



RESULTS

101st CONFERENCE
AND RELATED MEETINGS

OF THE

INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION

BRUSSELS (BELGIUM)

8 - 16 APRIL 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
A. 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference		
1.	Inaugural Ceremony	1
2.	Participation	1
3.	Selection of supplementary items	2
4.	Work and decisions of the Conference and its Study Committees	
(a)	General Debate on the political, economic and social situation in the world	3
(b)	Parliamentary action to encourage all countries to sign and ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty prohibiting all nuclear testing, to encourage universal and non-discriminatory nuclear non-proliferation measures and to work towards the eventual elimination of all nuclear weapons	3
(c)	The problem of metropolitan areas: a global challenge to which parliamentarians must respond in terms of urban civilisation and democracy	4
(d)	Writing off the government debt of heavily indebted poor countries (HIPCs)	5
(e)	Amendments to the Union's Statutes	5
 B. 164th Session of the Inter-Parliamentary Council		
1.	Membership of the Union	6
2.	Co-operation between the Union and the United Nations system	6
3.	Conference of Presiding Officers of National Parliaments at United Nations Headquarters in the Year 2000	6
4.	Reports of the President of the Council and of the Secretary General	
(a)	Report by the President of the Council	7
(b)	Interim report of the Secretary General on the activities of the Union since the 163 rd session of the Council	7
5.	Meeting of women parliamentarians	7
6.	Security and Co-operation in the Mediterranean	7
7.	Sustainable Development	7
8.	Human rights of parliamentarians	8
9.	Situation in Cyprus	8
10.	Middle East Questions	8
11.	International Humanitarian Law	8
12.	Gender Partnership Group	9
13.	Results of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference on " <i>Attaining the World Food Summit's Objectives through a Sustainable Development Strategy</i> "	9
14.	Financial Results for 1998	9
15.	Future Inter-Parliamentary meetings	9
16.	Questions relating to the Statutes and Rules of the Union	10
 C. 228th Session of the Executive Committee		
		11

D. First Meeting of Women Parliamentarians	13
E. Meetings of Various Subsidiary Bodies and Committees	
1. Meeting of Representatives of the Parties to the CSCM process	15
2. Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians	16
3. Group of Facilitators for Cyprus	16
4. Committee on Middle East Questions	17
5. Committee to promote respect for International Humanitarian Law	17
6. Gender Partnership Group	17
F. Elections and Appointments	
1. President of the 101 st Inter-Parliamentary Conference	19
2. Executive Committee	19
3. Study Committees of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference	19
4. Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians	19
5. Committee for Sustainable Development	20
6. Gender Partnership Group	20

ANNEXES

Membership

- I. Membership of the Union as of 16 April 1999

Resolutions and decisions of the 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference

- II. (A to F) Results of roll-call votes on requests for inclusion of a supplementary item in the Conference agenda

- II.G Results of the roll-call vote on a request for inclusion of an emergency supplementary item in the Conference agenda

- III. *Parliamentary action to encourage all countries to sign and ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty prohibiting all nuclear testing, to encourage universal and non-discriminatory nuclear non-proliferation measures and to work towards the eventual elimination of all nuclear weapons* (text of the resolution)

- IV. *The problem of metropolitan areas: a global challenge to which parliamentarians must respond in terms of urban civilisation and democracy* (text of the resolution)

- V. *Writing off the government debt of heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC)s* (text of the resolution)

- VI. Amendments to the Statutes of the Union

Resolutions and decisions adopted by the Inter-Parliamentary Council

- VII. Co-operation between the Union and the United Nations System
- VIII. Co-operation in armaments control in the Mediterranean with a view to preventing conflicts in the region

- IX. Process of implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)
- X. Tourism and the imperatives of sustainable development
- XI. Report of the Second Tri-Partite Meeting on follow-up of the World Summit for Social Development, New York, 31 March 1999
- XII. Report of the Committee on Middle East Questions
- XIII. Partnership between men and women at the Inter-Parliamentary Union
- XIV. Results of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference on "*Attaining the World Food Summit's objectives through a Sustainable Development Strategy*", **Rome (29 November to 2 December 1998)**
- XV. Agenda of the 102nd Inter-Parliamentary Conference
- XVI. List of international organisations and other bodies to be invited to follow the work of the 102nd Conference as observers
- XVII. Future meetings and other activities
- XVIII. Practical modalities of the rights and responsibilities of observers at IPU Meetings

Resolutions of the Inter-Parliamentary Council concerning the human rights of parliamentarians

- XIX. Thirty parliamentarians in **Burundi**
- XX. Mr. Sam Rainsy, Mr. Son Soubert, Mr. Pol Ham, Mr. Son Sann and Mr. Kem Sokha, of **Cambodia**
- XXI. Mr. Ngarléjy Yorongar, of **Chad**
- XXII. Mr. Pedro Nel Jimenez Obando, Mr. Leonardo Posada Pedraza, Mr. Octavio Vargas Cuéllar, Mr. Pedro Luis Valencia Giraldo, Mr. Bernardo Jaramillo Ossa, Mr. Manuel Cepeda Vargas, of **Colombia**
- XXIII. Mr. Hernán Motta Motta and Mr. Nelson Veloria, of **Colombia**
- XXIV. One hundred and nine parliamentarians in **Colombia**
- XXV. Mr. Joseph Olenghankoy, Mr. Eugène Diomi Ndongala Nzomambu and Mr. Etienne Tshisekedi, of the **Democratic Republic of the Congo**
- XXVI. Mr. Ahmed Boulaleh Barreh, Mr. Ali Mahamade Houmed and Mr. Moumin Bahdon Farah, of **Djibouti**
- XXVII. Mr. Lamin Waa Juwara, of **Gambia**
- XXVIII. Mr. Omar Jallow, of **Gambia**
- XXIX. Mr. Alpha Condé, Mr. El-Hadj Amiata Mady Kaba, Ms. Koumbafing Keïta, Mr. Mamady Yö Kouyate and Mr. Ibrahima Kalil Keïta, of **Guinea**
- XXX. Mr. Miguel Angel Pavón Salazar, of **Honduras**
- XXXI. Mr. Lim Guan Eng, of **Malaysia**
- XXXII. Mr. Anwar Ibrahim, of **Malaysia**
- XXXIII. Two-hundred and eight parliamentarians in **Myanmar**
- XXXIV. Mr. Amadi Okorafor, Rev. Mac Nwulu, Mr. Polycap, Mr. Abu Ibrahim, Mr. Bola Ahmed Tinubu, Mr. Olawale Oshun and Mr. O.J. Adewunmi, of **Nigeria**
- XXXV. Mr. Marc Atidépé, Mr. Tavio Amorin and Mr. Gaston Aziaduvo Edeh, of **Togo**
- XXXVI. Fifteen parliamentarians in **Turkey**
- XXXVII. Mr. Hasan Mezarci, of **Turkey**

A. 101st INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE¹

The 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference began its work at the European Parliament in Brussels on the afternoon of 11 April by **electing by acclamation Mr. R. Langendries, President of the Chamber of Representatives of Belgium, as its President.**

On the morning of 12 April, the Conference heard a statement by **Mr. J. Diouf**, Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), who summed up the world food situation, highlighting its most acute problems.

On that same afternoon, the Conference was addressed by **Mr. J.-L. Dehaene**, Prime Minister of Belgium, who explained his country's position on major international issues, particularly the current situation dominated by events in Kosovo.

1. INAUGURAL CEREMONY

The 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference was inaugurated at a ceremony held on 11 April at the Palais des Congrès in the presence of **Their Majesties, the King and Queen of the Belgians.** During the ceremony, the delegates heard statements from Mr. J. Lefevre, President of the Inter-Parliamentary Group of Belgium; Mr. A. Gutiérrez Díaz, Vice-President of the European Parliament; Mr. V. Petrovsky, Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations and Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva, who delivered a message from the UN Secretary-General, Mr. K. Annan; and Mr. M.A. Martínez, President of the Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. The ceremony concluded with a speech by H.M. King Albert II.

Extracts from the speeches delivered on that occasion will be published in the Inter-Parliamentary Bulletin (N° 1, 1999).

2. PARTICIPATION

Delegations from the *Parliaments* of the following 125 countries took part in the work of the Conference²: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, San Marino, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

¹ The resolutions and reports referred to in this document, as well as general information on the Brussels session, are available on the IPU's web site at <http://www.ipu.org>.

² For the complete list of IPU membership, see Annex I.

The following **Associate Members** also took part in the Conference: the Andean Parliament, the Central American Parliament, the Latin American Parliament and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe.

The **observers** included representatives of: (i) Palestine; (ii) United Nations system: United Nations Organization, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat), Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), World Bank, International Labour Organisation (ILO), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD); (iii) the Council of Europe, the League of Arab States, the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the International Organization for Migration (IOM); (iv) the Assembly of the Western European Union (WEU), the Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), the Association of Parliamentarians for (Southern) Africa (AWEPA), the Parliamentary Assembly of the Black Sea Economic Co-operation (PABSEC), the Parliamentary Association for Euro-Arab Co-operation (PAEAC), the ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Organization (AIPO), the Amazonian Parliament, the Union of African Parliaments (UAP), the Arab Inter-Parliamentary Union; (v) the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies; (vi) the World Association of Cities and Local Authorities Co-ordination (CAMVAL).

There was a total of 1,377 delegates, including 647 parliamentarians among whom 46 were Speakers of Assemblies, 28 Deputy Speakers and 132 women parliamentarians (20.4% of the parliamentarians), and lastly 53 delegates attending as observers.

3. SELECTION OF SUPPLEMENTARY ITEMS

(a) Supplementary item

When this question was taken up in the afternoon of 11 April, the Conference had before it **six requests for the inclusion of a supplementary item** (the request from Kuwait was amended slightly). After hearing statements by the sponsors of the requests, the Conference proceeded to vote on them by roll call with the following results:

- The item proposed by the Parliament of **Ethiopia** on "*The peaceful resolution of the ongoing conflict between Eritrea and Ethiopia*" received 336 votes to 543, with 658 abstentions (see details of the vote in Annex II-A);
- The item proposed by the Parliament of **the Islamic Republic of Iran** entitled "*Inter-parliamentary contribution to the programmes of the year 2001 as the United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilisations*" received 410 votes to 533, with 594 abstentions (see details of the vote in Annex II-B);
- The item proposed by the Parliament of **Iraq** entitled "*The lifting of the embargo off Iraq ensures respect for human rights*" received 469 votes to 645, with 423 abstentions (see details of the vote in Annex II-C);
- The item proposed by the Parliament of **Kuwait** on "*The increasing potential dangers of the production, proliferation and use of weapons of mass destruction: the contribution of parliaments to the world-wide campaign to ban the production, proliferation, stockpiling and use of weapons of mass destruction*" received 520 votes to 469, with 548 abstentions (see details of the vote in Annex II-D);
- The item proposed by the Parliament of **Norway** on "*Humanitarian action - challenges facing the international community on the 50th anniversary of the Geneva Conventions*" received 881 votes to 318, with 338 abstentions (see details of the vote in Annex II-E);

- The item proposed by the Parliament of **South Africa** on "*Writing off the Government debt of heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC's)*" received 969 votes to 201, with 367 abstentions (see details of the vote in Annex II-F).

The proposal by the Parliament of South Africa, having received not only the necessary two-thirds majority but also the highest number of positive votes, was added to the agenda as item 7 (see paragraph 4(d) below). The delegations of Egypt and Uruguay then explained their votes.

(b) Emergency supplementary item

The Conference had before it a request from the Parliament of the **Russian Federation** to include in the agenda an emergency supplementary item entitled: "*The situation in the Balkans and parliamentarians' role in putting an end to the escalation of the NATO aggression against Yugoslavia and in normalising the situation in the region*". After hearing a representative of the Russian Parliament and a delegate from the German Parliament who spoke against the proposal, the Conference rejected the request by 625 votes to 438, with 315 abstentions. The delegations of Mexico and Guatemala then explained their votes.

