



# Economic and Social Council

Provisional

7 November 2000

Original: English

## Substantive session of 2000

### Provisional summary record of the 45th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 28 July 2000, at 3 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Mbayu (Vice-President).....(Cameroon)  
*later:* Mr. Wibisono.....(Indonesia)

## Contents

Social and human rights questions (*continued*)

- (a) Advancement of women (*continued*)
- (b) Social development (*continued*)
- (c) Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)
- (d) Narcotic drugs (*continued*)
- (e) United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (*continued*)
- (f) Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Third Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (*continued*)
- (g) Human rights (*continued*)

Integrated and coordinated implementation of and follow-up to major United Nations conferences and summits (*continued*)

Coordination, programme and other questions (*continued*)

- (a) Reports of the coordination bodies (*continued*)
- (e) International cooperation in the field of informatics (*continued*)

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (*continued*)

Economic and social repercussions of the Israeli occupation on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territory including Jerusalem, and the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan (*continued*)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Non-governmental organizations (*continued*)

Economic and environmental questions (*continued*)

- (a) Sustainable development (*continued*)
- (b) Public administration and finance (*continued*)
- (c) Water supply and sanitation (*continued*)
- (d) Cartography (*continued*)
- (e) Population and development (*continued*)
- (f) Statistics (*continued*)
- (g) International cooperation in tax matters (*continued*)
- (h) Functioning of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development including its role in coordinating science and technology for development (*continued*)

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters

Suspension of the session

*In the absence of Mr. Wibisono (Indonesia), Mr. Mbayu (Cameroon), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

*The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.*

**Social and human rights questions** (*continued*)  
(E/2000/NGO/1)

**(f) Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Third Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination** (*continued*) (A/54/855-E/2000/44; E/2000/75)

**(g) Human rights** (*continued*) (A/54/855-E/2000/44; A/55/41 and A/55/139-E/2000/93; E/2000/22 and Corr.1, E/2000/23 (Parts I and II) and E/2000/23/Add.1, E/2000/76, E/2000/83, E/2000/105, E/2000/106 and E/2000/107)

1. **Mr. Le Bret** (France), speaking on behalf of the European Union, the associated countries Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia, and in addition, Liechtenstein, explained the position of those countries regarding the case of Mr. Param Cumaraswamy, the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers. The European Union welcomed the judgement handed down on 7 July by the High Court in Kuala Lumpur, recognizing the immunity of the Special Rapporteur in the libel proceedings brought against him. That judgement complied with the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, pronounced on 29 April 1999. The European Union fully agreed with the opinion expressed by the Secretary-General in his letter of 24 July and drew attention to the fact that the judgement did not settle three other pending cases against Mr. Cumaraswamy, because the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice was not accepted as binding in respect of those cases. Moreover, the decision of the High Court made each party responsible for its own legal costs, contrary to the opinion of the International Court of Justice that Mr. Cumaraswamy should be discharged of any financial obligation in respect of the proceedings. The Government of Malaysia, which had explicitly stated that it accepted its obligations under article VIII, section 30, of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, should therefore give full effect to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and should also accept responsibility for legal costs

incurred by Mr. Cumaraswamy or on his behalf by the United Nations. The Council, which had requested the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in its decision 1998/297, should remain seized of the matter until it was definitively resolved.

2. **The President** said that he had received a request from the observer for the Grand Council of the Crees, a non-governmental organization in consultative status with the Council, to address it on the establishment of a Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. He invited the Council to grant that request on an exceptional basis.

3. *It was so decided.*

4. **Mr. Coon-Come** (Observer for the Grand Council of the Crees) recalled that in 1993, the International Year of the World's Indigenous People, the World Conference on Human Rights had recommended the establishment of a permanent forum for indigenous people. At the recent World Summit for Social Development, more than 130 Governments had supported the creation of such a forum, reflecting the willingness of States to build a new partnership with indigenous peoples. Twenty organizations of indigenous peoples worldwide had endorsed a statement urging the Council to establish the proposed Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues.

5. **Mr. Hynes** (Canada) said that his Government had worked closely with other Governments and organizations of indigenous peoples on the proposed mandate for the Forum. The decision to create a permanent body on indigenous issues was a very positive development which would enhance the ability of the United Nations system to respond to the needs and aspirations of indigenous peoples. The Secretariat should work expeditiously to bring the proposed Forum into being.

6. He welcomed the decision in the case of Mr. Cumaraswamy. He hoped that the outstanding issues would shortly be resolved by the Government of Malaysia, in the context of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.

7. With regard to the report of the Commission on Human Rights, it was quite appropriate for the High Commissioner for Human Rights to keep the Council informed of all significant developments and pronouncements of United Nations human rights bodies, including treaty bodies, and he hoped she would continue to do so. The report of the High

Commissioner (E/2000/83) did not call for action by the Council, which was merely required to take note of it. Any reservations which delegations wished to enter concerning the pronouncements of the Human Rights Committee should be addressed to that Committee.

8. **The President** drew the Council's attention to chapter I of the report of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights on its twentieth and twenty-first sessions (E/2000/22 and Corr.1) and invited comments on the draft decision entitled "Additional regular session of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights", which had been recommended for adoption by the Council. A letter from the Chairperson of the Committee, also in chapter I, gave additional information about the request contained in the decision.

9. **Mr. Hynes** (Canada) endorsed the Committee's comments about the inadequacy of the meeting arrangements for dealing with its heavy workload, a matter which was now coming before the Council for the third year running. In 1999, the Council had adopted a decision calling for a report from the Committee on the question for 2001. Accordingly, he suggested that the decision should be deferred to a resumed session of the Council, to allow time for further consultations.

10. **Ms. Nishimura** (Japan) supported that suggestion. The draft decision had been recommended by an expert body, not an intergovernmental body, and there had been no opportunity during the Council's current session to discuss it. Secondly, in its decision E/1999/288 the Council had already approved two additional extraordinary sessions for the Committee in the period 2000-2001, so that there would be three sessions in all over that period. As for holding the session in New York, in its decision E/1999/288 the Council had requested the Committee to consider ways of improving the efficiency of its working methods and to report to the Council in 2001. It would therefore be better to defer the matter until the Council's next session.

11. **The President** said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to defer the decision.

12. *It was so decided.*

13. **The President** invited the Council to take action, under item 14 (g) of its agenda on the draft proposals

recommended for adoption by the Council in chapter I of the report of the Commission on Human Rights on its fifty-sixth session (E/2000/23, Part I). He drew the Council's attention to document E/2000/23/Add.1, containing a statement of the administrative and programme budget implications of those draft resolutions and decisions, and reminded the Council that it had already adopted draft resolutions 2 and 4 and draft decisions 4, 5, 35 and 41 at its 8th and 10th meetings. He invited the Council to consider draft resolution 1 in section A of document E/2000/23 (Part I), entitled "Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance".

