

PROVISIONAL

E/1995/SR.55
2 August 1995

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Substantive session of 1995

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 55th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 27 July 1995, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan)

CONTENTS

DEVELOPMENT OF AFRICA, INCLUDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS NEW
AGENDA FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AFRICA IN THE 1990s (continued)

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (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 Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

DEVELOPMENT OF AFRICA, INCLUDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS NEW AGENDA FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AFRICA IN THE 1990s (agenda item 2) (continued) (E/1995/117)

The PRESIDENT said he took it that the members of the Council had read his summary and conclusions of the deliberations of the high-level segment of the Council (E/1995/117).

Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) said that the summary and conclusions, which faithfully reflected the Council's deliberations, would be useful as an input to the mid-term review of the United Nations New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s (UN-NADAF) and a basis for the General Assembly's consideration, at its fiftieth session, of the concerns voiced by the Council. It was likewise important to bear in mind the concerns expressed by Africans themselves on the critical situation prevailing in the continent, as reflected, for example, in the Cairo Agenda.

Despite the positive aspects reflected in paragraphs 7 and 8 of the document, the picture in the case of most African countries remained bleak. For example, his own country's current high growth rate had to be seen against the 20 years of economic retrogression that had still to be overcome, including the enormous debt-repayment burden. Paragraph 14 touched upon the highly relevant topic of economic globalization; Africa must be enabled to take advantage of the opportunities offered, but it could not do so without the international community's assistance, which should include a very high proportion of debt relief; an 80 per cent reduction would be a good gesture. Resource flows, too, would be a further constructive form of assistance, particularly for the essential structural-adjustment efforts, which should not have to be at the expense of social welfare.

His delegation welcomed the emphasis on trade as an important factor in Africa's development. In that regard, he stressed the crucial importance of the United Nations system, primarily the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), together with the agencies working under the resident coordinator system, which should be fully supported and strengthened.

Mr. OLANIYAN (Organization of African Unity (OAU)) said that OAU welcomed the interest shown by most members of the Council in the re-examination of Africa's development problems. It was pleased to note that

the President's summary and conclusions had taken up most of the views expressed during the discussions and that the various problems had been well stated. His delegation welcomed the references to sustainable development and the implementation of UN-NADAF. It urged the Council to take effective steps with a view to implementation of the conclusions, since the exercise would be worth while only if it led to the promotion of development in Africa.

Mrs. MENENDEZ (Observer for Spain), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the Union attached great importance to the subject of Africa and generally supported the President's summary, issued on his own responsibility. While it considered that there were some imbalances, it appreciated the effort made to reflect all points of view. The specific comments and proposals it contained did not necessarily command consensus and, if they were followed up, the Union would consider them on their individual merits.

Mrs. LIMJUCO (Philippines), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the President's summary and conclusions contained a welcome note of optimism in noting Africa's great potential in human and natural resources. The Group of 77 and China reiterated their solidarity with the peoples of Africa.

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (agenda item 10) (continued) (E/1995/108; E/1995/L.43)

The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/1995/108) and invited it to consider draft decision II in chapter I on the provisional agenda and documentation for the session of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to be held in 1997.

Draft decision II was adopted.

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision III, by which the Council would authorize the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to hold a one-week resumed session in January 1996.

Mr. SLIPTCHENKO (Ukraine) recalled that, at an earlier meeting, the Council had adopted the report of the Open-ended Working Group on the Review of Arrangements for Consultation with Non-Governmental Organizations on its second session (E/1995/83 and Add.1 and 2). Paragraphs 4 and 5 of addendum 2 to that report indicated the envisaged cost of an additional two-week session of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and stated that, since the actual conference-servicing costs would be reported to the General Assembly in

the context of the programme budget performance report, no additional funds would be required at the current stage. He took it that that the information also applied to the decision about to be taken on draft decision III.

Ms. KELLEY (Secretary of the Council) said that the Programme Planning and Budget Section had indicated that draft decision III would have no additional financial implications.

Draft decision III was adopted.

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take a decision on the Committee's report (E/1995/108) as a whole.