4. WORK AND DECISIONS OF THE CONFERENCE AND ITS STUDY COMMITTEES

(a) General Debate on the political, economic and social situation in the world (Item 3)

The General Debate on the political, economic and social situation in the world was held throughout Monday, 12 April, from 4 p.m. to 6.30 p.m. on 13 April and throughout 14 April. A total of 141 speakers from 113 delegations took part in the debate, which was chaired by the President of the Conference. The latter invited the Conference Vice-Presidents belonging to delegations of the following countries to take the chair in turn: Bolivia, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Jordan, Luxembourg, Netherlands and Senegal.

Many speakers devoted much of their statements to the situation in **Kosovo**, which was also mentioned by the Conference President during the closing ceremony. He emphasised that what was happening in that region hurt everyone, the Serbian people, the inhabitants of Kosovo. He declared that on the eve of the third millennium, the international community did not have the right to shut its eyes to that situation.

Moreover, at that sitting, the President made a statement concerning the situation in **Niger**, which had received the unanimous support of the Conference, denouncing and strongly condemning the brutal blow to the efforts of the people of Niger to build a State based on the rule of law. The Conference President made an urgent appeal to the military authorities in that country to re-establish democratic institutions as soon as possible.

(b) Parliamentary action to encourage all countries to sign and ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty prohibiting all nuclear testing, to encourage universal and non-discriminatory nuclear non-proliferation measures and to work towards the eventual elimination of all nuclear weapons (Item 4)

This item was considered on 12 and 14 April by the **Ist Committee** (Committee on Political Questions, International Security and Disarmament) which met under the chairmanship of its President, **Mr. A.R. Zamharir (Indonesia)**. The Committee had before it **11 memoranda** presented by the National Groups of Argentina, Australia, Chile, Congo, Egypt, Hungary, Iraq, Japan, Russian Federation, Switzerland and Venezuela; **an information document** prepared by the Union's Secretariat; and **20 draft resolutions** submitted by the Groups of Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, Congo, Denmark, Egypt, Germany, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq,

Japan, Kuwait, Philippines, Russian Federation, Senegal, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom and Venezuela.

Altogether 66 speakers took the floor in the debate which was held on 12 April. At the end of the discussion, the Political Committee designated a **drafting committee** composed of representatives of the following nine Groups: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Denmark, Egypt, Germany, Japan, Poland and South Africa. This group, assisted by an international arms control expert, met for some four hours on 13 April. It began its deliberations by electing **Mr. J. McKiernan (Australia)** as its **President** and **Mr. T.G. Alant (South Africa)** as its **Rapporteur**. Taking the Australian text as a basis for its work, the committee proceeded to a detailed consideration thereof. In the process of putting the resolution together, it also incorporated elements from five other texts. The resulting consolidated draft was adopted unanimously.

On 14 April, the Ist Committee, after having heard the report by Mr. Alant on the work of the drafting committee, examined the proposed text paragraph by paragraph. A number of amendments were tabled, which led to a total of 14 votes. Major changes related to the operative section, where additional wording and three supplementary paragraphs to sub-heading D (on nuclear-weapon-free zones) were approved. The draft resolution as a whole was subsequently **adopted by 25 votes to 2, with 1 abstention**.

In the afternoon of 15 April, Mr. Alant presented this same text at the concluding plenary sitting of the Conference. Subsequently, the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran proposed additional wording to operative paragraph E.16 concerning non-proliferation of missiles; that insertion was **unanimously approved**. Thereafter, the entire draft resolution, thus amended, was **adopted without a vote**. Finally, the delegations of India, China, Belarus and Lebanon took the floor to explain their votes, with the first of these expressing its rejection of the resolution as a whole (see text of the resolution in Annex III).

(c) **The problem of metropolitan areas: a global challenge to which parliamentarians must respond in terms of urban civilisation and democracy (Item 5)**

This item was considered on 13 and 15 April by the **IVth Committee** (Committee on Education, Science, Culture and Environment) which met under the presidency of **Mr. J. Trobo (Uruguay)**. The Committee had before it **13 memoranda** presented by the Parliaments of the following countries: Belgium, Chile, Congo, Egypt, France, Hungary, Iraq, Japan, Sudan, Switzerland and Venezuela, by one individual MP, Mr. C.A. Becerra (Argentina), and by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe; **three information documents** presented by the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); and **23 draft resolutions** presented by the delegations of the following countries: Belgium, Canada, Chile, Congo, Egypt, France, Gabon, Germany, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Philippines, Romania, Senegal, Sudan, United Kingdom and Venezuela, by Mr. C.A. Becerra and by the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians.

A total of 70 speakers from 63 countries took part in the debate, which was held throughout 13 April. After the debate, the Committee appointed a **drafting committee** composed of representatives of the Groups of the following countries: Belgium, Canada, Chile, Egypt, Guatemala, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Romania, Senegal and Sudan. The FAO also took part in the drafting in an advisory capacity. The drafting committee met throughout 14 April and elected **Mrs. Z. Rios Montt (Guatemala)** as its **President** and **Mr. L. Goovaerts (Belgium)** as its **Rapporteur**. It took the text of the Group of Romania as the basis for its draft but also drew extensively on other texts. The resulting consolidated draft was adopted without a vote.

At its sitting on the morning of 15 April, the IVth Committee considered the text presented by the drafting committee and **adopted it without a vote**.

On the afternoon of 15 April, Mr. Goovaerts (Belgium) presented the IVth Committee's draft resolution to the 101st Conference, which **adopted it without a vote** (see text of the resolution in Annex IV).

(d) Writing off the government debt of heavily indebted poor countries (HIPCs) (Item 7)

This item was placed on the agenda of the Conference at its first sitting on 11 April and referred to the **IIIrd Committee** (on Economic and Social Questions). The Committee held two sittings on 13 and 15 April with its President, **Mr. H. Gjellerod (Denmark)**, in the Chair. It had before it **two draft resolutions** submitted by the delegations of Philippines and South Africa and elements for a draft resolution submitted by the Group of Canada.

During its first sitting on 13 April, the Committee held a debate on the item in which 31 speakers took the floor. At the end of the debate, the Committee appointed a **drafting committee** composed of the representatives of the Parliaments of the following countries: Australia, Côte d'Ivoire, Kenya, Mexico, Philippines, Romania, South Africa, Switzerland, Togo and United Kingdom.

The drafting committee met on 14 April and at the beginning of its work, elected as its President **Mr. A. Somlyay (Australia)** and **Mr. M. Lekota (South Africa)** as its **Rapporteur**. The committee adopted the draft resolution submitted by the Parliament of South Africa as a basis for its work and drew from the other texts to produce a consolidated text. This text was **adopted unanimously**.

During its second sitting, on 15 April the IIIrd Committee examined the drafting committee's text and adopted it **unanimously with minor amendments**.

Mr. Lekota (South Africa) presented the draft resolution to the plenary Conference at its sitting in the afternoon of 15 April. The plenary Conference **adopted it without a vote** (see text of resolution in Annex V).

(e) Amendments to the Union's Statutes

At its first sitting, the 101st Conference had before it a proposal, submitted by the Council (which had decided in favour thereof at its 163rd session held in September 1998 in Moscow), to amend Article 24 of the Statutes to the effect that the President of the Co-ordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians is an *ex officio* member of the Executive Committee. The Conference adopted it unanimously (see Annex VI).

At its last sitting, the 101st Conference also had before it a proposal submitted by the Council (which had decided in favour thereof at the first sitting of its 164th session on 11 April in Brussels) to amend Article 22(h) of the Statutes concerning the participation of observers in the Union's meetings. The Conference adopted it unanimously (see Annex VI).

B. 164th SESSION OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY COUNCIL

The Inter-Parliamentary Council held its 164th session at the European Parliament in Brussels on 11 and 16 April 1999 with its President, Mr. M.A. Martínez (Spain), in the Chair.

1. MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNION

During its 164th session, the Council decided, on the recommendation of the Executive Committee, to reaffiliate the Parliaments of Burundi and Liberia as Members and the European Parliament as an Associate Member of the Union.

Following the recent coup d'Etat in Niger, the Council decided at its sitting of 16 April to follow developments in that country closely and revert to the question at its 165th session in Berlin with a view to taking a final decision on the possible suspension of the affiliation of the Parliament of this country to the Union.

As a result of those decisions, **the Union now comprises 138 Member Parliaments and five regional international parliamentary assemblies as Associate Members** (see list in Annex I).

2. CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE UNION AND THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

At its second sitting, the Council took note of the report which the Secretary General presented giving an overview of the level and extent of the co-operation between the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the United Nations system (see Annex VII). On that occasion, Mr. V. Petrovsky, Under-Secretary-General and Director-General of the United Nations Office in Geneva, addressed the Council and reiterated the wish of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to strengthen further the co-operation between the two Organisations.

The Council welcomed the interest expressed by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the World Health Organization, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization to establish closer working relations with the IPU.

The Council further approved the texts of a Co-operation Agreement between the International Labour Organization and the IPU and of a Memorandum of Understanding on Co-operation between the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the IPU, and authorised the President of the Council and the Secretary General to sign them on behalf of the IPU.

3. CONFERENCE OF PRESIDING OFFICERS OF NATIONAL PARLIAMENTS AT UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS IN THE YEAR 2000

At its second sitting, the Council took note of the report of the first meeting of the Preparatory Committee of the Conference. It also took note of the action being taken to prepare a refounding Act for the IPU for adoption on the occasion of the Conference and set up a Working Group consisting of Mr. H.R. Choudhury (Speaker of the Parliament of Bangladesh), Mr. M.M. Traoré (President of the National Assembly of Burkina Faso and Member of the IPU Executive Committee), Mrs. N. Heptulla (Deputy Chairman of the Rajya Sabha of India and Vice-President of the IPU Executive Committee), Mr. F. Solana (President of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate of Mexico and Member of the IPU Executive Committee) and the heads of the National Groups of France and the United Kingdom (the two founder National Groups).

4. REPORTS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL AND OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL

(a) Report by the President of the Council

At its second sitting, the Council **took note** of the **written report by the President** on his activities and contacts since the 163rd session.

At both sittings, the Council also heard and **took note** of an **oral report of the President on the activities of the Executive Committee** in the context of its 228th session in Brussels (see Section C).

(b) Interim report of the Secretary General on the activities of the Union since the 163rd session of the Council

At its sitting on 16 April, the Council had before it the written report of the Secretary General on the activities of the Union since the 163rd session of the Council. After hearing a presentation by the Secretary General, the Council **took note** of the report. The Council also endorsed the Secretary General's proposal to align the period of his next Annual Report with the calendar year.

5. MEETING OF WOMEN PARLIAMENTARIANS

On 16 April, the Council heard the report presented by Mrs. A. Hermans (Belgium) on the work of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians which she had chaired on 10 April 1999 (see Section D). The Council **took note** of this report.

6. SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

At its second sitting, the Council considered the report on the work of the XIVth Meeting of the Representatives of the Parties to the CSCM Process, presented by the General Rapporteur of the CSCM, Mr. M.H. Khelil of Tunisia (see Section E.1). The report covered the results of the Third Thematic Preparatory Meeting of the IIIrd CSCM that was held in Ljubljana (Slovenia) on 12 and 13 March 1999. In **taking note** of that report (see Annex VIII); the Council noted a recommendation that the question of small arms be considered at a future statutory conference.

The Council endorsed a recommendation of the parties to the CSCM process that in view of the forthcoming elections in Tunisia, that country, instead of hosting the IIIrd CSCM, would host a IVth CSCM at dates to be defined. It welcomed the invitation of the French Parliament to host the IIIrd CSCM in May 2000, it being understood that the exact date and place would be indicated at a later stage.

7. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

At its second sitting, the Council heard the report of the Union's Committee for Sustainable Development, presented by Mrs. M. Chidzonga (Zimbabwe). The Council **approved the Committee's report** on its session held in Geneva from 1 to 3 March 1999. It **endorsed** in particular the Final Declaration adopted by the Meeting of Parliamentarians on the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification organised by the Secretariat of the Convention (UNCCD) and sponsored by the IPU (see Annex IX) and a Statement on tourism and the imperatives of sustainable development to be submitted to the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (see Annex X). In its report, the Committee recommended that the issue of international financial flows and sustainable development and the issue of climatic change be considered at a future statutory Conference or addressed in any other appropriate way by the Inter-

Parliamentary Union. It also indicated that it would meet henceforth informally at each September/October statutory Conference where its members could contribute to the debates of the IIIrd Committee (on Economic and Social Questions) and where they would focus on preparing the next annual session of the Committee for Sustainable Development and, particularly, on setting its agenda on the basis of proposals by the Secretary General.

On the same occasion, the Council endorsed the report of the Second Tripartite Meeting of Representatives of Parliaments, Governments and Inter-Governmental Organisations (held at United Nations Headquarters, New York, on 30-31 March 1999) on the follow-up of the World Summit for Social Development (see Annex XI).

8. HUMAN RIGHTS OF PARLIAMENTARIANS

On 16 April, the Council observed a minute of silence in memory of Mr. H. Batalla (Uruguay), a former President of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians who had passed away in October 1998. It then heard Mr. F. Autain (France), President of the Committee, reporting on the work carried out by the Committee at its 84th and 85th sessions, which took place respectively in Geneva from 1 to 4 February and in Brussels from 10 to 15 April 1999 (see Section E.2).

The Council then **adopted without a vote resolutions concerning 404 serving or former MPs in the following 14 countries: Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Gambia, Guinea, Honduras, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nigeria, Togo and Turkey** (see Annexes XIX to XXXVII).

9. SITUATION IN CYPRUS

At its second sitting, the Council heard Mrs. Y. Loza (Egypt) on the activities of the three-member Group of Facilitators, for which she is the Moderator (see section E.3). It endorsed that body's suggestion to continue facilitating contacts between representatives of Greek and Turkish Cypriot political parties while adjourning for the time being the holding of discussions involving the representatives of the three Guarantor Powers, Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

10. MIDDLE EAST QUESTIONS

At its sitting on 16 April, the Council had before it the report of the Committee on Middle East Questions, presented by its Rapporteur, Mr. A. Philippou (Cyprus). After interventions by the representatives of Palestine and Jordan, and replies by the Rapporteur and the President of the Committee, the Council **took note** of the Committee's report (see Section E.4 and Annex XII).

11. INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW

On 16 April, the Council heard Mrs. B. Mugo (Kenya) on the stage reached with different projects initiated by the Committee to Promote Respect for International Humanitarian Law (see Section E.5). The Council noted that 67 of the 135 States that signed the Ottawa Convention on Antipersonnel Mines had ratified it, a proportion far in excess of the number of ratifications (40) required for the Convention to take effect.

12. GENDER PARTNERSHIP GROUP

The Council heard at its second sitting the report of the Group's Moderator, Mrs. N. Heptulla (India), on the Group's deliberations in Brussels (see Section E.6). It approved a resolution proposed by the Group which *inter alia* invited the Parliaments of those countries which had no women members to take steps to encourage women's access to Parliament (see Annex XIII).

13. RESULTS OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE ON "ATTAINING THE WORLD FOOD SUMMIT'S OBJECTIVES THROUGH A SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY"

At its second sitting on 16 April, the Council adopted a resolution on the results of the IPU Conference held in Rome from 29 November to 2 December 1998 with the support of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations and hosted by the Italian Parliament. The resolution was presented by Mrs. M. Chidzonga (Zimbabwe) on behalf of the Union's Committee for Sustainable Development (see Annex XIV by which the Council endorsed the Final Document of the Conference).

14. FINANCIAL RESULTS FOR 1998

At its second sitting, the Council had before it the financial results of the Union for 1998 and the report of the External Auditor. It heard the report by its own Auditors, Mrs. Z. Rios Montt (Guatemala) and Mrs. T. Yariguina (Russian Federation) presented by the former and **approved** the Union's accounts for 1998 and the Secretary General's financial administration for that year.

15. FUTURE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY MEETINGS

At its second sitting, the Council **approved** the Executive Committee's recommendations concerning the **agenda of the 102nd Inter-Parliamentary Conference** to be held in Berlin from 10 to 16 October 1999 (see Annex XV) as well as the list of **observers** to be invited to that meeting (see Annex XVI).

The Council took note that, as the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians had become an official part of the statutory sessions, there would henceforth be no separate inaugural ceremony for that meeting and that the Conference inaugural ceremony in Berlin would take place on Sunday, 10 October at 7 p.m.

The Council took note of the **calendar of future meetings** (see Annex XVII).

It approved the modalities for the Forum on the theme "*Perspectives on Democracy: How Women Make a Difference*", organised by IPU and UNESCO with the UN Division for the Advancement of Women, to be held from 1 to 3 December 1999 at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris. It appointed Mrs. F. Kéfi (Tunisia), Mr. C.S. Park (Republic of Korea) and a French parliamentarian to serve on the Preparatory Committee of that event.

On the proposal of the Executive Committee, the Council decided to grant the Union's **sponsorship** to the following meetings: (i) Meeting of IPU National Groups from the Asia-Pacific Region, Ulan Bator (Mongolia), July 1999; (ii) Third International Forum on "*Parliaments and Local Authorities: Tourism Policy-Makers*", organised by the World Tourism Organization and hosted by the Brazilian Inter-Parliamentary Group in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil) in November 1999, and (iii) the Second Meeting of Parliamentarians on the Convention to Combat Desertification, organised by the Secretariat of the Convention in Recife (Brazil) in November 1999.

Furthermore, the Council asked the Secretary General to pursue discussions with the relevant organisations and submit specific recommendations at the next session with a view to the possible holding of (i) a parliamentary meeting on the occasion of UNCTAD X, February 2000; and (ii) a dialogue between Parliaments and the World Trade Organization in the first half of 2000.

16. QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE STATUTES AND RULES OF THE UNION

At its first sitting, the Council had before it the proposal of the Executive Committee to amend Article 22(h) of the Statutes and to adopt regulations concerning the participation of observers at IPU meetings. Having decided to recommend that the Conference adopt the amendment to the Statutes, the Council approved the regulations proposed by the Executive Committee (see Annex XVIII).

At its second sitting, the Council approved the Rules established by the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians under Article 23 of the Statutes.

At that same sitting, the Council endorsed the interpretation of Article 20(4) of the Statutes which the Secretary General presented at the request of the Executive Committee that, in the event that the President of the Inter-Parliamentary Council loses his or her national parliamentary mandate, the transfer of the exercise of the President's functions to the Vice-President of the Executive Committee shall be immediate. The Council also endorsed the suggestion that a President who has thus lost the parliamentary mandate may be invited to the next session of the Inter-Parliamentary Council in order that he/she may have the opportunity to report to the Council on his/her activities as President of the Council between the last session and the date of loss of mandate.

C. 228th SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee held its 228th session at the European Parliament in Brussels on 8, 9 and 14 April 1999 with the President of the Inter-Parliamentary Council, Mr. M.A. Martínez (Spain), in the Chair.

The following members and substitutes took part in the work of the session: Mr. I. Fjuk (Estonia), substituting on 8 and 9 April for Mrs. K. Kilvet who is no longer a parliamentarian and on 14 April as duly elected member to succeed Mrs. Kilvet; Mrs. N. Heptulla (India); Mrs. B. Imiolczyk (Poland); Mrs. F. Kéfi (following the adoption on 11 April by the Conference of an amendment to the Statutes providing for the President of the Co-ordinating Committee of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians to be a member of the Executive Committee); Mr. E. Menem (Argentina), replaced on 8 and 9 April by Mr. L.A. León; Mr. D. Novelli (Italy), replaced on 14 April by Mrs. M.A. Daniele Galdi; Mr. C.S. Park (Republic of Korea); Mr. F. Solana (Mexico); Mr. M.P. Tjitendero (Namibia); Mr. M.M. Traoré (Burkina Faso); Mr. F. Tuaimah (Jordan); Mr. G. Versnick (Belgium) and Mrs. T. Yariguina (Russian Federation).

The Executive Committee mainly devoted its time to formulating opinions and recommendations to the Inter-Parliamentary Council regarding items on the latter's agenda. The other matters considered by the Executive Committee may be summarised as follows:

It reverted to the question of **enlivening debates and encouraging active discussion in the Study Committees** that it had discussed at its previous session in Moscow on a proposal from the Finnish delegation and took the view that attempts could be made to achieve the desired result within the existing rules. Noting that Rule 23 of the Study Committees gave the presiding officer the discretion to call speakers in an order different to the one in which they had registered and that the presiding officers had the possibility to orient and manage the debates by using that discretion, the Executive Committee decided to make a strong recommendation to the Steering Committee of the Conference to encourage the Presidents of the Study Committees to make full use of their powers under paragraph 1 of Rule 23 in an attempt to enliven the discussions. It further decided to assess the effectiveness of the experiment and revert to the question at its next session if need be.

It adopted a **schedule for the first two days of the statutory meetings** to be held in Berlin, moving the Inaugural Ceremony for the 102nd Inter-Parliamentary Conference up to the evening of Sunday, 10 October to take place after the second Meeting of Women Parliamentarians and fixing the first sitting of the 102nd Conference devoted to procedural items to take place between 11.30 a.m. and 1 p.m. on Monday, 11 October and the General Debate to start at 2.30 p.m. the same day (the main benefit of this schedule would be that approximately three and a half hours of additional time would be available for the General Debate).

It heard the annual report on the activities carried out under the Union's **Programme for the Study and Promotion of Representative Institutions** and noted in particular the growing number of **technical co-operation projects** funded from extra-budgetary sources.

It reviewed the project for the construction of a **new headquarters** building for the Union in Geneva as a result of the difficulties faced with regard to the site proposed. The Swiss authorities were currently reviewing three alternative sites and the Secretary General would keep the Executive Committee informed of progress thereon.

The Executive Committee reviewed the **financial situation of the Union** and noted that a large majority of members continued to discharge their financial obligations towards the Union in full and on time. It expressed concern that a few members were in arrears in the payment of contributions for prior years and that 73% of all arrears was owed by one member.

It studied the **situation of three Member Parliaments in arrears** in the payment of contributions for more than three years and decided to inform them that unless payments were made in order to reduce those arrears, the Executive Committee would be compelled to recommend that the Inter-Parliamentary Council suspend the affiliation of those members at the session in Berlin in application of Article 4.2 of the Statutes.

It considered a communication from a National Group suggesting that the IPU base its **scale of assessments** for 2000 on the current UN scale of assessments. The Executive Committee took the view that the existing IPU scale should continue to be used until such time as a full review of the question could be undertaken including all aspects of the Union's financial situation.

It took note of the staff turnover at the Secretariat since the Moscow sessions and welcomed both the increased diversity of nationalities and cultures represented at the **Secretariat** and the fact that the proportion of the posts in the professional grades in the Secretariat occupied by women had increased to 40%.

It established the **salary scales** for the staff of the IPU Liaison Office in New York and modified the provisions concerning the payment of an education grant to IPU staff in keeping with the practice of formulating the Union's system of allowances and grants taking into account those of the other international organisations.

It prepared the **draft agenda of the 165th session of the Council** to be held in Berlin on 11 and 16 October 1999.