*Draft resolution 1*

14. *Draft resolution 1 was adopted.*

*Draft resolution 3*

15. **Mr. Reyes Rodríguez** (Cuba) said that he wished to dissociate his delegation from the draft resolution. He recalled that it had excited some controversy during the Commission's session, especially for a group of countries including his own, which did not feel that the arrangements contemplated in it provided any real defence of the rights of indigenous peoples. The penultimate preambular paragraph of the draft resolution stated that the establishment of the Permanent Forum should lead to "careful consideration of the future" of the Working Group on Indigenous Populations, which had been among the principal mechanisms for promoting those rights. His delegation also objected to the procedure proposed in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution for electing representatives of indigenous peoples to the Forum. That procedure was completely anti-democratic and would enable Governments to veto proposals by organizations of indigenous peoples. Moreover, the procedure contemplated in paragraph 3 ran counter to the principles for the protection of human rights, since the consensus rule would limit the scope for initiative by the indigenous peoples themselves. Lastly, the financing arrangements proposed in paragraph 6 would not allow the new body to function independently.

16. **Mr. Gallagher** (United States of America) welcomed the proposal to establish a permanent United Nations forum for discussion and education about indigenous issues. However, the future role of the new body in relation to the Council required further discussion, as did the transfer of functions from the

Working Group on Indigenous Populations, and the selection of Government and indigenous population representatives. He looked forward to discussing those matters with all interested parties.

17. *Draft resolution 3 was adopted.*

18. **Mr. Bojer** (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden, congratulated the Council on a landmark decision to advance the conditions of indigenous peoples worldwide. The process of appointing the eight government representatives and the eight representatives of indigenous peoples should allow for wide-ranging consultation, and could well last throughout the year 2001, so that the Forum was unlikely to hold its first annual session before 2002. It could begin work in Geneva in June-July 2002, in tandem with the Working Group on Indigenous Populations. The following session could be held in New York, and future sessions, if Governments were willing, in the various parts of the world where indigenous peoples lived.

*Draft decision*

19. *Draft decision 1 was adopted.*

*Draft decision 2*

20. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft decision 2.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, China, Columbia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Japan, Norway, Poland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, France, Greece, Italy, New Zealand, Portugal.

21. *Draft decision 2 was adopted by 29 votes to 9, with 9 abstentions.*

*Draft decision 3*

22. *Draft decision 3 was adopted.*

*Draft decision 4*

23. **The President** invited the Council to consider the text of draft decision 4, entitled "Question of the realization in all countries of the economic, social and cultural rights contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and study of special problems which the developing countries face in their efforts to achieve these human rights". The version of that draft decision which had been adopted by the Council at its 10th meeting (E/2000/L.5) contained technical errors which had now been corrected. He took it that the Council agreed to include the corrected version of the decision in its official records.

24. *It was so decided.*

*Draft decisions 6 and 7*

25. *Draft decisions 6 and 7 were adopted.*

*Draft decision 8*

26. *A recorded vote was taken on draft decision 8.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Greece, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

None.

27. *Draft decision 8 was adopted by 43 votes to 1.*

*Draft decision 9*

28. **Mr. Al-Humaimidi** (Observer for Iraq) said that, like previous similar decisions, the draft decision on human rights in Iraq was a blatant abuse of the human rights issue for political purposes by the perpetrators of the ongoing military aggression against Iraq. Iraq had complied with the relevant Security Council resolutions and cooperated with humanitarian organizations operating within its borders, and the time had come for the Security Council to remove the sanctions. The highest court in Iraq had made the right of appeal against a death sentence automatic, and Iraq had generally complied with international agreements on human rights and anti-discrimination. It was hoped that the other delegations would discern the hidden political motivations that lurked behind the draft decision and vote against it.

29. *A recorded vote was taken on draft decision 9.*

*In favour:*

Angola, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Against:*

None.

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, Burkina Faso, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela, Viet Nam.

30. *Draft decision 9 was adopted by 26 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.*

*Draft decisions 10, 11 and 12*

31. *Draft decisions 10, 11 and 12 were adopted.*

*Draft decision 13*

32. **Mr. Musenga** (Rwanda) said that identical draft decisions had been adopted in previous years, and his delegation regretted that their provisions had not been implemented by the United Nations or the international community. If the same text, which failed to reflect the reality of the situation in Rwanda, was considered in the General Assembly, his delegation would not accept it.

33. *Draft decision 13 was adopted.*

*Draft decisions 14 and 15*

34. *Draft decisions 14 and 15 were adopted.*

*Draft decision 16*

35. **Mr. Rogov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation had voted against the draft decision in the Commission on Human Rights because the opinion of the Special Rapporteur had not been taken into account regarding the situation in Kosovo. His delegation was in favour of extending the mandate of the Special Rapporteur for another year and would support the draft decision.

36. *Draft decision 16 was adopted.*

*Draft decision 17*

37. *Draft decision 17 was adopted.*

38. **Mr. Rahmtalla** (Sudan) said that respect for human rights was deeply rooted in the cultural and religious traditions of the Sudan and in its system of government and Constitution. Lapses in the practical application of the law should not cast any doubt on the State's commitment to human rights. Although his delegation had, in a spirit of consensus and flexibility, joined the rest of the Council in adopting the decision, it had reservations about certain paragraphs, particularly those regarding the plight of citizens in the south of the country, for which it held the rebel movement responsible.

*Draft decision 18*

39. *Draft decision 18 was adopted.*

*Draft decision 19*

40. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft decision 19.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Fiji, India, Indonesia, New Zealand, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Suriname, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Norway, Poland, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

*Abstaining:*

Croatia, Japan, Mexico, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Venezuela.

41. Draft decision 19 was adopted by 23 votes to 14, with 6 abstentions.\*

42. **Mr. Al-Hariri** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on draft decision 19, because the text failed to mention General Assembly resolution 46/51 or to provide a definition of terrorism acceptable to all States. A clear distinction must be made between terrorism, which his Government condemned, and the legitimate right of peoples to struggle for self-determination and independence.

*Draft decisions 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26*

43. *Draft decisions 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26 were adopted.*

*Draft decision 27*

44. **Mr. Lenain** (France) proposed that action on draft decision 27 should be deferred, since a draft decision on the same subject (E/2000/L.24) was before the Council.

45. **Ms. Monroy** (Mexico), supported by **Mr. Reyes Rodríguez** (Cuba), noted that the wording of the draft

decision was erroneous, since it was for the General Assembly, not the Secretary-General, to make a decision on whether to adopt 18 December as International Migrant's Day.

46. **The President** said he took it that the Council wished to defer action on draft decision 27.

47. *It was so decided.*

*Draft decisions 28, 29, 30, 31, and 32*

48. Draft decisions 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32 were adopted.

*Draft decision 33*

49. **Mr. Rogov** (Russian Federation), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on draft decision 33 concerning the situation in the Republic of Chechnya of the Russian Federation, said that his Government intended to continue to cooperate with international institutions for the protection of human rights, as it had stated at the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights. Currently, it was pursuing an active dialogue with the Council of Europe, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. However, it would allow special rapporteurs to visit its territory only within the framework of their general mandates and not in connection with Commission on Human Rights resolution 2000/58, which it found unacceptable. The Russian Federation would therefore vote against draft decision 33 recommended by the Commission.