Mr. BLANEY (United States of America) said that his delegation was very disappointed that the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had not granted consultative status to Freedom House, a human rights non-governmental organization (NGO) based in the United States. The role-call vote of 9 to 9 was hardly a sign of consensus, and his delegation felt that the Council should take a positive decision with regard to that application for category II consultative status.

Freedom House was one of the world's most active human rights organizations, of the sort clearly envisaged in Article 71 of the Charter, and had supported individual political rights and civil liberties for over 50 years. Eleanor Roosevelt had been one of its founders. Its activities included its recent participation in the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia's electoral observation activities, and its work in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union was a matter of record. The Council had, in fact, just accredited it to the Fourth World Conference on Women, in accordance with the Secretariat's recommendation.

The decision reflected in the report thus amounted to a double standard which could be explained only by political considerations and its acceptance would set a disturbing precedent. Most delegations, including his own, did not take a political approach to the accreditation of NGOs. A certain negative reaction to Freedom House's publications was perhaps understandable, but the eligibility of an NGO should not have to depend on agreement with its position, especially in the case of human rights organizations. His own Government, indeed, did not agree with everything that the NGO had published, but it strongly believed in tolerating differences of opinion. The way to accommodate differing opinions was through association and consultation, not exclusion.

Since it would serve no purpose to refer the application back to the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, the Council should decide to grant consultative status to Freedom House; it had the power to do so.

Mr. DENHAM (Ireland) said that his delegation fully supported the statement just made. It hoped that the Council would be able to adopt draft decision E/1995/L.43 by consensus, thereby granting category II consultative status to Freedom House.

Mrs. BAUTA SOLES (Cuba) said it was true that Freedom House had a long history as a human rights organization and was very well known, especially in countries of the third world and, as with other such organizations, views about its activities could differ considerably. The point at issue, however, was the Council's procedure; there was no precedent for failing to take note of a report duly submitted by a subsidiary body or subjecting it to any preconditions. The adoption of draft decision E/1995/L.43 would alter the substance of the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. The roll-call vote referred to by the representative of the United States of America had been taken pursuant to the established procedure. It was clear from the provisions of Council resolution 1296 (XLIV) that the Council could grant consultative status to an NGO only on the basis of a prior recommendation by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and no such recommendation was before it.

The attempt to link the Council's taking note of the report with consideration of draft decision E/CN.4/1995/L.43 was thus not a legitimate procedure. It was most surprising, also, that the United States delegation had not taken the opportunity to discuss the matter at a previous meeting during consideration of the report of the Open-ended Working Group (E/1995/83 and Add.1 and 2).

Before the Council proceeded any further, therefore, the President should ask it to decide whether the report of the Committee should be amended; in that case, her delegation would request a roll-call vote.

Mr. ZHANG Yishan (China) said it seemed strange that the delegation of the United States, itself a member of the Committee on the Non-Governmental Organizations, should be challenging a decision taken by the latter in strict accordance with its rules of procedure; to do so was to challenge the Council's rules of procedure also.

The grounds adduced by the United States representative for granting consultative status to an NGO did not suffice to justify overturning a decision taken by the Committee. Moreover, the procedure which it was proposing would set a bad precedent and was bound to have an adverse effect on future relations between the Council and its functional commissions. Consequently, he appealed to the delegation of the United States to maintain strict compliance with the Council's rules of procedure.

Mr. KAMINSKI (Poland) said that his delegation supported draft decision E/1995/L.43. It believed that the work of the NGOs would be supplemented by the positive activities of Freedom House. The devotion of Freedom House to human rights issues was unquestionable and his delegation saw no reason why it should not be granted category II consultative status.

Mr. ROGOV (Russian Federation) said that Freedom House was well known in Russia. Together with other NGOs, it had helped the people of the former Soviet Union to understand that democracy and human rights were values very different from what monopolistic propaganda had tried to make them.

It was true that Freedom House frequently criticized his country, but understanding and appreciation of other views formed the very basis of democracy. His delegation thus supported the granting of category II consultative status to Freedom House.