Lastly, it decided on **representation of the Union** at a number of meetings to which the Union had been invited in coming months.

D. FIRST MEETING OF WOMEN PARLIAMENTARIANS*

The women parliamentarians met in Brussels on Saturday, 10 April with Mrs. A. Hermans, a Member of the Belgian House of Representatives, in the Chair. The meeting was preceded by a session of the Co-ordinating Committee chaired by Mrs. F. Kéfi (Tunisia): see below.

The Meeting was opened at a short ceremony during which Mr. M.A. Martínez, President of the Inter-Parliamentary Council, Mrs. A. Hermans, President of the Meeting, Mrs. F. Kéfi, President of The Women's Co-ordinating Committee, and Mr. A.B. Johnsson, Secretary General of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, took the floor. Some 105 women MPs from the delegations of the following 75 countries participated: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Surinam, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, United Kingdom, Uzbekistan, Vietnam, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Observers from the ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Organization (AIPO) also attended.

The participants held a lengthy debate on problems affecting women in large cities. Participants from Canada (Mrs. J. Fraser and Mrs. P. Torsney), Malaysia (Mrs. S.B. Chua) and Thailand (Mrs. S. Masdit) were entrusted with the task of collecting the main ideas and suggestions presented during the debate and summarising them. The summary was later transformed into a draft resolution presented to the 101st Conference on behalf of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians, under item 5 of the Conference agenda: "*Problems of metropolitan areas: a global challenge to which parliamentarians must respond in terms of urban civilisation and democracy*".

On an item added to the original agenda at the initiative of the Co-ordinating Committee, the participants also discussed the issues related to women and children in armed conflict, with particular reference to Kosovo. Also discussed in the course of the debate was a suggestion by a representative of Italy to set up a delegation with a mandate to meet women of Kosovo.

The participants also studied the draft rules for the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians and its Co-ordinating Committee, that had previously been examined by the Co-ordinating Committee. They adopted them, after which the Rules of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians were referred to the Inter-Parliamentary Council for approval, as per Article 23 of the Statutes (see section B.16).

The meeting also provided an opportunity to discuss progress made with regard to the IPU survey on "*Women's Political Experience and their Contribution to the Democratic Process*", and preparations for the meeting on "*Perspectives on Democracy: How Women Make a Difference*" scheduled for 1- 3 December 1999 in Paris (see section B.15). Similarly, the participants took stock of the state of the IPU survey on national follow-up to the *Beijing Platform for Action* adopted in September 1995 by the Fourth World Conference on Women and the *Plan of Action To Correct Present Imbalances in the Participation of Men and Women in Political Life* adopted in March 1994 by the Union. It also took stock of progress made in the preparations of a

* Following the adoption of Article 23 of the Statutes whereby the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians becomes an official IPU meeting, it will henceforth be numbered starting with this first official session.

tripartite meeting on "*Democracy through Partnership between Men and Women*" to be held by the IPU on 1-2 June 2000 in connection with the Special Session of the UN General Assembly (5-9 June 2000) to review and appraise the follow-up to the Beijing Conference (Beijing +5).

The **Co-ordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians** met on Saturday, 10 April, and made preparations for the plenary meeting, under the chairmanship of Mrs. F. Kéfi (Tunisia). At a second sitting also held under Mrs. Kéfi's chairmanship on Thursday, 15 April, the Committee assessed the results of the Brussels IPU Meetings as they pertained to women. Its main concern was to determine means of improving the integration of women's work within the Union while developing genuine partnership with men. In that connection, it welcomed the adoption by the 101st IPU Conference of amendments to Article 24 of the Statutes (see Annex VI), by which the President of the Co-ordinating Committee becomes an *ex officio* member of the IPU Executive Committee. Furthermore, it decided that the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians in Berlin would focus on women's contribution to the development of a new global financial and economic model (see item 5 of the Berlin Conference agenda in Annex XV). The Co-ordinating Committee further agreed that a hearing of women Presiding Officers of Parliament should be organised at Berlin on the occasion of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians.

E. MEETINGS OF VARIOUS SUBSIDIARY BODIES AND COMMITTEES

1. MEETING OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PARTIES TO THE CSCM PROCESS

On the occasion of the Inter-Parliamentary Meetings in Brussels, the representatives of the parties to the Inter-Parliamentary Process of Security and Co-operation in the Mediterranean (CSCM)* held their XIVth Meeting on Tuesday, 13 April 1999 at the European Parliament. The meeting was chaired by Mr. J. Kacin, Member of the Slovenian National Assembly and President of the Slovenian Inter-Parliamentary Group. The following took part:

- ♦ representatives of the following main participants: Algeria, Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Monaco, Morocco, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia and Turkey;
- ♦ representatives of the following associate participants: Russian Federation, United Kingdom, Palestine, Arab Inter-Parliamentary Union, Assembly of the Western European Union, Parliamentary Assembly of the Black Sea Economic Co-operation.

The session was preceded by a meeting of the CSCM Co-ordinating Committee, chaired by Mr. M.H. Khelil (Tunisia), in which representatives of all its members participated: Egypt, France, Italy, Malta, Morocco, Slovenia, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic and Tunisia.

The representatives of the parties to the CSCM process took stock of parliamentary, governmental and non-governmental initiatives on security and co-operation in the Mediterranean and the IPU's action in this area.

They also embarked on preparations for the IIIrd Inter-Parliamentary Conference on Security and Co-operation in the Mediterranean (IIIrd CSCM). In view of the fact that the forthcoming elections in Tunisia would make preparing for a major conference difficult, they agreed to the Tunisian Parliament's request that Tunis be the venue of a IVth rather than the IIIrd CSCM as decided earlier. The participants also welcomed the French Parliament's offer to host the IIIrd CSCM Conference in France in May 2000. The Inter-Parliamentary Council subsequently accepted the invitation with gratitude (see section B.6).

The participants agreed that the arrangements for the IIIrd CSCM would be based on those of the Ist and IInd CSCMs. Discussions on this subject would resume at the XVth Meeting of representatives of the parties to the CSCM process, to take place in Berlin on 13 October 1999, on the occasion of the statutory Inter-Parliamentary Meetings. The participants had already agreed that during the IIIrd CSCM, a meeting should be organised of women parliamentarians from the Mediterranean, who are members of delegations. They also agreed that emphasis should be placed on certain specific topics pertaining to the three Baskets, including the following: armaments control, protection of the environmental heritage, dialogue on civilisations and religions in the Mediterranean.

In addition, the participants took note of the report, presented by the General Rapporteur, Mr. M.H. Khelil (Tunisia), on the work and results of the Meeting held in Ljubljana

* Parties to the CSCM process:

As main participants, the Parliaments of the following countries: Albania, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Monaco, Morocco, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Yugoslavia.

As associate participants: (i) the Parliaments of the Russian Federation, of the United Kingdom, and of the United States of America; (ii) Palestine; (iii) Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Assembly of the Western European Union, OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, Consultative Council of the Arab Maghreb Union, European Parliament, Arab Inter-Parliamentary Union, Parliamentary Assembly of the Black Sea Economic Co-operation.

(Slovenia) on 12 and 13 March 1999 on the topic: "*Co-operation in armaments control in the Mediterranean with a view to preventing conflicts in the region*". The report on the Meeting (see Annex VIII) and the preparatory document presented by a Spanish expert, Prof. V. Fisas, focusing on the issue of small arms, were presented at the 164th session of the Council (see Annex VIII).

2. COMMITTEE ON THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF PARLIAMENTARIANS

The Committee held its 85th session from 10 to 15 April 1999 in Brussels. The session was chaired by Mr. F. Autain (France), President of the Committee, and attended by Mr. F. Borel (Switzerland), Mr. H. Etong (Cameroon) and Mr. J.P. Letelier (Chile), titular members. Mr. M. Samarasinghe (Sri Lanka) participated in the session in his capacity as substitute member.

The Committee held eight *in camera* meetings during which it studied 50 cases concerning 476 serving or former parliamentarians in 35 countries of all regions of the world. Taking advantage of the presence in Brussels of delegations from several of the countries concerned, the Committee, in keeping with its constant practice, conducted 16 *in camera* hearings. In addition, the Committee asked its members individually to seek information from other delegations attending the 101st Conference regarding several cases before it.

Having before it eight new cases from six countries which were under consideration for the first time, the Committee thoroughly studied the allegations and information submitted to it and declared them admissible. It decided **to submit to the Council a report and recommendations concerning the cases of 404 serving or former members of Parliament** in the following **15 countries**: Argentina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Djibouti, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gambia, Guinea, Honduras, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nigeria, Togo and Turkey (see also Section B.8 and Annexes XIX to XXXVII). On its proposal, the Council decided to close five cases regarding 120 MPs and former MPs.

Moreover, the Committee was informed of follow-up action to its decisions and the Council's resolutions by a number of Member Parliaments.

Mr. F. Borel and Mr. M. Samarasinghe respectively informed the Committee of the outcome of the two missions carried out in Chad (November 1998) and Malaysia (November-December 1998) on the recommendation of the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 163rd session (Moscow, September 1998); the two mission reports were submitted to the Council on 16 April.

3. GROUP OF FACILITATORS FOR CYPRUS

Set up by the IPU Council in September 1998 following the dissolution of the Committee to Monitor the Situation in Cyprus, the Group of Facilitators met for the first time on 12 and 14 April 1999, on the occasion of the 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference. Mrs. Y. Loza (Egypt) acted as Moderator; the other two Facilitators are Mr. H. Gjellerod (Denmark) and Mr. J. Hunt (New Zealand).

The Facilitators had invited Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots for a dialogue on the basis of party representation, all existing parties in Cyprus having been offered the possibility to join in the discussions. The Greek Cypriots actually taking part in the discussions were members of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus. As the overall objective was not negotiation but to create a climate conducive to dialogue between the parties concerned, the Facilitators decided to act with maximum flexibility. The format of discussions they devised made it possible to ensure the presence of both Greek and Turkish Cypriots around the same table for what eventually developed into a very open and constructive dialogue. A second round of discussions involving the same interlocutors and representatives of the three Guarantor Powers - Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom - could not take place as a result of a misunderstanding over the schedule.

The Greek and Turkish Cypriots present in the round of discussions, on 12 April 1999, agreed to focus on the immediate and more distant future rather than the past. They felt that the IPU should carry on with this type of initiative and stated that they would welcome any decision by the IPU to help them pursue the dialogue not only within the context of IPU meetings - such as the next Conference in Berlin - but also in Cyprus itself at Ledra Palace. The Facilitators expressed readiness to make themselves available for such an exercise at dates to be established by common agreement as they felt that the IPU should be able to offer an ideal framework for parliamentary diplomacy and could be instrumental in restoring dialogue where there would otherwise be a stalemate. The Facilitators also noted a suggestion to encourage other types of inter-communal contacts: between such groups as universities, trade unions, professional organisations, sports associations, youth, women, business people, intellectuals, artists. While such type of initiative went beyond what IPU was able to arrange, they felt that the proposal itself should be considered as very positive. Another suggestion was to promote teaching of the language of the other community in both parts of Cyprus, which the Facilitators felt would be a step in the right direction.

4. COMMITTEE ON MIDDLE EAST QUESTIONS

The Committee held its XXIVth session in Brussels on 13 and 14 April 1999. The Committee elected Mr. C.E. Ndebele (Zimbabwe) as President and Mr. A. Philippou (Cyprus) as Rapporteur. Ms. O.A. Starrfelt (Norway) also took part in the work of the Committee. The report of the Committee was presented to the Council by Mr. A. Philippou.