50. *At the request of the representative of the Russian Federation, a recorded vote was taken on draft decision 33.*

*In favour:*

Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Against:*

Belarus, China, Cuba, India, Russian Federation, Viet Nam

\* The delegation of Morocco subsequently informed the Council that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft decision.

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Saint Lucia, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela

51. *Draft decision 33 was adopted by 21 votes to 6, with 15 abstentions.*

52. **Mr. Al-Hariri** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on draft decision 33 because the latter referred to the need for human rights observers and special rapporteurs in Chechnya. That represented an abuse of human rights instruments. If the international community wished to improve the human rights situation in Chechnya, it must do so by means that were acceptable to all the parties concerned. He had hoped that the draft decision would have used wording similar to the balanced language adopted by OIC on 30 June 2000 at the most recent session of the Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, which had referred to the need to study the difficult human rights situation in Chechnya and to find practical solutions that would lead to the peaceful settlement of the problems in that region.

*Draft decisions 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48 and 49*

53. *Draft decisions 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48 and 49 were adopted.*

*Draft decision E/2000/L.24*

54. *Draft decision E/2000/L.24 was adopted.*

55. **The President** said he took it that, since draft decision 27 recommended by the Commission had been superseded by the adoption of draft decision E/2000/L.24, the Council wished to take no action on draft decision 27.

56. *It was so decided.*

57. **The President** said that the Council had thus concluded its consideration of the recommendations contained in the report of the Commission on Human Rights.

58. **Mr. Reyes Rodríguez** (Cuba), speaking in explanation of position on the report of the Commission on Human Rights, said that Cuba rejected Commission resolution 2000/25 on the situation of human rights in Cuba. Despite its title, that resolution

in no way reflected the real situation of human rights in Cuba. It had been adopted as a result of the manipulation of the Commission by a single State, namely the United States of America, which needed the resolution to justify its aggressiveness and hostility towards Cuba. The resolution therefore lacked any legitimacy, and Cuba rejected its content.

59. **The President** suggested that the Council should take note of the report of the Commission on Human Rights on its fifty-sixth session (E/2000/23, Parts I and II), while taking the comments of the Cuban delegation duly into consideration, and should also take note of documents E/2000/75, E/2000/22 and Corr.1) and E/2000/83.

60. *It was so decided.*

(a) **Advancement of women** (*continued*) (E/2000/27; E/2000/77 and E/2000/78; E/2000/L.23)

*Draft resolution II recommended by the Commission on the Status of Women (E/2000/27)*

61. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution II, concerning the situation of and assistance to Palestinian women.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Greece, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Viet Nam

*Against:*

United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Canada, Norway

62. *Draft resolution II was adopted by 42 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.*

63. **Mr. Al-Hariri** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his Government supported the struggle of the Palestinian people against Israel's occupation and policy of colonization, as well as measures to enable



Palestinian women to fully exercise their rights. The adoption of the draft resolution by such a large majority of the Council bore witness to the international community's support for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in general and of Palestinian women in particular. However, the draft resolution would have been preferable if it had mentioned the bases for the international community's efforts to help bring peace to the Middle East, particularly Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and the principle of land for peace.

64. **Mr. Hynes** (Canada) said that, although Canada was concerned about the situation of Palestinian women, it had once again abstained from voting on the relevant draft resolution, as in the past. At the current delicate moment in the peace process, the Council should make every effort to encourage the parties to reach a comprehensive solution that would ensure lasting peace.

65. **Ms. Eckey** (Norway) said that Norway's concern about the difficult situation of Palestinian women and their families was the basis for its considerable efforts to assist the Palestinian people. Since the signing of the Oslo accords in 1993, Norway had transferred more than \$280 million to the Palestinian people, and it was prepared to maintain its level of support for the next four years. Norway paid special attention to the need to involve Palestinian women in the development process.

66. Although Norway was committed to the Middle East peace process, it felt that the remaining issues must be resolved by the parties themselves through direct negotiations. The Commission on the Status of Women was not the proper forum for addressing problems related to that process. Norway had therefore abstained from voting on the draft resolution.

67. **The President** said that the Council had thus concluded its consideration of the recommendations contained in the report of the Commission on the Status of Women.

*Draft resolution E/2000/L.23*

68. **The President** said that Austria and Italy had joined the list of sponsors of draft resolution E/2000/L.23 on the revitalization and strengthening of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW).

69. *Draft resolution E/2000/L.23 was adopted.*

70. **Ms. Álvarez** (Observer for the Dominican Republic) said that draft resolution E/2000/L.23 had been adopted as a result of the spirit of cooperation that had prevailed in the negotiations between the Group of 77 and China, on the one hand, and the European Union, on the other. That collaboration had attested to the importance which both groups of countries attached to the revitalization of INSTRAW. She appreciated the support which many countries, most recently the Netherlands and Spain, had decided to give INSTRAW and hoped that the adoption of the draft resolution would mark the beginning of a process of strengthening the Institute, which was of critical importance for the advancement of women worldwide.

71. **Ms. Onoh** (Observer for Nigeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, and **Mr. Le Bret** (France), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that they supported the statement made by the observer for the Dominican Republic.

72. **The President** suggested that the Council should take note of documents E/2000/77 and E/2000/78.

73. *It was so decided.*

(b) **Social development** (*continued*) (E/2000/9; E/2000/L.12)

*Draft resolution E/2000/L.12*

74. **The President** said that Armenia, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, France, Germany, Greece, Guyana, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malta, Norway, Peru, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Slovakia, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United Kingdom had joined the list of sponsors of draft resolution E/2000/L.12 concerning the International Year of Volunteers.

75. **Mr. Maruyama** (Japan) said that Argentina, Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Israel, Latvia, Lebanon, Monaco, Nepal, Panama, Romania, Slovenia and Venezuela had also joined the list of sponsors, bringing the total number of sponsors to 60.

76. *Draft resolution E/2000/L.12 was adopted.*

77. **Mr. Rogov** (Russian Federation) said that his Government strongly supported the important goals and activities of the United Nations Volunteers programme. However, although it did not object in

principle to the draft resolution just adopted, the latter was not directly related to the Council's coordinating role and was hardly within its competence. According to Council resolution 1998/1, matters relating to the proclamation of international years were within the purview of the General Assembly. It was his delegation's understanding that other matters relating to international years were also within the Assembly's competence. Thus, the Council's consideration and adoption of such decisions represented a duplication of the Assembly's work. Although his delegation had not opposed the adoption of draft resolution E/2000/L.12, out of respect for the views of the many sponsoring delegations, the Council should, in future, refrain from considering matters which were not directly related to its primary function of coordinating the activities of United Nations bodies in the economic and social fields.

78. **The President** suggested that the Council should take note of document E/2000/9.