Mr. SHINODA (Japan) said that his delegation endorsed the statement by the representative of the United States. He agreed that the Council would normally reach a decision on the recommendation of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and that Freedom House was not included in the recommendation submitted to it. However, his delegation believed that the Council was entitled to grant accreditation to NGOs seeking consultative status even if its subsidiary body had decided otherwise. There had been a precedent when the Council had suspended the consultative status of an NGO.

It was thus quite possible for the Council to decide on draft decision E/1995/L.43 even though no recommendation had been made to it by the Committee. In that connection, the Committee's report merely stated that the accreditation of Freedom House had been rejected by a vote of 9 to 9. It was quite possible, therefore, for the Council to take note of the report and then to vote on the United States proposal. Freedom House met all the criteria stipulated in Council resolution 1296 (XLIV) and should therefore be granted category II consultative status.

Mrs. LIMJUCO (Philippines), Chairman of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations said she did not agree that the Committee's decision on the application had been marred by political considerations. The Committee had considered the application in accordance with Council resolution 1296 (XLIV), which was the basis of the consultative process. That action had been taken on the basis of the information available at the time and no further information had been received since.

In the interests of the Committee and the rules and regulations under which it operated, she hoped that, if the Council adopted the United States proposal such action would not constitute a precedent.

Mr. A. HASSAN (Sudan) said that he fully agreed with the representatives of Cuba and China. The Committee had dealt with the issue comprehensively and had decided not to grant category II consultative status to the organization in question.

On the previous day, the Council had discussed a similar problem concerning an NGO and had decided to return the case to the Committee so that it could decide whether or not to grant that organization consultative status. It would thus be appropriate for the Council to return the case in point to the Committee rather than to set a precedent that would complicate further the work of the Committee and of the Council itself.

Mr. MOHAMED (Malaysia) said that his delegation agreed with the representatives of Cuba, China and Sudan. The Council should respect the Committee's decision. Overruling it would set a bad precedent. The Committee had followed the normal process based on the information available at the time. If it was necessary to consider the case again, the Council should decide to return it to the Committee for reconsideration.

Mr. GERVAIS (Côte d'Ivoire) said that a decision had been taken by the Committee and recorded in its report. The Council should first take note of the report and then discuss the admissibility of Freedom House.

Mr. OBODOZIE (Nigeria) said he fully agreed that the Council should uphold the Committee's decision. Any additional information that was relevant to the application should be submitted to the Committee rather than to the Council. It would be a breach of the Council's rules of procedure if the issue were reopened at the Council level. The situation regarding the rules of procedure should, perhaps, be clarified before the Council took any action.

Mr. JIKONYA (Zimbabwe) said that the Council should be seen to uphold its own rules of procedure and should also uphold the Committee's decisions. The case should thus be returned to the Committee, since that appeared to be the correct procedure.

Mr. SLIPTCHENKO (Ukraine) said that, so far, the Council had adopted only parts of the Committee's report. It also had before it draft decision E/1995/L.43. It must therefore reach a decision on the matter without delay.

Mr. RUNGE (Germany) said that the case was an unusual one. The application had been rejected by a roll-call vote of 9 to 9. The Committee's decision was thus far from unanimous. It would therefore be appropriate for the Council, with its larger membership, to review the case.

Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) said that the matter should be referred back to the Committee.

Mr. PRATOMO (Indonesia) said that the matter fell within the competence of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, which considered and made recommendations to the Council on all matters relating to the consultative status of NGOs. The application of Freedom House for consultative status should be referred back to the Committee which, by the adoption of draft decision III, had just been authorized to meet in a resumed session in order to complete the work of its 1995 session.

Mr. BUNNAG (Thailand) said that his delegation agreed with the representatives of Cuba, China, Malaysia and Indonesia.

The PRESIDENT said that, on the previous day, the Council had begun its consideration of the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/1995/108) and had taken action on draft decision I on the Committee's recommendations concerning the consultative status and reclassification of a number of NGOs. In that connection the Council had returned one of the NGOs in question to the Committee for reconsideration on the grounds that new information had been produced which needed to be taken into account. Following the adoption of draft decisions II and III, he had asked whether the Council was prepared to take action on the report as a whole, at which point, a delegation had requested that action should first be taken on draft decision E/1995/L.43.