The representatives of the Arab Groups (Egypt, Jordan and Palestine) and those of Israel presented their views before the Committee together, which the Committee welcomed. The Committee considered the views of the parties and proposed concrete measures which the parties could undertake and invited them to inform the Committee of measures taken at its next session. Additionally, the Committee requested wider representation by the Knesset and participation of the Palestinian Legislative Council (see Section B.10 and Annex XII).

5. COMMITTEE TO PROMOTE RESPECT FOR INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW

The Committee to Promote Respect for International Humanitarian Law met on 11 April 1999, on the occasion of the 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference in Brussels, at the European Parliament. The session was held with the participation of all three members of the Committee, who are the Officers of the IInd Committee of the IPU Conference, Mr. T.J. Nonô (Brazil), Mr. J. Hunt (New Zealand) and Mrs. B. Mugo (Kenya), and with the contribution of representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross. The main object of the meeting was to finalise the text of a Guidebook for parliamentarians to ensure respect for the rules of international humanitarian law, which the Committee had undertaken to prepare at its session held in Moscow in September 1998. The Committee also took stock of progress made in its world parliamentary survey covering parliamentary action with regard to three main issues: (i) the eradication of antipersonnel mines, (ii) the application of the rules of international humanitarian law, and (iii) the international criminal court.

6. GENDER PARTNERSHIP GROUP

The Gender Partnership Group - a subsidiary body of the Executive Committee - met on 8 and 9 April 1999 on the occasion of the IPU Conference in Brussels, at the European Parliament. The Group is composed of Mrs. N. Heptulla (India), who acted as Moderator, Mrs. B. Imiolczyk (Poland) (see section F), Mr. F. Solana (Mexico) and Mr. M.M. Traoré (Burkina Faso). At the request of the IPU Council, the Group was to study the possibility of establishing in the IPU a rule which would apply equally to all delegations failing to include at least one woman among their members and that would decrease by two the number of votes to which those delegations were entitled in the IPU Conference. Having studied the evolution of women's

participation in IPU Meetings in the last 25 years and the respective proportion of men and women at the Brussels Conference, the Group felt that, at least for the time being, it would be helpful to propose an incentive rather than a sanction. As a result of its debates, the Group presented to the Executive Committee a draft resolution which was later endorsed by this body and presented for adoption to the IPU Council (see section B.12 and Annex XIII).

F. ELECTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

1. PRESIDENT OF THE 101ST INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The 101st Conference elected Mr. R. Langendries, President of the Belgian House of Representatives, as its President.

2. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Council was required to elect one member to replace, until the expiry of her term of office, Mrs. K. Kilvet (Estonia), who is no longer a member of her Parliament. At its first sitting, the Council elected Mr. I. Fjuk (Estonia) to serve until September 2001.

Further to the amendments to Article 24 of the Statutes adopted by the IPU Conference (Annex VI), the Executive Committee includes *ex officio* the President of the Co-ordinating Committee of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians. The current President of the Co-ordinating Committee, Mrs. F. Kéfi (Tunisia), immediately became, in Brussels, a member of the Executive Committee in which she will serve until her mandate in the Co-ordinating Committee expires in April 2000.

3. STUDY COMMITTEES OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

Ist Committee (on Political Questions, International Security and Disarmament)

At its meeting on 14 April, the Ist Committee re-elected the following officers by acclamation:

President:	Mr. A.R. Zamharir (Indonesia)
Vice-Presidents:	Mr. J. Lefevre (Belgium)
	Mrs. M. Clarke-Kwesie (Ghana)

IVth Committee (on Education, Science, Culture and Environment)

At its meeting on 15 April, the IVth Committee re-elected the following officers by acclamation:

President:	Mr. J. Trobo (Uruguay)
Vice-Presidents:	Mrs. M. Chidzonga (Zimbabwe)
	Mrs. S. Finestone (Canada)

4. COMMITTEE ON THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF PARLIAMENTARIANS

The Council was required to elect one titular member to replace Mr. C. Holding (Australia), who is no longer a member of Parliament. At its second sitting on 16 April, it had before it two candidatures for the post for the Asia-Pacific region, those of Mr. M. Samarasinghe (Sri Lanka), an incumbent substitute member of the Committee, and Mr. A.P. Yapa (Sri Lanka). A vote was held by secret ballot, with the following result:

Total number of ballots:	147
Blank or void ballots:	6
Valid ballots:	141
Votes obtained:	
Mr. M. Samarasinghe	130
Mr. A.P. Yapa	11

The Council thereby elected Mr. M. Samarasinghe (Sri Lanka) as a titular member of the Committee for a five-year term of office.

The Council was also required to elect three substitute members. It elected Mrs. A. Clwyd (United Kingdom) to replace Mrs. L. Fischer (Germany), who is no longer a member of Parliament, and Mrs. L. Aslaoui (Algeria) and Mrs. M.G. Daniele Galdi (Italy), respectively, to replace Mrs. B. Skalli (Morocco) and Mr. G. Terenzi (San Marino), whose terms of office expired in April 1999.

5. COMMITTEE FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

At its second sitting on 16 April, the Council elected by acclamation Mr. F. Ferry Tinggogoy (Indonesia), to replace, until the expiry of his term of office, Mr. F. Suyitno (Indonesia), who is no longer a member of Parliament, and Mr. A. Colman (United Kingdom), Mrs. O. Musurmanova (Uzbekistan) and Mr. C. Quiroga (Bolivia) as substitute members of the Committee for a four-year term.

6. GENDER PARTNERSHIP GROUP

At its first sitting on 8 April, the Executive Committee elected Mrs. B. Imiolczyk (Poland) to replace Mrs. K. Kilvet (Estonia).

**MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNION
AS OF 16 APRIL 1999**

Members (138)

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger*, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, San Marino, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Associate Members

Andean Parliament, Central American Parliament, European Parliament, Latin American Parliament, Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe

* Following the recent coup d'Etat in Niger, the Council decided at its sitting of 16 April to follow developments in that country closely and revert to the question at the 165th session in Berlin with a view to taking a final decision on the possible suspension of the affiliation of the Parliament of this country to the Union.

**RESULTS OF ROLL-CALL VOTES ON REQUESTS FOR INCLUSION
OF A SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM IN THE CONFERENCE AGENDA**

A single roll-call vote was held on 11 April to choose the supplementary item from among the six requests that were submitted by the National Groups. For the sake of clarity, the breakdown of votes on each of these requests is presented in separate tables.

**Vote on the request of the Group of Ethiopia
for the inclusion of a supplementary item entitled**

"THE PEACEFUL RESOLUTION OF THE ONGOING CONFLICT BETWEEN ERITREA AND ETHIOPIA"

Results

Affirmative votes	336	Total of affirmative and negative votes.....	879
Negative votes.....	543	Two-thirds majority	586
Abstentions	658		

Country	Yes	No	Abst.	Country	Yes	No	Abst.	Country	Yes	No	Abst.
Algeria			14	Greece	10		3	Portugal	6		6
Andorra		10		Guatemala		12		Rep. of Korea			16
Angola	12			Guinea	12			Rep. of Moldova	11		
Argentina		15		Hungary		13		Romania	10		4
Armenia			11	Iceland		10		Russian Federation	10	5	5
Australia		13		India	23			Rwanda		12	
Austria		12		Indonesia			22	San Marino			10
Azerbaijan	12			Iran (Islam. Rep. of)			17	Senegal			12
Bangladesh			20	Ireland		11		Singapore			11
Belarus			13	Israel			12	Slovakia		12	
Belgium		11	1	Italy			17	Slovenia	3	8	
Bolivia		10		Japan			20	South Africa			16
Botswana	11			Jordan			11	Spain		13	2
Brazil		20		Kazakhstan		13		Sri Lanka	5		8
Bulgaria			12	Kenya			14	Sudan	14		
Burkina Faso			12	Kuwait			11	Suriname			10
Burundi	12			Kyrgyzstan			11	Sweden		12	
Cambodia			13	Lao Peop. Dem. Republic			11	Switzerland			12
Cameroon		13		Latvia		11		Syrian Arab Rep.			13
Canada		14		Lebanon		11		Tajikistan	10		
Cape-Verde	10			Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	11			Thailand			18
Chile		13		Lithuania	2		9	The FYR of Macedonia	11		
China	23			Luxembourg	10			Togo			11
Colombia	14			Malaysia			13	Tunisia	12		
Congo		11		Mali			12	Turkey		absent	
Costa Rica		absent		Malta			10	United Arab Emirates		10	
Côte d'Ivoire		13		Mauritius		absent		United Kingdom		17	
Croatia		10		Mexico		19		Uruguay		11	
Cuba		13		Monaco		10		Uzbekistan			14
Cyprus	5		5	Mongolia			11	Venezuela		10	
Czech Republic	1	9	3	Morocco	6		8	Viet Nam	12		6
Dem. People's Rep. of Korea			14	Mozambique			13	Yemen	13		
Denmark			12	Namibia		11		Yugoslavia		absent	
Ecuador		10		Nepal			13	Zambia			12
Egypt			18	Netherlands		13		Zimbabwe			13
El Salvador		absent		New Zealand	11						
Estonia			11	Norway		11					
Ethiopia	16			Pakistan			20				
Finland		10		Panama			11				
France			17	Paraguay			11				
Gabon		11		Peru			14				
Georgia	12			Philippines			18				
Germany		19		Poland			15				
Ghana	6		7								

N.B. This list does not include certain delegations present at the Conference which were not entitled to vote by virtue of the provisions of Article 5.2 of the Statutes.

**RESULTS OF ROLL-CALL VOTES ON REQUESTS FOR INCLUSION
OF A SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM IN THE CONFERENCE AGENDA**

A single roll-call vote was held on 11 April to choose the supplementary item from among the six requests that were submitted by the National Groups. For the sake of clarity, the breakdown of votes on each of these requests is presented in separate tables.

**Vote on the request of the Group of the Islamic Republic of Iran
for the inclusion of a supplementary item entitled
"INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONTRIBUTION TO THE PROGRAMMES OF THE YEAR 2001
AS THE UNITED NATIONS YEAR OF DIALOGUE AMONG CIVILISATIONS"**

Results

Affirmative votes	410	Total of affirmative and negative votes.....	943
Negative votes.....	533	Two-thirds majority	629
Abstentions	594		

Country	Yes	No	Abst.	Country	Yes	No	Abst.	Country	Yes	No	Abst.
Algeria			14	Ghana	5		8	Philippines	8		10
Andorra		10		Greece	10		3	Poland		15	
Angola			12	Guatemala		12		Portugal	6		6
Argentina		15		Guinea			12	Rep. of Korea	16		
Armenia			11	Hungary		13		Rep. of Moldova	11		
Australia		13		Iceland		10		Romania	7		7
Austria		12		India	23			Russian Federation	20		
Azerbaijan	8		4	Indonesia			22	Rwanda		12	
Bangladesh	20			Iran (Islam. Rep. of)	17			San Marino			10
Belarus			13	Ireland		11		Senegal			12
Belgium		11	1	Israel			12	Singapore	1		10
Bolivia		10		Italy	7		10	Slovakia			12
Botswana			11	Japan			20	Slovenia		11	
Brazil		20		Jordan			11	South Africa		16	
Bulgaria	10	2		Kazakhstan	8	5		Spain		10	5
Burkina Faso		12		Kenya			14	Sri Lanka	5		8
Burundi	12			Kuwait	11			Sudan	10		4
Cambodia			13	Kyrgyzstan	11			Suriname			10
Cameroon		13		Lao Peop. Dem. Republic	11			Sweden		12	
Canada		14		Latvia		11		Switzerland			12
Cape-Verde			10	Lebanon			11	Syrian Arab Rep.			13
Chile		13		Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	11			Tajikistan	10		
China	23			Lithuania			11	Thailand			18
Colombia	11	3		Luxembourg		10		The FYR of Macedonia			11
Congo		11		Malaysia			13	Togo			11
Costa Rica		absent		Mali	6		6	Tunisia	6		6
Côte d'Ivoire		13		Malta	10			Turkey		absent	
Croatia		10		Mauritius			absent	United Arab Emirates		10	
Cuba		13		Mexico		19		United Kingdom		17	
Cyprus	2		8	Monaco		10		Uruguay		11	
Czech Republic		10	3	Mongolia	11			Uzbekistan			14
Dem. People's Rep. of Korea	14			Morocco	12		2	Venezuela		10	
Denmark			12	Mozambique			13	Viet Nam	8		10
Ecuador		10		Namibia		11		Yemen	13		
Egypt			18	Nepal			13	Yugoslavia		absent	
El Salvador		absent		Netherlands		13		Zambia			12
Estonia			11	New Zealand	11			Zimbabwe			13
Ethiopia			16	Norway		11					
Finland		10		Pakistan	20						
France	5		12	Panama		11					
Gabon			11	Paraguay		11					
Georgia		12		Peru		14					
Germany			19								

N.B. This list does not include certain delegations present at the Conference which were not entitled to vote by virtue of the provisions of Article 5.2 of the Statutes.