79. *It was so decided.*

**(c) Crime prevention and criminal justice**  
(*continued*) (E/2000/3 and Corr.1)

**(d) Narcotic drugs** (*continued*) (E/INCB/1999/1)

**(e) United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees** (*continued*) (E/2000/18 and Corr.1)

80. **The President** suggested that the Council should take note of documents E/2000/3 and Corr.1, E/INCB/1999/1 and E/2000/18 and Corr.1.

81. *It was so decided.*

**Integrated and coordinated implementation of and follow-up to major United Nations conferences and summits** (*continued*) (E/2000/57, E/2000/64 and E/2000/69; E/2000/L.25 and L.30)

*Draft resolution E/2000/L.25*

82. **The President** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

83. **Mr. Gallagher** (United States of America), speaking with regard to paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, said that while he understood the concerns of some countries regarding the challenges presented by trade liberalization and structural adjustment

programmes, his Government believed that facing those challenges was essential to economic progress at the national and global levels. Turning to paragraph 6, he said that his Government had never endorsed the concept of quantitative official development assistance (ODA) targets; it was more important to focus on the quality of assistance and on establishing a sound domestic policy framework to ensure that assistance had a positive, long-lasting impact on developing countries.

84. *Draft resolution E/2000/L.25 was adopted.*

*Draft resolution E/2000/L.30*

85. **The President** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

86. *Draft resolution E/2000/L.30 was adopted.*

87. **The President** suggested that the Council should take note of documents E/2000/69, E/2000/57 and E/2000/64.

88. *It was so decided.*

**Coordination, programme and other questions**  
(*continued*) (A/55/16 (Part I) and Corr.1)

**(a) Reports of coordination bodies** (*continued*)  
(E/2000/L.31)

**(e) International cooperation in the field of informatics** (*continued*) (E/2000/94; E/2000/L.20 and L.27)

*Draft decision E/2000/L.31*

89. *Draft decision E/2000/L.31 was adopted.*

*Draft resolution E/2000/L.20*

90. **Mr. Popov** (Belarus) announced that Belarus had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

91. *Draft resolution E/2000/L.20 was adopted.*

*Draft resolution E/2000/L.27*

92. **The President** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

93. **Ms. Onoh** (Observer for Nigeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that a global partnership between Governments, the private sector and the United Nations system must be established in

order to narrow the digital divide and implement the development agenda. The United Nations should provide guidance with a view to achieving universal access to information and communication technologies.

94. **Mr. Civili** (Assistant Secretary-General for Policy Coordination and Inter-Agency Affairs) said that he welcomed the adoption of draft resolution E/2000/L.27, which, together with the Ministerial Declaration adopted on 7 July 2000, represented an important step forward in the Council's work and a model for the future.

95. **The President** suggested that the Council should take note of documents A/55/16 (Part I) and Corr.1 and E/2000/94.

96. *It was so decided.*

**Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations**

*(continued)* (E/2000/L.17)

*Draft resolution E/2000/L.17*

97. **The President** announced that Algeria, Benin, Bolivia, China, Colombia, Fiji, Indonesia, Iraq, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, the Solomon Islands and Viet Nam had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

98. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution E/2000/L.17.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Belarus, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Fiji, Indonesia, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Oman, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

None.

*Abstaining:*

Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Japan, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great

Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

99. *Draft resolution E/2000/L.17 was adopted by 27 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.\**

100. **Mr. Runacres** (United Kingdom) said that, as in previous years, his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution on implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (E/2000/L.17). However, with respect to the new language included in the sixth preambular paragraph and paragraph 13 of the current year's resolution, his delegation was firmly of the view that the Non-Self-Governing Territories' right of participation in and access to the bodies mentioned therein should be applied on the basis of equality and without discrimination.

101. **Mr. Tchoulkov** (Russian Federation) said that his Government had always been in favour of the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. His delegation was confident that the specialized agencies and the United Nations system would continue their efforts on behalf of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, most of which were small island States. However, it had abstained from voting on the draft resolution because implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples lay outside the Council's mandate, which was to coordinate the Organization's activities in the economic and social fields.

102. **Mr. Hirata** (Japan) said that his delegation supported the independence of colonial peoples and encouraged the specialized agencies of the United Nations to take appropriate measures in that regard within their mandates. However, his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution for two reasons: the draft resolution was unbalanced in that it failed to mention recent progress in decolonization; furthermore, in light of the need to avoid duplication and increase effectiveness, it was inappropriate for the Council to concern itself with political issues.

---

\* The delegation of India subsequently informed the Council that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

**Economic and social repercussions of the Israeli occupation on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem, and the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan** (*continued*) (E/2000/L.16)

*Draft resolution E/2000/L.16*

103. **The President** announced that Indonesia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Qatar had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

104. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution E/2000/L.16.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Greece, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Croatia.

105. *Draft resolution E/2000/L.16 was adopted by 41 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.*

106. **Mr. Le Bret** (France) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as it had done the previous year. Speaking on behalf of the European Union, he welcomed the historic Camp David efforts to ensure implementation of the existing agreement and considered that there was a real possibility of a permanent solution leading to peace in the region. The Union hoped that there would be genuine improvement in the economic and social conditions described and that the situation would improve to such an extent that in the future, the Council would be able to consider whether such a resolution was still necessary.

107. **Mr. Aardal** (Norway) said that an improvement in the living conditions of the people in the occupied Palestinian territory was a necessary prerequisite for a lasting peace and that his Government would continue to play a vital role in promoting peace and removing

impediments to development. He commended the recent Camp David negotiations and hoped that they would lead to the achievement of those goals.

108. **Mr. Maruyama** (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution and that his Government would continue to provide active political and economic support for the Middle East peace process. However, the issue of the occupied territories was already under consideration in other United Nations forums, including the General Assembly and the Security Council. He therefore reiterated that in order to avoid duplication and improve efficiency, the Council should avoid engaging in repeated discussion of political issues.

109. **Mr. Tchoukov** (Russian Federation) said that in voting for the draft resolution his delegation's primary concern had been the need for a healthier economic and social situation in the West Bank and Gaza region as a sound platform for political progress. He welcomed the efforts of the United Nations system in that regard and hoped that the Council would have an important voice in mobilizing international investment in the region and that the donor conference on southern Lebanon, soon to be held in Beirut, would set an example for the United Nations system's contribution to the Middle East peace process.

**Non-governmental organizations** (*continued*)  
(E/2000/51 and E/2000/88 (Part I) and Add. 1;  
E/2000/L.21)

110. **Mr. Le Gargasson** (France), speaking on behalf of the European Union, proposed that the Council should postpone action on the four draft decisions contained in the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on the first and second parts of its 2000 session (E/2000/88 (Part I)). Part III of the report was not yet available in the six official languages of the United Nations. Respect for multilingualism was a fundamental principle affirmed in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and the Council and reaffirmed in General Assembly resolution 50/11 of 2 November 1995. Moreover, although the draft decisions were contained in Part I of the report, which was available in all six languages, the Committee's discussions and, in particular, its reasons for recommending the suspension of two non-governmental organizations, the International Council of the Associations for Peace in the Continents and the Transnational Radical Party, were contained in Part II.