The normal procedure followed by the Council was that it considered the Committee's recommendations. The Committee had not recommended Freedom House for accreditation and the report explained that the application had been

rejected by a roll-call vote of 9 to 9. Since the Council was the sovereign body, however, it was competent to depart from the established practice if its members wished to do so.

There were two distinct proposals before the Council, the first submitted by the representative of the United States, that the Council should take action on draft decision E/1995/L.43 and the second submitted by the representative of Cuba. Both proposals were supported by a number of delegations. The Council must first decide whether it intended to depart from established practice or, in the words used by the representative of Cuba, whether it accepted that there should be an amendment to the Committee's report (E/1995/108). The United States proposal was that the Council should accredit the NGO in question directly. Given the wide differences of opinion expressed, he asked whether the Council wished to depart from established procedures and consider draft decision E/1995/L.43 on its merits.

Mr. BLANEY (United States of America) said that his delegation accepted the President's interpretation of the situation and supported his suggestion that a procedural motion should be put to the vote. As to the substantive issue, he wished to point out that there had been no formal decision by the Committee but merely a recommendation submitted to the Council.

With regard to the comment made by the representative of China, his delegation also considered the case to be a highly exceptional one in view of the very close result of the vote, which left it open to the Council to review the Committee's conclusions. His delegation would abide by the Council's verdict.

Mrs. BAUTA SOLES (Cuba) said that the argument that there were precedents to the proposed reversal of the Committee's decision was a baseless one. It was true that, in 1984, the Council had asked the Committee to reconsider its recommendation of consultative status for the International Police Association when it became known that the organization in question had links with the apartheid regime and subsequently, on receipt of a further recommendation by the Committee, had suspended that status. Again, in 1993, the consultative status granted to the International Lesbian and Gay Association, had been subsequently withdrawn in the light of fresh information received.

In both those cases, however, new information had come to light which had justified a review of the Committee's original recommendations. In the case under consideration, however, the Committee had exhaustively studied the application before making its recommendation and, since its decision some four weeks previously, no new information had been presented to justify reconsideration of that decision.

It should be remembered that the Committee was a technical body established by Council resolution 1296 (XLIV) and that its members were elected by the Council on the basis of equitable geographical representation and the capacity to contribute positively to the development of consultative relations between the Council and NGOs. She did not think there could be any doubt as to the powers of the Committee to make decisions in matters within its competence.

During its consideration of the application by Freedom House, the Committee had had before it all the information provided by the organization and had decided to reject the application on the grounds that the organization failed to meet the requirements of paragraphs 5, 8, 14, 17 and 18 of resolution 1296 (XLIV). The Council had, on all previous occasions, respected the competence of the Committee, and the attempt currently being made to reverse its decision for political reasons would jeopardize the credibility of a procedure that had guaranteed the legitimacy of NGOs in consultative status - a point of principle which her delegation had strongly defended at the recent session of the Committee.

As to the specific grounds for rejection of the application, Freedom House did not meet the requirements of paragraph 5 of the resolution that the applicant organization should have a democratically adopted constitution providing for the determination of the policy by a conference, congress or other representative body. Nor did it meet the requirements of paragraph 8 regarding its sources of financing since almost 50 per cent of its finance was provided by the National Endowment for Democracy, a fund established by the United States Congress, and its behaviour was very reminiscent of a government agency.

Moreover, the organization was guided by political principles that were in total contradiction with paragraphs 8, 14, 17 and 18 of the resolution. Its hostility to plurality of opinion was provided by the World Freedom Map it had produced in 1994, which represented 46 third-world States as partially

free, and another 51 as non-free. Its utter disregard of texts of concern to any NGO anxious to protect human rights throughout the world meant either that the membership of Freedom House was incapable or that it was an organization whose purposes were incompatible with those of the United Nations in the sphere of human rights. Clearly, therefore, it did not meet the minimum requirements for consultative status.