**RESULTS OF ROLL-CALL VOTES ON REQUESTS FOR INCLUSION
OF A SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM IN THE CONFERENCE AGENDA**

A single roll-call vote was held on 11 April to choose the supplementary item from among the six requests that were submitted by the National Groups. For the sake of clarity, the breakdown of votes on each of these requests is presented in separate tables.

**Vote on the request of the Group of Iraq
(supported by 11 other Arab countries as well as Palestine)
for the inclusion of a supplementary item entitled
"THE LIFTING OF THE EMBARGO OFF IRAQ ENSURES RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS"**

Results

Affirmative votes	469	Total of affirmative and negative votes.....	1114
Negative votes.....	645	Two-thirds majority	743
Abstentions	423		

Country	Yes	No	Abst.	Country	Yes	No	Abst.	Country	Yes	No	Abst.
Algeria	14			Ghana		10	3	Philippines			18
Andorra		10		Greece	9		4	Poland		15	
Angola	12			Guatemala		12		Portugal		12	
Argentina		15		Guinea			12	Rep. of Korea			16
Armenia	11			Hungary		13		Rep. of Moldova		11	
Australia		13		Iceland		10		Romania	2	10	2
Austria		12		India	23			Russian Federation	20		
Azerbaijan	8		4	Indonesia	22			Rwanda		12	
Bangladesh	20			Iran (Islam. Rep. of)			17	San Marino	10		
Belarus	13			Ireland		11		Senegal			12
Belgium	5	7		Israel		12		Singapore			11
Bolivia		10		Italy		9	8	Slovakia		12	
Botswana			11	Japan			20	Slovenia	3	8	
Brazil		20		Jordan	11			South Africa		16	
Bulgaria		9	3	Kazakhstan		13		Spain	2	13	
Burkina Faso		12		Kenya			14	Sri Lanka			13
Burundi	12			Kuwait		11		Sudan	14		
Cambodia	13			Kyrgyzstan			11	Suriname			10
Cameroon		13		Lao Peop. Dem. Republic	11			Sweden		12	
Canada		14		Latvia		11		Switzerland			12
Cape-Verde			10	Lebanon	11			Syrian Arab Rep.	13		
Chile		13		Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	11			Tajikistan			10
China	23			Lithuania			11	Thailand	10		8
Colombia	3	11		Luxembourg		10		The FYR of Macedonia			11
Congo		11		Malaysia			13	Togo			11
Costa Rica		absent		Mali	6		6	Tunisia	12		
Côte d'Ivoire		13		Malta			10	Turkey		absent	
Croatia		10		Mauritius				United Arab Emirates	10		
Cuba			13	Mexico		absent		United Kingdom			17
Cyprus	6		4	Monaco		19		Uruguay			11
Czech Republic	1	9	3	Mongolia			11	Uzbekistan	14		
Dem. People's Rep. of Korea	14			Morocco	14			Venezuela		10	
Denmark			12	Mozambique			13	Viet Nam	18		
Ecuador		10		Namibia		11		Yemen	13		
Egypt	18			Nepal			13	Yugoslavia		absent	
El Salvador		absent		Netherlands		13		Zambia			12
Estonia			11	New Zealand		11		Zimbabwe			13
Ethiopia			16	Norway		11					
Finland		10		Pakistan	20						
France	17			Panama		11					
Gabon			11	Paraguay		11					
Georgia		12		Peru		14					
Germany		19									

N.B. This list does not include certain delegations present at the Conference which were not entitled to vote by virtue of the provisions of Article 5.2 of the Statutes.

**RESULTS OF ROLL-CALL VOTES ON REQUESTS FOR INCLUSION
OF A SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM IN THE CONFERENCE AGENDA**

A single roll-call vote was held on 11 April to choose the supplementary item from among the six requests that were submitted by the National Groups. For the sake of clarity, the breakdown of votes on each of these requests is presented in separate tables.

Vote on the request of the Group of Kuwait

for the inclusion of a supplementary item entitled

**"THE INCREASING POTENTIAL DANGERS OF THE PRODUCTION, PROLIFERATION AND USE OF
WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION: THE CONTRIBUTION OF PARLIAMENTS TO THE WORLD-WIDE
CAMPAIGN TO BAN THE PRODUCTION, PROLIFERATION, STOCKPILING AND USE OF WEAPONS OF
MASS DESTRUCTION"**

Results

Affirmative votes	520	Total of affirmative and negative votes.....	989
Negative votes.....	469	Two-thirds majority	659
Abstentions	548		

Country	Yes	No	Abst.	Country	Yes	No	Abst.	Country	Yes	No	Abst.
Algeria			14	Greece	7		6	Portugal	10		2
Andorra		10		Guatemala		12		Rep. of Korea	16		
Angola			12	Guinea			12	Rep. of Moldova	11		
Argentina		15		Hungary		13		Romania	7		7
Armenia			11	Iceland		10		Russian Federation	20		
Australia		13		India	23			Rwanda		12	
Austria		12		Indonesia			22	San Marino			10
Azerbaijan	4		8	Iran (Islam. Rep. of)	10		7	Senegal			12
Bangladesh	20			Ireland		11		Singapore			11
Belarus	13			Israel			12	Slovakia			12
Belgium		11	1	Italy	10		7	Slovenia	8		3
Bolivia		10		Japan			20	South Africa		16	
Botswana	11			Jordan	11			Spain	3	10	2
Brazil		20		Kazakhstan	13			Sri Lanka	8		5
Bulgaria	10	2		Kenya			14	Sudan	14		
Burkina Faso		12		Kuwait	11			Suriname			10
Burundi	12			Kyrgyzstan	11			Sweden		12	
Cambodia			13	Lao Peop. Dem. Republic	11			Switzerland			12
Cameroon	13			Latvia		11		Syrian Arab Rep.			13
Canada			14	Lebanon			11	Tajikistan	10		
Cape-Verde			10	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya			11	Thailand			18
Chile		13		Lithuania	6		5	The FYR of Macedonia	6		5
China	23			Luxembourg	10			Togo			11
Colombia	14			Malaysia			13	Tunisia	12		
Congo		11		Mali			12	Turkey		absent	
Costa Rica		absent		Malta			10	United Arab Emirates	10		
Côte d'Ivoire		13		Mauritius		absent		United Kingdom		17	
Croatia			10	Mexico		19		Uruguay		11	
Cuba		13		Monaco		10		Uzbekistan	14		
Cyprus	7		3	Mongolia			11	Venezuela		10	
Czech Republic	3	7	3	Morocco	14			Viet Nam	12		6
Dem. People's Rep. of Korea			14	Mozambique			13	Yemen		13	
Denmark			12	Namibia		11		Yugoslavia		absent	
Ecuador		10		Nepal	7	6		Zambia			12
Egypt	18			Netherlands		13		Zimbabwe	13		
El Salvador		absent		New Zealand	11						
Estonia	1		10	Norway			11				
Ethiopia			16	Pakistan			20				
Finland		10		Panama			11				
France	17			Paraguay		11					
Gabon			11	Peru		14					
Georgia	12			Philippines			18				
Germany		19		Poland		15					
Ghana	13										

N.B. This list does not include certain delegations present at the Conference which were not entitled to vote by virtue of the provisions of Article 5.2 of the Statutes.

**RESULTS OF ROLL-CALL VOTES ON REQUESTS FOR INCLUSION
OF A SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM IN THE CONFERENCE AGENDA**

A single roll-call vote was held on 11 April to choose the supplementary item from among the six requests that were submitted by the National Groups. For the sake of clarity, the breakdown of votes on each of these requests is presented in separate tables.

**Vote on the request of the Group of Norway
for the inclusion of a supplementary item entitled
"HUMANITARIAN ACTION - CHALLENGES FACING THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY
ON THE 50th ANNIVERSARY OF THE GENEVA CONVENTIONS"**

Results

Affirmative votes	881	Total of affirmative and negative votes.....	1199
Negative votes.....	318	Two-thirds majority	799
Abstentions	338		

Country	Yes	No	Abst.	Country	Yes	No	Abst.	Country	Yes	No	Abst.
Algeria			14	Ghana	3		10	Philippines	15		3
Andorra	10			Greece	6		7	Poland	15		
Angola	12			Guatemala		12		Portugal	12		
Argentina		15		Guinea			12	Rep. of Korea	16		
Armenia	11			Hungary	13			Rep. of Moldova	11		
Australia	13			Iceland	10			Romania	14		
Austria	12			India	23			Russian Federation	20		
Azerbaijan	12			Indonesia			22	Rwanda		12	
Bangladesh	10		10	Iran (Islam. Rep. of)			17	San Marino	10		
Belarus	13			Ireland	11			Senegal			12
Belgium	12			Israel	12			Singapore	1		10
Bolivia		10		Italy	15		2	Slovakia	12		
Botswana	11			Japan	20			Slovenia	11		
Brazil			20	Jordan			11	South Africa		16	
Bulgaria	12			Kazakhstan		10	3	Spain	15		
Burkina Faso		12		Kenya	4		10	Sri Lanka	13		
Burundi	12			Kuwait	11			Sudan		14	
Cambodia	13			Kyrgyzstan	11			Suriname	10		
Cameroon			13	Lao Peop. Dem. Republic	11			Sweden	12		
Canada	14			Latvia	11			Switzerland	12		
Cape-Verde			10	Lebanon			11	Syrian Arab Rep.			13
Chile		13		Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	11			Tajikistan	10		
China	23			Lithuania	11			Thailand	10		8
Colombia	14			Luxembourg	10			The FYR of Macedonia	11		
Congo		11		Malaysia			13	Togo	7		4
Costa Rica		absent		Mali			12	Tunisia	6		6
Côte d'Ivoire		13		Malta	10			Turkey		absent	
Croatia	10			Mauritius			absent	United Arab Emirates		10	
Cuba		13		Mexico		19		United Kingdom	17		
Cyprus	10			Monaco	10			Uruguay		11	
Czech Republic	13			Mongolia	11			Uzbekistan			14
Dem. People's Rep. of Korea	14			Morocco	7		7	Venezuela		10	
Denmark	12			Mozambique			13	Viet Nam	10		8
Ecuador		10		Namibia			11	Yemen	13		
Egypt		18		Nepal			13	Yugoslavia		absent	
El Salvador		absent		Netherlands	13			Zambia			12
Estonia	11			New Zealand	11			Zimbabwe			13
Ethiopia			16	Norway	11						
Finland	10			Pakistan			20				
France	17			Panama			11				
Gabon		11		Paraguay			11				
Georgia	12			Peru			14				
Germany	19										

N.B. This list does not include certain delegations present at the Conference which were not entitled to vote by virtue of the provisions of Article 5.2 of the Statutes.