Moreover, Part II of the report had not been issued, even in English, until the day before the Council's consideration of the agenda item on non-governmental organizations.

111. Furthermore, the Transnational Radical Party had already challenged the validity of the method used by the Committee to justify its recommendation. If the Council took immediate action on draft decision II, that organization would be denied the opportunity to respond thereto as provided for in paragraph 56 of Council resolution 1996/31. He therefore welcomed the Committee's decision to give the Transnational Radical Party additional time to prepare a response by postponing its own consideration of the matter to a later date.

112. **Mr. Gallagher** (United States of America) said that his delegation supported the proposal made by the representative of France on behalf of the European Union. The fact that the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had decided to grant the Transnational Radical Party additional time to respond to its recommendation showed that it had not completed its consideration of the question dealt with in draft decision II. The Council should therefore postpone action on the matter to its resumed session.

113. **Mr. Al-Hariri** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, while he agreed with the European Union regarding the importance of multilingualism, the reality was that in 1998 the Council had adopted a declaration on human rights despite the fact that it had not been issued in any of the six official languages. Nevertheless, his delegation would not oppose the proposal to postpone discussion of the matter to the resumed session of the Council.

114. **Mr. Reyes Rodríguez** (Cuba) said that his delegation was concerned at the fact that the Council had not been given adequate notice that the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations would not be available for consideration in all official languages. If the Council postponed action on the recommendations contained in the report until its resumed session, the 37 non-governmental organizations which the Committee had recommended for consultative status would have to wait months for that status to be granted.

115. His delegation attached great importance to the principle of multilingualism; however, as the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic had pointed

out, the Council would not be setting a precedent by taking action on a document that was not available in all six languages. Moreover, certain delegations, which were supporting that principle in the current case, applied a double standard when issues important to them were at stake.

116. In a spirit of conciliation, he was prepared to support the European Union proposal that action on the draft decisions contained in Part I of the report should be postponed to the Council's resumed session. However, he would expect that procedure to be followed by all United Nations bodies in the future. Furthermore, the Council should take action on the draft decisions as early as possible in its resumed session.

117. In the meantime, the International Council of the Associations for Peace in the Continents could not be allowed to act with impunity. During the short period in which it had enjoyed consultative status, it had involved itself in the activities of terrorist groups, circulated offensive documents and attacked the Permanent Representative of Cuba to the United Nations Office at Geneva. In order to prevent similar occurrences during the meetings of human rights bodies to be held in Geneva prior to the resumed session of the Council, his delegation had sponsored draft decision E/2000/L.21, which would suspend the organization's consultative status temporarily pending further action by the Council.

118. **The President** said that the Council would take action on draft decision E/2000/L.21 once it had dealt with the question of postponement.

119. **Mr. Tchoukov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation shared the concern expressed by the Cuban delegation regarding the principle of multilingualism. The Council had just adopted recommendations and resolutions concerning the report of the Commission on Human Rights. The Russian version of Part I of that report had been received only two days before, while Part II was not yet available. Those difficulties notwithstanding, his delegation had agreed that the aforesaid decisions should be adopted and the report approved at the current meeting.

120. The representative of the European Union had expressed doubts as to whether due process had been observed with regard to the Transnational Radical Party. A recommendation to suspend its consultative status had been adopted by consensus at the June

session of the Commission. He reiterated his delegation's view, which was shared by other members of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, that due process had been observed fully and scrupulously. The Committee had followed both the letter and the spirit of Council resolution 1996/31, which determined the relationship between the Council and non-governmental organizations. Nevertheless, in order to accommodate the wishes of a number of delegations, his delegation had joined the consensus on the decision according to which the Committee would, on 16 September, again consider the reply from the Transnational Radical Party.

121. **Ms. Mesdoua** (Algeria) welcomed the fact that the question of multilingualism was being discussed. It was highly regrettable that the Committee's report had not been translated into all official languages. It was to be hoped that in the future the Secretariat would observe the deadlines for the transmittal of reports, thus enabling the Council to discuss them in a timely manner.

122. **The President** said he took it that the Council wished to postpone action on the four draft decisions contained in document E/2000/88 (Part I).

123. *It was so decided.*

*Draft decision E/2000/L.21*

124. **The President** recalled that in introducing the draft decision its sponsor, the delegation of Cuba, had revised the title to read "Request for a resumed session of the substantive session 2000 of the Economic and Social Council to finalize consideration of item 12 of its agenda".

125. **Mr. Reyes Rodríguez** (Cuba) said that his delegation had revised the title of the draft decision in order to emphasize the need for a resumed session of the Council for the purpose of adopting the four draft decisions contained in document E/2000/88 (Part I).

126. **Mr. Gallagher** (United States of America) proposed the deletion of paragraph (b) of draft decision E/2000/L.21, calling for temporary suspension of the consultative status of the International Council of the Association for Peace in the Continents. The Council should be aware that the recommendation of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to suspend consultative status of the organization in question had not been adopted by consensus. A group

of delegations including his own had voted against suspension in the belief that it was not warranted.

127. Suspension of the consultative status of a non-governmental organization was a serious matter, the consequence of which was the silencing of a voice. As the Council's rules did not provide for temporary suspension, his delegation believed that the Council should wait until its resumed session in October to take action in the matter.

128. **Mr. Al-Hariri** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that a small number of non-governmental organizations whose actions affected the sovereignty of Member States had recently been given protection at the United Nations. Decisions were sometimes taken with regard to them that were not taken in the case of other non-governmental organizations. The organization referred to by the representative of the Russian Federation had put out a number of very dangerous publications which were aimed at a certain group of countries with a view to intervening in their internal affairs. His delegation had raised the matter in the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, but it had not been resolved satisfactorily. It was to be hoped that questions concerning the two non-governmental organizations in question would be clarified fully at the resumed session.

129. **Mr. Hynes** (Canada) said that his delegation supported the United States amendment.

130. **Mr. Reyes Rodríguez** (Cuba) said that his delegation would request a recorded vote on the United States amendment. It would, however, accept the proposal by Japan to amend paragraph (a) of the draft decision to read "To take action on the four draft decisions contained in the report....".

*The meeting was suspended at 6.45 p.m. and resumed at 6.50 p.m.*

131. **Mr. Reyes Rodríguez** (Cuba) said that the draft decision represented the outcome of extensive negotiations, and each word contained therein corresponded to the interests of a large number of delegations. What was before the Council was the fifth version of the draft.

132. If the United States proposal was adopted, the organization in question would be free to continue its participation in the Council, and matters might get out of hand. What was involved was not a question of prestige. The organization in question included

provocateurs who had physically assaulted his Government's ambassadors in Geneva.

133. It was not true, as the United States representative had stated, that there were no precedents for temporarily suspending the consultative status of a non-governmental organization. At the previous session of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, under very similar circumstances, the United States and other delegations which appeared to have difficulties with the draft decision had joined the consensus on suspending the consultative status of the non-governmental organization Christian Solidarity International.