Mr. ZHANG Yishan (China) said that the representative of Japan had referred to the case of the International Lesbian and Gay Association as constituting a precedent, but that was not so since the decision on the Association had been taken during an inter-sessional period. The representatives of the United States of America and Germany had said that the equally divided vote in the Committee made the case under consideration an exceptional one. That was not so either. It was a perfectly normal situation and one clearly envisaged by rule 71 of the Council's rules of procedure. What would be exceptional and would create a bad precedent would be for the Council to depart from its duly established procedures.

The United States representative had also argued that Freedom House was not mentioned in the draft decisions recommended to the Council for adoption, but that was merely because it was the Committee's practice to list only the names of recommended organizations. If that practice did not meet with the approval of the United States delegation, it could of course introduce a proposal that, in future, the names of rejected organizations should also be listed.

The United States representative had also mentioned in support of the application by Freedom House that the organization had been in existence for over 50 years. In that case, the question arose why it had waited so long before applying for consultative status, and why it could not wait another year or two. The Committee's decision did not mean that the organization could not reapply and submit evidence or new information to show that it met all the requirements of Council resolution 1296 (XLIV).

The PRESIDENT reminded the Council that he had suggested that the procedural aspect of the question should be decided before the substance of the United States amendment was entered into.

Mr. BLANEY (United States of America) said that he had understood that the President's suggestion related to whether or not the Council could take action on document E/1995/L.43, which was, incidentally, a draft decision and not an amendment.

The PRESIDENT said that he had consulted the Office of Legal Affairs which had confirmed that the document had the status of an amendment, its effect being to propose an increase in the number of recommended NGOs from 91 to 92. If the Council decided to depart from its established procedures, it would be open to it to consider not only document E/1995/L.43 but any other proposal that had the same weight.

In answer to a question from Mr. BLANEY (United States of America), he said that, if the Council answered the proposed question affirmatively, it would then proceed to take action on document E/1995/L.43.

In answer to a question from Mr. A.K. SINGH (India), he confirmed that it would be open to the Council to consider proposals other than that contained in the document he had mentioned.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said he understood that the Council would be voting on two separate proposals, a procedural motion on whether the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations could be amended by the Council, and the substantive proposal contained in document E/1995/L.43. The substantive proposal itself, once it was put before the Council for consideration, would be open to amendment in accordance with the Council's rules of procedure.

The PRESIDENT confirmed that that was the case and read out rule 65 of the rules of procedure, which defined an amendment as a proposal that did no more than add to, delete from or revise part of another, proposal.

He recalled that the representative of Cuba had requested a roll-call vote on the first, procedural, motion, which was: "Does the Council agree to depart from established practice and procedure to consider an amendment to the proposals of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations contained in document E/1995/108?"

Mr. ZHANG Yishan (China), recalling that draft decisions I, II and III, contained in the Committee's report, had already been approved by the Council, asked whether the second, substantive, motion embodied in document E/1995/L.43 amounted to the amendment of a decision that had already been adopted.

The PRESIDENT said that he had sought an opinion from the Office of Legal Affairs, which had informed him that the proposal in E/1995/L.43 amounted to a reconsideration of an earlier decision. The Council was sovereign in its proceedings and was entirely entitled to take that action if it so desired in accordance with rule 57 of its rules of procedure.

Mr. A.K. SINGH (India) said that the procedural motion put forward by the President seemed to be worded in a rather awkward way. To streamline the wording, he suggested that the reference to "established procedure and practice" be deleted and a reference to the proposal in E/1995/L.43 included, as that was the very basis for the procedural motion.

Mrs. BAUTA SOLES (Cuba), speaking on a point of order, said her delegation's proposal had been phrased very clearly and aptly by the President, and she was unable to accept the proposed modification of that phrasing.

Mr. BLANEY (United States of America) said he supported the proposal made by the representative of India, which would result in a more elegant version of the procedural motion. He understood the reference to "an amendment" in the President's formulation to refer to document E/1995/L.43. Finally, he recalled that the Council was sovereign and could take whatever decisions it wished.