**RESULTS OF ROLL-CALL VOTES ON REQUESTS FOR INCLUSION
OF A SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM IN THE CONFERENCE AGENDA**

A single roll-call vote was held on 11 April to choose the supplementary item from among the six requests that were submitted by the National Groups. For the sake of clarity, the breakdown of votes on each of these requests is presented in separate tables.

**Vote on the request of the Group of South Africa
for the inclusion of a supplementary item entitled
"WRITING OFF THE GOVERNMENT DEBT OF HEAVILY-INDEBTED POOR COUNTRIES (HIPC)"**

Results

Affirmative votes	969	Total of affirmative and negative votes.....	1170
Negative votes.....	201	Two-thirds majority	780
Abstentions	367		

Country	Yes	No	Abst.	Country	Yes	No	Abst.	Country	Yes	No	Abst.
Algeria	14			Greece	13			Portugal			12
Andorra		10		Guatemala	12			Rep. of Korea			16
Angola	12			Guinea	12			Rep. of Moldova			11
Argentina	15			Hungary	3	10		Romania	7		7
Armenia			11	Iceland			10	Russian Federation	10		10
Australia	2	11		India	23			Rwanda	12		
Austria		8	4	Indonesia	22			San Marino			10
Azerbaijan	4		8	Iran (Islam. Rep. of)			17	Senegal	12		
Bangladesh	10		10	Ireland		11		Singapore	11		
Belarus			13	Israel			12	Slovakia		12	
Belgium		6	6	Italy	10		7	Slovenia			11
Bolivia	10			Japan			20	South Africa	16		
Botswana	11			Jordan	11			Spain	3	10	2
Brazil	20			Kazakhstan	13			Sri Lanka	8		5
Bulgaria	4	8		Kenya	14			Sudan	14		
Burkina Faso	12			Kuwait	11			Suriname	10		
Burundi	12			Kyrgyzstan	11			Sweden			12
Cambodia	13			Lao Peop. Dem. Republic	11			Switzerland			12
Cameroon	13			Latvia		11		Syrian Arab Rep.	13		
Canada	2	12		Lebanon	11			Tajikistan	10		
Cape-Verde	10			Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	6		5	Thailand	18		
Chile	13			Lithuania	4		7	The FYR of Macedonia			11
China	23			Luxembourg	10			Togo	11		
Colombia	14			Malaysia	13			Tunisia	12		
Congo	11			Mali	12			Turkey		absent	
Costa Rica		absent		Malta			10	United Arab Emirates	10		
Côte d'Ivoire	13			Mauritius		absent		United Kingdom		17	
Croatia		10		Mexico	19			Uruguay	11		
Cuba	13			Monaco		10		Uzbekistan			14
Cyprus	5		5	Mongolia	11			Venezuela	10		
Czech Republic	3	8	2	Morocco	14			Viet Nam	15		3
Dem. People's Rep. of Korea	14			Mozambique	13			Yemen	13		
Denmark			12	Namibia	11			Yugoslavia		absent	
Ecuador	10			Nepal			13	Zambia	12		
Egypt	12		6	Netherlands		13		Zimbabwe	13		
El Salvador		absent		New Zealand	11						
Estonia			11	Norway			11				
Ethiopia	16			Pakistan	20						
Finland			10	Panama	11						
France	17			Paraguay	11						
Gabon	11			Peru	14						
Georgia			12	Philippines	9		9				
Germany		19		Poland		15					
Ghana	13										

N.B. This list does not include certain delegations present at the Conference which were not entitled to vote by virtue of the provisions of Article 5.2 of the Statutes.

**RESULT OF THE ROLL-CALL VOTE ON A REQUEST FOR INCLUSION OF
AN EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM IN THE CONFERENCE AGENDA**

Vote on the request of the Group of the Russian Federation

for the inclusion of an emergency supplementary item entitled

**"THE SITUATION IN THE BALKANS AND PARLIAMENTARIANS' ROLE IN PUTTING AN END TO THE
ESCALATION OF THE NATO AGGRESSION AGAINST YUGOSLAVIA AND IN NORMALISING THE
SITUATION IN THE REGION"**

Results

Affirmative votes	438	Total of affirmative and negative votes.....	1063
Negative votes.....	625	Four-fifths majority	850
Abstentions	315		

Country	Yes	No	Abst.	Country	Yes	No	Abst.	Country	Yes	No	Abst.
Algeria			14	Ghana		13		Philippines	9	9	
Andorra		10		Greece		absent		Poland		15	
Angola	12			Guatemala	12			Portugal		11	1
Argentina	10			Guinea			12	Rep. of Korea			16
Armenia	11			Hungary		13		Rep. of Moldova	5	6	
Australia		13		Iceland		10		Romania	4	10	
Austria		12		India	23			Russian Federation	20		
Azerbaijan	4		8	Indonesia			22	Rwanda	12		
Bangladesh		20		Iran (Islam. Rep. of)	5	2	10	San Marino			10
Belarus	13			Ireland		11		Senegal		12	
Belgium		12		Israel		12		Singapore		11	
Bolivia	12			Italy		17		Slovakia	4	8	
Botswana		absent		Japan	2		18	Slovenia		11	
Brazil	20			Jordan			11	South Africa			16
Bulgaria	2	10		Kazakhstan	11	2		Spain	2	13	
Burkina Faso			12	Kenya			14	Sri Lanka		13	
Burundi	6		6	Kuwait		absent		Sudan			14
Cambodia			13	Kyrgyzstan	7		4	Suriname			10
Cameroon		13		Lao Peop. Dem. Republic	11			Sweden		12	
Canada		14		Latvia			11	Switzerland		12	
Cape-Verde			10	Lebanon		absent		Syrian Arab Rep.		absent	
Chile	13			Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	11			Tajikistan		absent	
China	23			Lithuania			11	Thailand	15		3
Colombia	12	2		Luxembourg			10	The FYR of Macedonia		11	
Congo		11		Malaysia			13	Togo		absent	
Costa Rica		absent		Mali			12	Tunisia		12	
Côte d'Ivoire			13	Malta			absent	Turkey		absent	
Croatia		11		Mauritius			absent	United Arab Emirates		10	
Cuba	13			Mexico	15	4		United Kingdom			17
Cyprus	6		4	Monaco		10		Uruguay	11		
Czech Republic	1	11	1	Mongolia			absent	Uzbekistan	14		
Dem. People's Rep. of Korea	14			Morocco		10	4	Venezuela		absent	
Denmark		12		Mozambique	13			Viet Nam	18		
Ecuador		absent		Namibia			11	Yemen	6	7	
Egypt			18	Nepal			absent	Yugoslavia		absent	
El Salvador		absent		Netherlands			13	Zambia			12
Estonia		11		New Zealand			11	Zimbabwe		absent	
Ethiopia			16	Norway			11				
Finland		absent		Pakistan			20				
France		17		Panama							
Gabon		11		Paraguay	11						
Georgia		12		Peru	14						
Germany		19									

N.B. This list does not include certain delegations present at the Conference which were not entitled to vote by virtue of the provisions of Article 5.2 of the Statutes.

**PARLIAMENTARY ACTION TO ENCOURAGE ALL COUNTRIES TO SIGN AND RATIFY
THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY PROHIBITING ALL NUCLEAR TESTING,
TO ENCOURAGE UNIVERSAL AND NON-DISCRIMINATORY NUCLEAR
NON-PROLIFERATION MEASURES AND TO WORK TOWARDS THE
EVENTUAL ELIMINATION OF ALL NUCLEAR WEAPONS**

Resolution adopted without a vote by the 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference
(Brussels, 15 April 1999)*

The 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Determined to contribute to the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects and to the process of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control, with a view to strengthening international peace and security, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations,

Recognising the key role of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in achieving the above objectives, and *appreciating* the extension of the Treaty in 1995 for an indefinite period of time,

Underscoring the gravity of nuclear tests and their harmful effects on the natural environment,

Stressing the importance of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) adopted by the United Nations and opened for signature on 24 September 1996,

Emphasising the need to reach agreement on banning the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices,

Recalling the most recent resolutions of the Inter-Parliamentary Union on disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, in particular those adopted by the 94th (Bucharest, 1995), 91st (Paris, 1994) and 89th (New Delhi, 1993) Inter-Parliamentary Conferences,

Convinced of the imperative need to eliminate all weapons of mass destruction,

Guided by a sense of responsibility towards the fate of humanity,

* The delegation of India opposed the resolution.

A. Nuclear Non-Proliferation

1. *Urges* all States which have not yet done so to sign and become parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT);
2. *Appeals* to the States parties to the NPT to implement fully the decision of the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference on Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament;
3. *Urges* universal application of the comprehensive nuclear safeguards administered by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and adherence to the 1997 Additional Protocol strengthening the existing safeguards;
4. *Calls* for the strengthening of controls in order to prevent transfers of nuclear weapon-usable material and equipment, while promoting international co-operation for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy by the States parties to the NPT;

B. Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty

5. *Calls* for the cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests and for the signature and ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) by all States;
6. *Calls on* governments of the ratifying States to request the UN Secretary-General to convene a conference, prior to the 2000 NPT Review Conference, in accordance with Article XIV(2) of the CTBT, in order "... to facilitate the early entry into force of the Treaty";
7. *Considers* that it is important to reach an agreement on the closure and abolition of all nuclear test sites;

C. "Cut-Off" Treaty

8. *Calls* for the commencement and early conclusion of negotiations on a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices ("cut-off" treaty), on the basis of the report of the Special Co-ordinator of the Conference on Disarmament and the mandate contained therein;

D. Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones

9. *Welcomes* the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in different regions of the world as an important step in achieving the objective of a nuclear-weapon-free world;
10. *Supports* the existing nuclear-weapon-free zones in Latin America, the South Pacific, Africa and South-East Asia;
11. *Calls* for the completion of the negotiations for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia;

12. *Also calls* for the elimination of nuclear weapons and for negotiations with a view to establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East;
13. *Further calls* for negotiations with a view to establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central and Eastern Europe;
14. *Lastly calls* for negotiations with a view to establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world where no such zones exist;
15. *Calls on* all countries possessing nuclear weapons to respect the status of nuclear-weapon-free zones;

E. Non-Proliferation of Missiles

16. *Calls* for the strengthening of the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) through an international non-discriminatory and transparent framework in order to reduce the danger of proliferation of missiles capable of carrying weapons of mass destruction;

F. Nuclear Disarmament

17. *Urges* the acceleration of the nuclear disarmament process, as required by Article VI of the NPT, the decisions of the NPT Review and Extension Conference, and the 1996 Opinion of the International Court of Justice;
18. *Acknowledges* the efforts made by the Russian Federation and the United States of America, within the framework of the START I and START II Treaties, to achieve drastic reductions of their nuclear arsenals; *appeals* to the Russian side to ratify the START II Treaty, and *also appeals* to both sides to begin negotiations shortly on a START III treaty;
19. *Calls* for negotiations on the reduction and eventual elimination of tactical nuclear weapons;
20. *Welcomes* the ongoing dismantlement of nuclear weapons, and *notes* the importance of the safe and effective management of the extracted fissile materials;
21. *Supports* the efforts to set up a forum within the Conference on Disarmament to identify and consider nuclear disarmament measures for multilateral negotiation;
22. *Calls* for the renunciation of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

**THE PROBLEM OF METROPOLITAN AREAS: A GLOBAL CHALLENGE
TO WHICH PARLIAMENTARIANS MUST RESPOND IN TERMS
OF URBAN CIVILISATION AND DEMOCRACY**

*Resolution adopted without a vote by the 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference
(Brussels, 15 April 1999)*

The 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Aware that due to the mushrooming of cities and the steady pace of population growth, half of the world's population will be living in urban areas by the start of the third millennium,