134. Accordingly, his delegation could not accept the deletion of paragraph (b), and it called on all members of the Council to vote against the United States proposal.

135. **Mr. Hynes** (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation was concerned at the trend seen in recent years in the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, and in the Council when it considered the report of the Committee, towards devoting more and more time to considering challenges to the privileges of duly accredited non-governmental organizations. In the process, the important task of strengthening the foundations for relations between the United Nations and non-governmental organizations with legitimate interests in its work was falling behind. The Committee appeared to be unable to keep up with its workload in that regard.

136. While his delegation recognized the need to take appropriate measures when accredited non-governmental organizations abused their privileges, the Council was once again being presented with proposals from the Committee to suspend the consultative status of non-governmental organizations under circumstances in which there were serious questions about the extent to which due process had been followed. In his delegation's view, the procedure followed by the Committee in 2000, as in 1999, featured some clear departures from the process envisaged in Council resolution 1996/31. His delegation had gone along with the consensus in 1999 but had consistently expressed its concerns at formal meetings during the current session. It was inappropriate for the Council to take any decision affecting an organization's status, including a

temporary suspension, until it could be demonstrated that due process had been observed. Accordingly, his delegation would vote in favour of the United States proposal, and, if paragraph (b) was retained, it would vote against the draft decision.

137. **The President**, speaking as the representative of Cameroon, said that his delegation found itself in the same situation as the Canadian delegation and would join in any petition submitted by Canada to the Secretariat.

138. **Ms. Nishimura** (Japan) said that her delegation had participated in a series of informal consultations on the question of non-governmental organizations with the hope that a consensus would be reached. However, despite the spirit of cooperation among the delegations concerned, consensus on the temporary suspension of the consultative status of a non-governmental organization had eluded them.

139. Temporary suspension of consultative status had a serious impact on the relations between the Council and the organization concerned. While the Council had taken a decision in 1999 to suspend temporarily the consultative status of Christian Solidarity International, that was not the procedure stipulated in Council resolution 1996/31. To uphold such a measure two years running might lead to the establishment of a new procedure without the revision of that resolution.

140. **Mr. Tchoukov** (Russian Federation) said that he, too, had participated in the consultations and the search for a consensus on the status of the organization referred to in draft decision E/2000/L.21. His delegation expressed appreciation for the flexibility shown by the delegation of Cuba, which had gone a long way towards accommodating the wishes of other delegations. Regrettably, consensus had not been achieved.

141. Temporary suspension of the consultative status of a non-governmental organization was consistent with the notion of due process, as it was based on a recommendation already approved by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. Accordingly, his delegation would vote against the United States proposal.

142. **The President** said that, in accordance with rule 64 of its rules of procedure, the Council would first take action on the United States proposal.

143. *A recorded vote was taken on the oral amendment proposed by the United States of America.*

*In favour:*

Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Against:*

Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Belarus, Benin, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, China, Colombia, Cuba, Indonesia, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela, Viet Nam.

*Abstaining:*

Brazil, Costa Rica, Fiji, India, Japan, Mexico, Morocco.

144. *The oral amendment proposed by the United States of America was defeated by 21 votes to 17, with 7 abstentions.*

145. **Mr. Gallagher** (United States of America) took note of the statement by the Cuban representative that a precedent had been set in 1999 when the Council had voted to temporarily suspend the consultative status of Christian Solidarity International. He wished to place on record that his delegation had joined the consensus on that measure on the express understanding that it would not constitute a precedent.

146. **Mr. Le Gargasson** (France), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the members of the European Union, said that the delegations concerned had voted to delete paragraph (b) because Council resolution 1996/31 did not provide for temporary suspension of the privileges of a non-governmental organization. The recommendations made in that regard by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations were not mandatory. In accordance with paragraphs 55 and 56 of the aforesaid resolution, the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations could only "recommend to the Council suspension of or exclusion from consultative status of organizations". Nevertheless, the European Union expressed appreciation to the Cuban delegation for its willingness to work in a transparent manner to reach a solution that would have the support of all members of the Council.

147. The delegations on whose behalf he spoke welcomed the Council's decision to postpone a

decision on the status of the non-governmental organization concerned.

148. *A recorded vote was taken on draft decision E/2000/L.21, as orally revised.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Belarus, Benin, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, China, Colombia, Cuba, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

Canada, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, India, Italy, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

149. *Draft decision E/2000/L.21, as orally revised, was adopted by 24 votes to 2, with 19 abstentions.*

150. **The President** invited the Council to take action on the draft decision contained in document E/2000/88 (Part I)/Add.1, entitled "Resumed 2000 session to consider the response of the Transnational Radical Party".

151. **Mr. Tchoukov** (Russian Federation) said it was his understanding that the proposal before the Council was the result of a rather complicated process in which his delegation had been involved. Thanks to the spirit of cooperation that had prevailed, it had been possible to reach a compromise solution. Regrettably, however, during that process his delegation had often encountered misunderstandings. He drew attention to the second line of the draft decision, which read "to hold a resumed 2000 session for a half-day". According to his recollection, the phrase "for a half-day" had not been in the original text, nor did it appear in the draft report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations which contained the draft decision. He therefore proposed that the phrase should be deleted.

152. **Mr. Hynes** (Canada) asked whether the Russian proposal would mean that the Committee would hold a one-day session or would meet for an entire week.



153. **The President** said that a one-day session would comprise two meetings, one in the morning and one in the afternoon.

154. **Mr. Reyes Rodríguez** (Cuba) said that he doubted whether any member of the Council wished the Committee to hold a week-long session on a single issue. In his view, a morning and an afternoon meeting should be sufficient.

155. **Mr. Bhatti** (Pakistan) said he agreed that a one-day session would be more appropriate.

156. **Mr. Le Gargasson** (France) said that his delegation would gladly accede to the Russian request.

157. **The President** said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to amend the draft decision to read “to hold a resumed session for one day”.

158. *The draft decision, as orally amended, was adopted.*

159. **Ms. Ahmed** (Sudan) thanked the President for having taken immediate action on her delegation’s letter dated 5 May 2000 (E/2000/51). She also expressed appreciation to the High Commissioner for Human Rights for her efforts to pursue the matter.

160. While acknowledging the action taken by the Secretariat to remove materials carrying the letterhead of Christian Solidarity International (CSI), her delegation expressed its dissatisfaction at the Secretariat’s indication that it was not in a position to investigate and had no way to identify whether the distribution of CSI material had been done by that organization or by an invited guest. It was her delegation’s understanding that it was the responsibility of the Commission on Human Rights secretariat to ensure that non-governmental organizations abided at all times by the rules governing their participation in the Commission’s meetings. The secretariat should be more vigilant in ensuring respect for those rules so that such misconduct would not take place in the future.

161. The matter had also been brought before the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and had been examined seriously. It was important to ensure that Council resolution 1996/31 was taken into consideration within the Commission’s established practices. Non-governmental organizations

participating in the meetings of the Commission should be reminded of the contents of the resolution.

