary-General, the Security Council and the Government of Mozambique, and it therefore fully supported draft resolution E/L.1716.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.

1999th meeting

Tuesday, 11 May 1976, at 11 a.m.

President: Mr. Siméon AKE (Ivory Coast).

E/SR.1999

AGENDA ITEM 12

Assistance to Mozambique (concluded) (E/5812 and Corr.1 and Add.1, E/L.1716, E/L.1719)

1. Mr. MUTHAURA (Kenya), introducing draft resolution E/L.1716, announced that Austria, Brazil and Norway had also become sponsors. The basic objective of the draft resolution was to facilitate the provision of United Nations assistance to Mozambique, taking into account the view expressed by numerous delegations that the programmes established in Mozambique as a result of the application of United Nations sanctions against Southern Rhodesia were the responsibility of the Organization. The draft resolution therefore contained provisions designed to translate the wishes of the members of the Council into a United Nations programme of action for assistance to Mozambique. In view of the basic principles embodied in Articles 49 and 50 of the United Nations Charter and the broad support that existed for United Nations assistance to Mozambique, as evidenced by the large number of sponsors of the draft resolution and the views expressed by delegations, he hoped that the Council would adopt

the draft resolution without amendment and without a vote.

2. The PRESIDENT drew attention to document E/L.1719, which set forth the financial implications of the assistance proposed under draft resolution E/L.1716.

3. Mr. DE BEIR (Belgium) endorsed the draft resolution and said that, on the basis of their consideration of the report of the Mission sent by the Secretary-General to Mozambique (see E/5812 and Corr.1 and Add.1), the Belgian authorities had agreed in principle to provide assistance to Mozambique on a bilateral basis.

4. Mr. KOCH (Federal Republic of Germany) said that he wondered whether the levels of two of the posts recommended by the Secretariat in document E/L.1719—the Joint Co-ordinator and the Economist/Programme Officer—were not too high.

5. Mr. RUEDAS (Budget Division) said the Secretary-General had felt that, since the draft resolution would entail frequent fund-raising missions consisting of meetings with high-level representatives of Govern-

ments and other organizations, he should be represented in such contacts by sufficiently high-ranking officials. Otherwise, the effectiveness of the fund-raising missions might be impaired.

6. The PRESIDENT asked whether the official who had headed the recent Mission to Mozambique could be appointed to the new post of Joint Co-ordinator.

7. Mr. RUEDAS (Budget Division) said that the programme of work arising from the draft resolution would require the frequent and prolonged absence from New York of the officer involved and that it was not possible to release from his duties at Headquarters the senior official who had directed the recent Mission.

8. Mr. DONNELLY (United Kingdom) supported the draft resolution, but wondered whether the financial implications arising from operative paragraphs 3 and 6 were not the same as those arising from paragraphs 5 and 6 of Security Council resolution 386 (1976), as the statement made by the representative of the Secretary-General at the beginning of the Council's consideration of the item seemed to suggest.

9. Mr. HARRY (Australia) said he had understood the representative of the Budget Division to say that the appointment of additional staff was necessitated not only by the increased workload arising from the provisions of the draft resolution but also because there was a general need to increase the number of staff members in the Office of the Secretary-General. He asked whether his understanding was correct.

10. Mr. RUEDAS (Budget Division) said that he had not intended to give that impression. When in due course the request for additional staff was placed before the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, it would be made clear that the posts involved were temporary. It had never been intended to use the requirements arising from the provision of assistance to Mozambique as a pretext for increasing the number of staff members in the Office of the Secretary-General. It was reasonable to assume, therefore, that the posts in question might be abolished in 1977.

11. Mr. ORTIZ RODRIGUEZ (Cuba), Mr. NGALLI-MARSALA (Congo), Mr. AL-SAIDI (Yemen) and Mr. FALCONI (Peru) said that their delegations wished to become sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1716.

12. The PRESIDENT invited the members of the Council to vote on draft resolution E/L.1716. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1987 (LX)).

13. The PRESIDENT invited the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Mozambique to make a statement, in accordance with article 72 of the rules of procedure.

14. Mr. PANGUENE (Mozambique) expressed his Government's appreciation for the manner in which the President had guided the Council's consideration of the item. The role played by the President had been a decisive factor in bringing about the decision which had just been taken. His Government was also grateful to the members of the Council for their constructive participation in the debate and their comprehension of the economic difficulties besetting his country as a

result of its application of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. He was sure that the appeal contained in the resolution just adopted would elicit a practical response from all Member States. He thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution, particularly Zambia, a country which shared with Mozambique a place on the front line in southern Africa. The battle was not yet over and he hoped that the international community, conscious of its responsibilities, would continue to keep a close watch on developments in the area and would deal with them as vigorously as it had in the past.

AGENDA ITEM 4

Procedures for the implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (concluded)* (E/5764, E/L.1710, E/L.1718)

15. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) drew attention to the statement of programme budget implications of draft resolution E/L.1710, contained in document E/L.1718.

