



ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКИЙ
И СОЦИАЛЬНЫЙ СОВЕТ

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/2001/153
10 April 2001

RUSSIAN
Original: ENGLISH

КОМИССИЯ ПО ПРАВАМ ЧЕЛОВЕКА
Пятьдесят седьмая сессия
Пункт 11 b) повестки дня

ГРАЖДАНСКИЕ И ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИЕ ПРАВА, ВКЛЮЧАЯ СЛЕДУЮЩИЙ ВОПРОС:
ИСЧЕЗНОВЕНИЯ И КАЗНИ БЕЗ НАДЛЕЖАЩЕГО
СУДЕБНОГО РАЗБИРАТЕЛЬСТВА

Письмо Постоянного представителя Сингапура при Отделении Организации
Объединенных Наций в Женеве от 6 апреля 2001 года на имя Председателя
Комиссии по правам человека

Имею честь сослаться на доклад Специального докладчика по вопросу о внесудебных казнях, казнях без надлежащего судебного разбирательства или произвольных казнях (E/CN.4/2001/9), представленный Комиссии по правам человека на ее пятьдесят седьмой сессии.

Прилагаю письмо от 6 апреля 2001 года*, направленное мною Специальному докладчику, и хотел бы просить распространить его в качестве официального документа пятьдесят седьмой сессии Комиссии по правам человека по пункту 11 b).

Подпись:

СИ Чак Мун
Посол
Постоянный представитель

* Воспроизводится в полученном виде, только на языке представленного документа.

Annex



PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE
TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Phone: (4122)929 6644

Fax: (4122) 929 6658

6 April 2001

Ms Asma Jahangir
UN Special Rapporteur
on Extrajudicial, Summary or Arbitrary Executions
c/o Office of the United Nations High Commissioner
for Human Rights
Palais Wilson
51 rue des Pâquis
1201 Geneva

Dear Ms Jahangir

With reference to your report on Extrajudicial, Summary or Arbitrary Executions (E/CN.4/2001/9), which was submitted to the 57th Session of the Commission on Human Rights (CHR) pursuant to CHR resolution 2000/31, I would like to make the following comments.

- (a) In para 94, it was said that the absence of the death penalty in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court is an example of the growing international consensus in favour of abolition. This has ignored the fact that in his statement to the plenary of the Rome Diplomatic Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Establishment of an International Criminal Court on 17 July 1998, the President of the Conference declared that the debate at the Conference on the issue of which penalties should be applied by the Court showed that there is no international consensus on the inclusion or non-inclusion of the death penalty, and further that not including the death penalty in the Rome Statute would not in any way have a legal bearing on national legislations and practices with regard to the death penalty, nor should it be considered as influencing, in the development of customary international law or in any other way, the legality of penalties imposed by national systems for serious crimes.
- (b) Consensus in the international community is not a question of 50% plus one. The statement that more than half of all countries have abolished the death penalty glosses over the fact that a significant number of countries retain it among their laws. The Second Optional Protocol to the International

Covenant on Civil and Political Rights has only been ratified by a minority of states. There is therefore no international consensus either for or against capital punishment. This view was reflected in the joint statement contained in the document E/CN.4/2000/162 in which 51 delegations disassociated themselves from CHR resolution 2000/65. This view was also reflected in (i) the joint statement contained in ECOSOC document E/1999/113 in which 50 delegations disassociated themselves from CHR resolution 1999/61, (ii) the joint statement contained in document E/1998/95 in which 54 delegations disassociated themselves from CHR resolution 1998/8, (iii) the joint letter contained in document E/CN.4/1998/156 in which 51 delegations expressed their reservations prior to the adoption of CHR resolution 1998/8 and (iv) the joint statement contained in document E/1997/106 in which 34 delegations disassociated themselves from a similar CHR resolution 1997/12.

- (c) The Report also completely ignores the position of those delegations that the death penalty is primarily a criminal justice issue, and therefore is a question for the sovereign jurisdiction of each country. Nor does it consider the point that the right to life is not the only right, and that it is the duty of societies and governments to decide how to balance competing rights against each other.

2 I sincerely hope that the above comments would be taken into consideration in future reports.

With best wishes

Yours sincerely



SEE CHAK MUN