162. Her delegation trusted that the Commission secretariat would keep the members of the Council informed of the precautionary measures it was taking in preparation for forthcoming sessions of the Commission so that such incidents would not recur. Her delegation would follow the proceedings of the Commission’s fifty-seventh session very closely and reserved the right to report any such incidents to the Council and the Committee.

**Economic and environmental questions** (*continued*)  
(E/2000/L.26)

*Draft resolution E/2000/L.26*

163. **The President** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

164. **Mr. Le Gargasson** (France) recalled that the draft resolution had been orally revised by the Bulgarian delegation at the previous meeting.

165. *Draft resolution E/2000/L.26, as orally revised, was adopted.*

**(a) Sustainable development** (*continued*)  
(E/2000/L.28 and L.29)

*Draft resolution E/2000/L.28*

166. **The President** introduced the draft resolution, which had been submitted by the Vice-President on the basis of informal consultations. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

167. Draft resolution E/2000/L.28 was adopted.

*Draft resolution E/2000/L.29*

168. **The President** introduced the draft resolution, which had been submitted by the Vice-President on the basis of informal consultations. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

169. **Mr. Le Gargasson** (France) said that paragraph 7 should be corrected to reflect the agreement reached. In the second clause, after “the identification of the least developed countries”, the word “and” should be deleted; after “where appropriate”, the comma should be deleted; and the word “and” should be inserted before “to report to the Economic and Social Council”.

While those changes might appear to be minor, if they were not made, the meaning of the sentence would be altered.

170. **Mr. Anaedu** (Observer for Nigeria) said that, while he had complete confidence in the French representative's recollection of the agreement reached, he wished to consult with the representative of Guyana who had been present during the negotiations.

171. **Mr. Robertson** (New Zealand) said he could confirm that the editorial changes read out by the French representative reflected the intended meaning of the paragraph.

172. *Draft resolution E/2000/L.29, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

*The meeting was suspended at 7.30 p.m. and resumed at 7.35 p.m.*

173. *Mr. Wibisono (Indonesia) took the Chair.*

174. **The President** invited the Council to take up the question of the United Nations Forum on Forests.

175. **Mr. Asadi** (Observer for the Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IFF) had completed its work at its fourth session in February and had presented its final report, including the proposed terms of reference for an international arrangement on forests, to the Commission on Sustainable Development in April. The Commission, in its decision 8/2, had welcomed the report and endorsed the conclusions and proposals for action contained therein. The Commission, while inviting the Council and the General Assembly, as appropriate, to take action on the proposed terms of reference, had also invited the President of the Council to initiate, before the Council's substantive session, informal consultations on options for placing the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) within the United Nations intergovernmental machinery.

176. During four meetings held in June, discussions had taken place on various aspects of the arrangement and the new intergovernmental body. On the basis of those discussions, a Chairman's non-paper, in the form of a draft resolution entitled "International arrangement on forests", had been presented as the basis of negotiation. Following an intensive round of informal consultations, consensus had been reached on a majority of paragraphs of the draft resolution. The objective of the international arrangement, its principal

functions, its components and the envisaged collaborative partnership on forests to support the work of UNFF had already been agreed. It had also been agreed that UNFF would hold its organizational meeting as soon as possible and its first substantive session in 2001.

177. The major issue that had prevented completion of the work involved the extent of membership of the new intergovernmental body, in other words, universal versus limited membership. The difficulty lay in the fact that the Council, itself a United Nations body with limited membership, would be the parent body. A number of options were already on the table. Once the question of the Forum's composition was resolved, the remaining issues would be resolved either automatically or more easily than was now the case. Another issue that remained to be settled was the location of the new body's secretariat.

178. Taking into account the tentative date for the Council's resumed substantive session, it had been agreed to resume informal consultations during the week of 18 September. Given the universal commitment to the initiation of the international arrangement on forests, he was confident that the last remaining stumbling-block would be overcome at that time.

179. **The President** suggested that the Council should authorize Mr. Asadi to continue his consultations with a view to submitting conclusions for consideration by the Council at its resumed substantive session.

180. *It was so decided.*

181. **Mr. Anaedu** (Observer for Nigeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, expressed appreciation to Mr. Asadi for having brought transparency to bear on the negotiating process.

182. **Mr. Le Gargasson** (France), speaking on behalf of the European Union, expressed appreciation to Mr. Asadi for the collegial spirit that had prevailed during the consultations.

**(b) Public administration and finance (continued)**  
(E/2000/66)

183. **The President** said that no draft proposals had been submitted on the sub-item. He suggested that the Council should take note of document E/2000/66.

184. *It was so decided.*

**(c) Water supply and sanitation** (*continued*)  
(E/2000/19)

185. **The President** said that no draft proposals had been submitted on the sub-item. He suggested that the Council should take note of document E/2000/19.

186. *It was so decided.*

**(d) Cartography** (*continued*) (E/2000/48 and  
E/2000/49)

187. **The President** said that no proposals had been submitted on the sub-item. He suggested that the Council should take note of documents E/2000/48 and E/2000/49.

188. *It was so decided.*

**(e) Population and development** (*continued*)

**(f) Statistics** (*continued*)

189. **The President** said that no proposals had been submitted on the two sub-items.

**(g) International cooperation in tax matters**  
(*continued*)

190. **The President** said that no proposals had been submitted on the sub-item. He suggested that the Council should take note of document E/1999/84/ and Corr.1 and the statement read out at the 42nd meeting, which read: "Taking fully into account the fact that some members expressed their desire that the report should be as accurate as possible".

191. *It was so decided.*

**(h) Functioning of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development, including its role in coordinating science and technology for development** (*continued*) (E/2000/84)

192. **The President** said that no proposals had been submitted on the sub-item. He suggested that the Council should take note of document E/2000/84.

193. *It was so decided.*

**Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters** (*continued*)

*Enlargement of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees* (E/2000/L.11)

*Draft decision E/2000/L.11*

194. *Draft decision E/2000/L.11 was adopted.*

*Elections postponed from the previous session of the Council*

*Commission on Science and Technology for Development*

195. **The President** said that the Council was to elect two members from African States, three members from Asian States and four members from Western European and Other States for a 4-year term beginning on 1 January 2001. He had been informed that Spain was a candidate for one of the vacancies in the Group of Western European and Other States.

196. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to elect Spain by acclamation.

197. *It was so decided.*

198. **The President** said that, if he heard no objection, he would also take it that the Council wished to postpone the election of the remaining three members from the Group of Western European and Other States.

199. *It was so decided.*

**Suspension of the session**

200. **The President** said that the success of the session was reflected in the high-level and broad-based participation achieved. More than 50 ministers and Heads of State, as well as the heads of all the organs of the United Nations system, the Director-General of the World Trade Organization, the President of the World Bank, the chief executive officers of leading companies from both developed and developing countries, and representatives of civil society had been present.

201. Reviewing the five main segments of the session, he said that the high-level segment, on the theme of information and communication technologies (ICT) for development, had transformed the Council into a global forum for dialogue among all stakeholders. The participants in the pre-session panel discussions and regional dialogues had included representatives of academia, the private sector, non-governmental organizations and the media. The Council had also held a number of formal meetings, ministerial round-tables and a public exhibition, designed to stimulate discussion and motivate the participants to commit

themselves to bridging the digital divide. A special effort had been made to engage development partners in the process.