16. Miss MASSIP (Canada) said that, while her delegation was not opposed to the adoption of the draft resolution, it regretted that the Council had not placed adequate stress on the need for expert assistance in the consideration of the reports which States were asked to submit under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. It feared that the machinery provided for in operative paragraph 9 would not ensure thorough consideration of those reports by persons possessing expertise in the various fields covered.

17. Her delegation also regretted that nowhere in the draft resolution was there any provision for enlisting the services of the Commission on Human Rights, which at its thirty-second session had expressed the desire to play a role in the implementation of the Covenant. She wished to emphasize her delegation's understanding that the task entrusted to the Council's working group under paragraph 9 (a) of the draft resolution would allow of its recommending to the Economic and Social Council that reports, or parts of reports, should be transmitted to the Commission on Human Rights for study, as provided in article 19 of the Covenant.

18. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) observed that the common effort made to accommodate the views of numerous delegations and of the specialized agencies had resulted in a draft resolution which could be adopted unanimously without a vote. The draft resolution provided for a speedy and smooth procedure which had various positive aspects: it avoided placing upon States a heavy reporting burden under the Covenant; it fully respected the provisions of article 16 of the Covenant as far as the main and direct responsibility of the Council was concerned, without excluding the contribution of the Commission on Human Rights as outlined in article 19; it ensured the participation of experts in the examination of the reports of the States parties without creating *ad hoc* bodies or establishing special sessions of the existing ones; finally, it settled the question of the competence and reporting obligations of the specialized agencies.

19. She was pleased to inform the Council that ratification by Italy of the Covenant under consideration and of the International Covenant on Civil and Politi-

* Resumed from the 1988th meeting.

cal Rights and the Optional Protocol thereto was expected shortly; a Government bill for that purpose would be presented to the parliament as soon as possible. Her delegation hoped that many other Member States would soon be in a position to ratify the two Covenants and the Optional Protocol.

20. Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria) said that his delegation was prepared to join the consensus on draft resolution E/L.1710. It believed that the procedures established should ensure that the reports from States parties would be considered in the most effective way possible, and it therefore trusted that the Council would avail itself of the possibility provided in article 19 of the Covenant of transmitting reports to the Commission on Human Rights, particularly as the Commission had recently expressed its readiness to assume the responsibilities involved.

21. His Government was in the process of ratifying both Covenants and hoped to complete the process in the near future.

22. Miss ILIC (Yugoslavia) said that supervision of the implementation of the Covenant should have been entrusted to the States parties themselves. The draft resolution should also have envisaged the active participation of the Commission on Human Rights.

23. Mr. LAMB (Australia) asked whether the Secretariat's estimate of the cost of pre-session documentation had taken account of the expected increase in the number of States parties to the Covenant.

24. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) said that the Secretariat had based its calculations on the assumption that there would be approximately 50 States parties, each of which would submit a report of 40-50 pages.

25. Mr. BROAD (United Kingdom) observed that the financial implications of the draft resolution seemed very high, and appealed to the Secretariat to keep costs as low as possible.

26. Mr. S. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would support the draft resolution. However, implementation of the Covenant by States parties should be supervised by the parties themselves. It was therefore to be hoped that the sessional working group charged with considering the reports would take into account the views of States parties. The establishment of a sessional working group should not have any financial implications, since servicing its meetings would require no additional effort on the part of the Secretariat.

27. Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) supported the draft resolution, on the understanding that the question of providing summary records for the sessional working group would be decided by the Council when the working group was set up.

28. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights), referring to the question raised by the representative of the Soviet Union, said that implementation of the draft resolution would have financial implications because of the number of additional documents which the Secretariat would have to process. If, however, it proved possible to utilize existing resources within the Secretariat, costs would be reduced accordingly. With reference to the point made by the representative of Egypt, he said that the question of providing summary records for the sessional working group had not yet been decided. However, similar

groups in the past had found summary records a useful means of communicating the substance of their discussions to Governments.

29. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolution E/L.1710 without a vote.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1988 (LX)).

30. Mrs. MEAGHER (World Health Organization) said that, in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant and the resolution which had just been adopted, WHO would submit a report on its programme by 1 December 1979. The report would be based on information provided by member States in connexion with WHO periodic reports on the world health situation.

AGENDA ITEM 5

Restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system (E/5453/Rev.1 and Add.1, E/5476 and Add.1-3, Add.3/Corr.1 and Add.4-13, E/5524 and Add.1-4, Add.4/Corr.1 and Add.5, E/5633, E/5753, annex; E/5792, E/NGO/43, E/NGO/45 and Add.1)

31. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that the measures for restructuring the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system, which had been adopted in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1768 (LIV) and General Assembly resolution 3341 (XXIX), were outlined in document E/5753. In connexion with the review of the Council's subsidiary machinery, he drew the attention of the Council to documents E/5453/Rev.1 and E/5453/Rev.1/Add.1. In connexion with Council decision 139 (ORG-76), relating to the terms of reference of CPC, he drew attention to the suggestions made by the Secretariat in document E/5792.