Ms. BIRGIN (Australia) suggested that the procedural motion be worded: "Does the Council agree to consider the draft decision in document E/1995/L.43?".

Mrs. BAUTA SOLES (Cuba) said that that wording was unacceptable. Her delegation had called for a roll-call vote on the procedural motion, as phrased by the President, and urged that that vote be taken without delay.

Mr. LOIZAGA CABALLERO (Paraguay) said that, before proceeding to a vote, the Council must be absolutely certain what it was voting on. As he understood it, it was voting on whether or not to amend the recommendation made by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations in its report.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that the issue before the Council was very simple: it had to decide on the admissibility of an amendment to the proposals made by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. If it resolved that that amendment was admissible, further proposals, including sub-amendments to the amendment, could be put forward, and his delegation reserved the right to do so should it deem such action necessary.

Mr. KISELEV (Russian Federation) said that the procedural motion put forward by the President had numerous legal nuances that were difficult for delegations to appreciate at first glance. He would have preferred the voting to have been on the proposal as put forward by the representative of Australia, which was much more straightforward.

Mr. JIKONYA (Zimbabwe) said he deplored the fact that the Council had not itself been privy to legal advice on such an important issue as whether it could amend its own rules of procedure. The members of the Council themselves would be called upon to decide that matter, and it would have been appropriate for them to be informed directly of the legal implications.

The PRESIDENT said that the issue was not whether the Council could amend its rules of procedure but whether it could modify the practice of one of its subsidiary organs.

In response to a comment by Mrs. BAUTA SOLES (Cuba), and referring to rule 59 of the rules of procedure concerning a request for a vote, the President announced that the voting procedure was under way.

Mr. SLIPTCHENKO (Ukraine), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said it was unfortunate that the lengthy discussion on a single issue had unduly prolonged the Council's consideration of item 10 of its agenda. He would vote in favour of the procedural motion put forward by the President.

Mr. SOMAVIA (Chile) said his delegation would vote in favour of the procedural motion. In fact, it believed the only possible vote was in favour, because a vote against would be tantamount to saying that the Council was incapable of modifying the recommendations of its subsidiary bodies and thus was entirely redundant. It would also constitute an unfortunate precedent if the Council, as the principal organ for economic and social matters, were to decide it could not modify the proposals made by its subsidiary bodies.

Mr. RINCHHEN (Bhutan) said his delegation regretted that the Council had had to reconsider a proposal of one of its subsidiary bodies, and hoped that such action would be the exception and not the rule in its work. As the parent body, however, it had the prerogative to review the proposals of its subsidiary bodies and his delegation would vote to allow the Council to do so.

Mr. ZHANG Yishan (China) said that the Council had already formally approved all three draft decisions submitted by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. To overrule such decisions at the current stage would, indeed, constitute an unfortunate precedent. His delegation would thus vote against the procedural motion.

Mr. BLANEY (United States of America) said that his delegation would vote in favour and urged other delegations to do so also.

Mr. MOHAMED (Malaysia) said that his delegation regretted the fact that the Council was required to decide whether to review a recommendation of one of its subsidiary bodies, not on the basis of any new information but solely for the purpose of making a political statement. That reflected badly on the Council's integrity and his delegation would vote against the motion.

Mr. KA (Senegal) said that the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had encountered major difficulties in resolving the matter under consideration. In such an instance, the Council both could and should take over the responsibility for making the decision. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the motion.

At the request of the representative of Cuba, a vote was taken by roll-call on the procedural motion as put forward by the President.

In favour: Australia, Bahamas, Belarus, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Nigeria, Sudan, Thailand, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Colombia, Gabon, Ghana, Jamaica, Mexico, Philippines, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela.

The procedural motion was adopted by 29 votes to 12, with 11 abstentions.

After a discussion in which Mr. ZHANG Yishan (China), Mr. BLANEY (United States of America) and Mr. LOIZAGA CABALLERO (Paraguay) took part, the PRESIDENT announced that the Council would defer its consideration of the proposal in document E/1995/L.43 until its next meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.