202. The staging of an ICT exhibition running concurrently with the high-level segment had been a unique undertaking for the United Nations. Forty-one leading private companies and agencies, representing both developed and developing countries, had showcased their ICT products and services. In so doing, they had helped to bring the private sector into closer contact with government and organizational decision-makers.

203. During the segment a broad sense had emerged that the United Nations could play a central role in providing an interface between the information technology community and the development community. It had also been recognized that the United Nations itself should be strengthened through the use of ICT. For the first time, a draft Ministerial Declaration submitted by the President had been discussed and adopted, in spite of difficulties. The declaration reflected the importance attached to the establishment of an ICT task force and an ICT trust fund for development.

204. The recently concluded G-8 summit had recognized the significance of the Council's Ministerial Declaration and had reached similar conclusions concerning the need for an ICT task force. The Working Group on Informatics had helped the Council to develop a framework for creating such a task force. The next step would be the consideration of the declaration by the General Assembly at the Millennium Summit in September.

205. Progress had also been achieved during the coordination segment. For the first time, the Council had directly addressed the mechanisms and processes for reviewing the implementation of major United Nations conferences and summits. The functional commissions had been called upon to make recommendations on how best to enhance the review process. With their full support, the Council would be in a strong position to effectively discharge its management and coordination responsibilities in the follow-up to conferences.

206. During the segment on operational activities for development, two important resolutions had been adopted on the crucial issues of funding and the triennial comprehensive policy review. Delegations had

made statements on efforts to revitalize the simplification and harmonization of the rules and procedures guiding operational activities. Those themes had been explored in a dialogue with the executive heads of the United Nations funds and programmes and in presentations by senior officials, as well as by the United Nations system teams for Ghana and Madagascar.

207. Turning to the humanitarian segment, he said that the panel discussions had contributed a wealth of knowledge on a variety of topics. The theme had tied in well with the overall theme of the high-level segment on information technology and its benefits to the world's impoverished. Nevertheless, given the complexity of the issues involved and the brief time available for discussion, it had not been possible to reach agreement.

208. As to the general segment, the Council had confirmed its determination to effectively exercise its responsibilities for coordination and management of the activities of the United Nations system in the economic and social fields. There was a need to ensure that the large, somewhat disjointed array of issues on the agenda of the segment were given more focus and direction.

209. At the organizational session held earlier in the year, the Council had pledged to seek ways to respond speedily to new emerging issues without having to wait for the annual substantive session. He was pleased to report that the Bureau had been able to convene a meeting in March to be briefed on the tragic situation in Mozambique in the wake of devastating floods and to provide guidance to United Nations agencies in the field. The Council had then called on Governments, the United Nations, the specialized agencies and other bodies, the international financial institutions, non-governmental organizations and the private sector to intensify their relief efforts in a coordinated manner.

210. While the substantive issues had been well addressed, the more logistical and organizational aspects of the Council's work needed to be bolstered. For that purpose, he had requested the Bureau to take a close look at the issues and submit a proposal for the consideration of the Council in the fall. Particular attention must be paid to the availability of documentation in all official languages of the United Nations. It was important to seek ways to ensure that documentation was issued in a timely fashion.

211. Globalization was yielding unparalleled choices and opportunities for prosperity, but it was also spawning new uncertainties and concerns about exclusion, marginalization and a widening digital divide. As the principal organ of the United Nations for promoting higher standards of living, full employment and conditions for economic and social progress and development for all, the Council provided a unique forum for bridging the various gaps between the developed and developing countries in the cause of development and the eradication of poverty. Though much had been accomplished, much more remained to be done. He looked forward to the continuation of the Council's work in September.

212. **Mr. Anaedu** (Observer for Nigeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that, while the Secretariat was to be commended for its efforts to facilitate the work of the Council, steps must be taken to address the causes of the late issuance of documentation.

213. With regard to the humanitarian segment, as noted by the President, the failure to reach consensus could be attributed to the complexity of the issues involved. In endeavouring to come to grips with the question of how to assist internally displaced persons, the Council had begun to redefine the concepts of government and sovereignty. In future deliberations the two issues should be dealt with separately.

214. **Mr. Le Gargasson** (France), speaking on behalf of the European Union, expressed satisfaction at the outcome of the coordination segment. While the European Union would have preferred the Council to formulate some general approaches at the outset, the agreed conclusions adopted by the Council would promote further dialogue on the subject.

215. The delegations on whose behalf he spoke also expressed satisfaction at the outcome of the segment on operational activities for development and the adoption by consensus of two resolutions. They expressed appreciation to the States members of the Group of 77 for their active participation in the negotiations and hoped that the forthcoming triennial review of operational activities for development would take place in an equally constructive atmosphere.

216. Nevertheless, the European Union was concerned at the limited interest which had been elicited by the discussions in plenary meeting. It was to be hoped that the small number of speakers did not reflect a lack of

support for United Nations action in the field of development.

217. With regard to the humanitarian segment, the inability to reach consensus on agreed conclusions had been one of the major shortcomings of the session. As to the general segment, the European Union regretted that the proliferation of informal meetings had prevented delegations from giving due attention to the debate in plenary meeting.

218. Lastly, the delegations on whose behalf he spoke expressed their disappointment at certain organizational aspects of the session. A large number of reports had been issued very late and had become available in all official languages only at the very last minute, so that many delegations had not had an opportunity to study them thoroughly. Moreover, negotiations had often taken place without interpretation, in violation of the principle of multilingualism. The explanations given by the Secretariat for those difficulties, namely, that they were linked to the recent holding of the five-year reviews of the Fourth World Conference on Women and the World Summit for Social Development, were not an excuse for such lapses, which the European Union found troubling. The lack of documentation had seriously impaired the discussion of certain topics and had even led to the postponement of several items. The European Union would monitor the situation closely to ensure that such problems did not recur.

219. **Mr. Kobayashi** (Japan) said that while the deliberations at the current session had been remarkably productive, they had been hampered by a number of difficulties, including delays in the issuance of documentation and the simultaneity of several important consultations. Such problems had become routine over the years, but they had been aggravated by the holding of the five-year review conferences shortly before the current session of the Council. It was to be hoped that the question would continue to be discussed by the functional commissions and that tangible progress would be made before the substantive session in 2001.

220. **Mr. Gallagher** (United States of America) said that, while recognizing the problems identified by the spokesmen for the Group of 77 and the European Union, his delegation believed that much had been accomplished during the session, particularly during the high-level segment.

221. **Mr. Civili** (Assistant Secretary-General for Policy Coordination and Inter-Agency Affairs) said he hoped that the current session would be remembered not only as the “information technology” session but also as the session which put an end to the expression “revitalization of the Council”.

*222. After an exchange of courtesies, the President declared the session suspended.*

*The meeting rose at 8.40 p.m.*