32. With reference to the review of the agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies and IAEA, he drew the attention of the Council to documents E/5524 and Add.1-4, Add.4/Corr.1 and Add.5, and E/5633, and also to Economic and Social Council resolution 1920 (LVIII) and pointed out that, since the Council had decided to review such agreements, it had already concluded one agreement which basically conformed to the old pattern and was in the process of initiating negotiations on another with IFAD.

33. A review of the rules of procedure of the Council's functional commissions was necessary, since there existed inconsistencies between the revised rules of the Council and the unrevised rules of the functional commissions. With reference to the review of the list of subsidiary bodies that received meeting records, he drew the attention of the Council to the provisional annotated agenda for the sixtieth session (E/5770) and pointed out that, at its organizational session for 1976, the Council had endorsed General Assembly resolution 3415 (XXX).

34. Since the last calendar of meetings had been approved in 1975, the Council had taken a number of decisions which affected not only the scope and size of its subsidiary machinery but also the calendar of meetings. The Council had decided to establish a committee on candidatures for election to the International Narcotics Control Board (decision 138 (ORG-76)); to prolong the next session of CPC; to

convene a second special session of the Committee on Natural Resources to prepare for the United Nations Water Conference (decision 144 (LX)); to authorize the Information and Research Centre on Transnational Corporations to convene a group of experts to explore the possibility of working out standard forms for the presentation of the financial relationships between transnational corporations and their associated enterprises; to establish a new sessional working group to supervise the implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; to authorize additional meetings with the purview of the Commission on Human Rights; to prolong the next session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and, in practice, to authorize annual meetings of that body; and to authorize an extraordinary session of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development in 1976 and a special session of the Committee on Science and Technology for Development in 1977. On the basis of the report of the Commission on Transnational Corporations, an international working group would be set up shortly, and was expected to hold three sessions in 1977.

35. Mr. STOFOROPOULOS (Greece) said that, at the current session, the Council should take two decisions related to restructuring.

36. First, the Council should decide: (a) to review the agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies and IAEA at its sixty-second session, or at its resumed sixty-first session, in the light of the conclusions and recommendations of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Restructuring of the Economic and Social Sectors of the United Nations System; (b) to review the terms of reference of its subsidiary machinery at its sixty-second or resumed sixty-first session in the light of the conclusions and recommendations of the *Ad Hoc* Committee; (c) to review the rules of procedure of its functional commissions at its sixty-second or resumed sixty-first session so that they might conform to the revised rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council (E/5715), and to that end to request the Secretariat to prepare a draft revised text of the rules based on, and fully consistent with, the revised rules of the Council; (d) that, in accordance with Council decision 137 (ORG-76), at the first meeting of each session of a subsidiary body of the Council the Chairman should propose, and the subsidiary body should decide on, the extent to which debates on substantive items were to be reflected in the summary records.

37. The second decision, relating to the terms of reference of CPC, should be based on the draft text contained in document E/5792, annex I. In subparagraph 1 (a) (ii) of that text, the words "long-term

plans formulated for these sectors" should be replaced by the words "medium-term plans formulated for the organizational units involved in each programme of the United Nations". Subparagraph 1 (e) should be replaced by a new text, reading: "Make recommendations with respect to work programmes proposed by the Secretariat to give effect to the legislative intent of the relevant policy-making organs, taking into account the need to avoid overlapping and duplication."

38. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) said that, for a number of reasons, there were limits to what the Council could expect to accomplish at the current session with regard to restructuring. While agreeing with the general approach proposed by the representative of Greece, his delegation would prefer to postpone taking a decision on the form and exact content of a draft decision until it had had an opportunity to consider more carefully the statements made in the Council.

39. Mrs. HARRIS (International Social Service), speaking at the invitation of the President and on behalf of the non-governmental organizations which had submitted the statement contained in document E/NGO/45, expressed the hope that, in considering the many proposals relating to the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system, the Council would take full account of the positions of non-governmental organizations committed to working with it. The Council should continue to consider the formal structuring of relations between the United Nations and the non-governmental organizations. Document E/NGO/45 contained three specific proposals for measures designed to achieve that end.

Statement by the representative of Bolivia

40. Miss LAPEYRIERE (Bolivia) said that, although she had received no instructions from her Government, she felt obliged, on behalf of the Bolivian Mission, to condemn the assassination on the previous day of the Bolivian Ambassador in Paris, General Joaquín Zen-teno Anaya. The identity of the victim showed that crime to have been one more case of political terrorism. She protested most strongly against the dastardly act and said she was confident that the French Government would find and punish with the fullest severity of the law the person or persons responsible. She recalled the generosity of the Bolivian Government in remitting the sentence of 30 years' imprisonment imposed on a French citizen, Régis Debray, for having participated in the training of the Nancahuazú guerrillas.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.