Mindful that cities are a driving force behind the overall economic and social progress of nations and that as society has evolved, urbanisation has made it possible to improve the quality of life of a large proportion of the population by facilitating access to education, social services and health care for all citizens, especially children, as well as participation in cultural, political and religious life,

Convinced that the potential for progress of metropolitan areas can be exploited fully only if lasting solutions are found to the serious problems caused by the concentration of population and activities specific to large cities, the most significant of which are:

- the shortage of housing and the inadequate nature of some existing housing;
- environmental pollution in and around urban areas;
- the lack or shortage of water resources or water-treatment facilities;
- the deterioration of the building stock and the architectural heritage;
- the inadequacy of infrastructures;
- the high unemployment rate;
- the insufficiency of basic social services, particularly child care and care for the elderly, and of access to education and health care for all citizens, especially children;
- traffic congestion;
- problems linked to the ageing population;
- food insecurity;
- inadequate financial resources for local authorities to meet their obligations;
- the rising crime rate;
- prostitution, the sexual exploitation of children and drug abuse;
- heightened vulnerability to natural and man-made disasters;

Disturbed by:

- the insufficient participation of women in political decision-making, particularly in local government, which means that decisions are taken without reference to women's needs,
- the fact that employed women are still frequently relegated to inferior jobs and are not paid equitably, that many women face harassment in the workplace, and that economic restructuring has had a profound impact on women's employment in many countries,
- the knowledge that women still carry most of the burden of housekeeping and family care, whereas social programmes are not adapted to the dual role of women as wage earners and home-makers,
- the barriers faced by unemployed women, including lack of education and training, discrimination in hiring practices, and lack of access to credit to start up their own businesses,

Deeply concerned that all these problems primarily affect the poor and vulnerable social groups (the elderly, women, children, people with disabilities) while posing an ongoing threat to the lives of all inhabitants of large cities, regardless of their social category,

Aware that the developing countries, where most large cities on the planet are located, are the first to suffer from the negative effects of urbanisation, the cause of which is rural exodus rather than population growth rates, but *mindful* that the developed countries also face major, albeit different, problems linked to megacities,

Concerned that the faster pace of the "urbanisation" of poverty and the ever growing gap between rich and poor in large cities jeopardise solidarity, accentuate the danger that part of the urban population will become alienated and marginalised, resulting in social segregation,

Preoccupied by the increase, in recent years, of conflicts and wars which have led and are leading to the destruction of the housing and settlements of millions of people throughout the world,

Recalling the support which the Inter-Parliamentary Union has given to the follow up of the decisions of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (Rio de Janeiro, June 1992), the International Conference on Population and Development (Cairo, September 1994), the World Summit for Social Development (Copenhagen, March 1995), the Fourth World Conference on Women (Beijing, September 1995), and the World Food Summit (Rome, November 1996),

Recalling especially the contribution of the Inter-Parliamentary Union to the preparation of the Second United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Istanbul, June 1996), which addressed the problems of human settlements in general and large cities in particular, and the Union's action to promote the implementation, at national and international level, of the commitments and decisions adopted at that Conference,

Recalling also that the resolution entitled "Parliamentary Support to the Second United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II)", adopted by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 158th session (Istanbul, 20 April 1996), especially operative paragraph 4, points out that many human settlement problems will require legislative action and that the participation of national parliaments and their members in the implementation of the Habitat II commitments will therefore be vitally important;

Expressing appreciation for the activities of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements carried out in co-operation with its partners in the UN system, with a view to promoting urban areas which are more productive, more equitable and more sustainable, in the spirit of the Habitat Agenda,

1. *Urges* national parliaments to:

- (a) promote full awareness of the positive role that cities play in the world as a source of social, economic, cultural and political development and, hence, of their importance to the sustainable overall development of human society;
- (b) contribute, through appropriate legislative measures, to strengthening the institutional and financial capacity of governments to put into practice the commitments of the Second United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) and to monitor the way in which these commitments are applied at the national level;
- (c) when dealing with food insecurity, support the FAO Special Programme for Food Security which, *inter alia*, focuses on urban and peri-urban food production problems and addresses the bottlenecks associated with food supply and distribution systems;
- (d) adopt, improve and supplement national legislation to create conditions conducive to sustainable urban development, by undertaking in particular to:
 - meet the need, in both the industrial and developing countries, to strengthen local self-administration, the systematic application of the principle of subsidiarity and the decentralisation of responsibility together with the corresponding financial and personnel resources of local authorities, and to promote greater participation by the people;
 - encourage the national private sector to invest and become involved in solving the problems of large cities, and to participate in a priority basis in urgent activities, such as the construction and improvement of housing and infrastructure, the management of household and industrial waste, the provision of adequate good-quality water, job creation, the delivery of basic services, etc.;
 - create a favourable and stable climate for foreign investment, especially in the developing countries, based on a balanced complementarity between the rural world and cities;
 - reinforce legislative measures to prevent and curb crime, prostitution, sexual exploitation of children and drug abuse, all of which are problems associated with urban areas;
 - ensure a healthy environment in and around large cities by preventing activities harmful to the environment, supporting public bodies and associations involved in the protection of the environment, and increasing financial and technical resources for the preservation of the environment;
 - promote measures for the conservation and restoration of the architectural heritage of cities, so as to preserve their identity and safeguard the spiritual and cultural particularities of each people;
 - revitalise urban social services, especially health care and education;

- (e) allocate to all levels of government, including local authorities, the budgetary resources needed for sustainable urban development;
 - (f) adopt the necessary legislative measures and allocate the necessary budgetary resources for the economic, social and cultural progress of rural areas, thereby helping to narrow the gap between cities and villages, balance rural-urban migration and thus prevent the overpopulation of large cities;
 - (g) take into consideration, in the legislative process, women's role in and contribution to the life of large cities, and the need to promote real partnership between men and women in the framing and implementation of urban development policies, by seeing to it that the principle of equal opportunity is applied; and recognise the particular needs of urban women by:
 - taking steps to increase the number of women involved in political decision-making and particularly in local government, whether as observers or as elected officials;
 - enacting specific legislation to encourage equality, end discrimination against women and in particular ensure equal pay for equal work;
 - changing laws and business practices that discriminate against women, including laws on inheritance, land tenure and housing allocation;
 - ensuring that credit is available to women, whether through dedicated funds or through the private sector;
 - addressing the safety and security of urban women, both in the design of cities and in the provision of safe havens for women who are victims of violence;
 - (h) create or improve the legal framework for the protection of all underprivileged and vulnerable social groups living in large cities, *inter alia* by:
 - preventing them from falling foul of discrimination or marginalisation;
 - facilitating their access to decent housing, employment, education, health care, basic social services, infrastructures, etc.;
 - encouraging them to participate actively in the framing of urban development policies;
 - (i) contribute to the creation of an environment conducive to the development of co-operation between States, their urban players and the competent regional and world bodies, with a view to achieving the goals of the Habitat Agenda as soon as possible;
 - (j) encourage the strengthening of technical and financial assistance to benefit large cities in developing countries;
2. *Calls on parliamentarians to:*
- (a) see to the systematic application of the principles of good governance, in order to ensure the transparency, accountability, effectiveness and participatory nature of the management and administration of large cities, as prerequisites for their sustainable development;

- (b) facilitate contacts and dialogue between citizens, local authorities and competent national bodies, with a view to solving the difficulties faced by urban communities;
 - (c) promote partnerships involving all committed and concerned players - private sector, local authorities, civil society, including NGOs, government, and also regional and international organisations - in the framing and implementation of sustainable development strategies of large cities;
 - (d) encourage exchanges of information, experience and know-how between local authorities at national and international level;
 - (e) promote the introduction of national and local systems for the collection, processing and utilisation of data pertaining to urban conditions and trends, as a basis for coherent strategies and programmes for the sustainable development of large cities;
 - (f) commit themselves to sustainable development in urban areas by encouraging sustainable patterns of production, consumption, transportation and settlement; pollution prevention; respect for the carrying capacity of ecosystems; and the preservation of opportunities for future generations;
3. *Urges* the industrialised nations to endeavour to allocate 0.7% of their GNP to development aid, as recommended by the United Nations and endorsed in the Brasilia Plan of Action adopted by the Inter-Parliamentary Union; and *invites* international financial institutions, the private sector and bilateral and multilateral aid organisations to contribute additional resources to consolidate national efforts to solve the problems of big cities;
 4. *Urges* national parliaments and parliamentarians to use all the mechanisms of parliamentary diplomacy to promote peace and stability, to eliminate hotbeds of conflict and to put a speedy end to current conflicts, thereby reducing the risk of loss of human life, the obliteration of historical and cultural values, and the deterioration of the environment and the architectural heritage in urban centres;
 5. *Recommends* that the Inter-Parliamentary Union and national parliaments support the activities of the UN Centre for Human Settlements and contribute more to the activities and programmes of the United Nations and its bodies operating in the field of sustainable development.

**WRITING OFF THE GOVERNMENT DEBT OF HEAVILY INDEBTED
POOR COUNTRIES (HIPC)**

*Resolution adopted without a vote by the 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference
(Brussels, 15 April 1999)*

The 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Acknowledging and appreciating the HIPC initiative launched by major donor countries, through the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, to provide debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries,

Concerned at the slow and limited implementation of the initiative,

Deeply concerned that several poor countries cannot service their foreign debts,

Deeply concerned also that the burden of debt inhibits and in some cases totally prevents economic growth and the delivery of vital socio-economic services in these countries,

Aware that the stranglehold of poverty is a source of instability and conflict within countries and regions, making world peace difficult to attain,

Distressed at the abject poverty and deprivation of many communities and the impact this has on the lives of their members, in particular the most vulnerable (women, children and the elderly),

Aware that in many cases the debt burden of poor countries has been inherited from historical conditions of colonialism and foreign domination, and *further aware* of the problem of corruption existing in some debtor and creditor countries,

Recognising the urgency of the issue, as evidenced by the high-level attention currently being devoted to the problem of HIPC by donor governments, parliaments, multilateral institutions and citizens groups world-wide,

Welcoming the efforts of debtor countries, despite the short-term social impact often involved, to pursue economic reform, stabilisation and structural adjustment programmes,

Recalling the relevant provisions of past IPU resolutions, notably the resolution on the "Need for a radical solution to the problem of debt in the developing world", adopted in Stockholm in September 1992, and the resolution on "Foreign debt as a factor limiting the integration of the Third World countries into the process of globalisation", adopted in Windhoek in April 1998,

1. *Urges* the creditor countries to commit themselves in principle to writing off the public debt of HIPC in the shortest possible time;

2. *Calls on* both creditor and debtor nations to convene a meeting of heads of government for the purpose of accelerating debt forgiveness;
3. *Recommends* that the eligibility criteria for debt relief under the HIPC initiative be broadened to include other poor or vulnerable countries facing unsustainable debt burdens;
4. *Urges* debtor countries to perform in accordance with good governance, introducing transparent and accountable mechanisms of control in order to ensure that the benefits of debt relief result in the socio-economic development of their peoples;
5. *Recommends* that debt relief should be achieved without jeopardising the economies of other nations or the stability of the world's financial markets;
6. *Requests* the IPU Secretary General to transmit this resolution to the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund and to explore with them possibilities for future co-operation;
7. *Urges* the IPU Committee for Sustainable Development to monitor the follow-up of the present resolution and to report yearly to the Inter-Parliamentary Council.

AMENDMENTS TO THE STATUTES OF THE UNION

*Adopted by the 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference
(Brussels, 11 April 1999)*

(a) Article 24 of the Statutes
(New wording underlined)

1. The Executive Committee shall be composed of the President of the Inter-Parliamentary Council and twelve members belonging to different National Groups and the President of the Co-ordinating Committee of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians.
2. The President of the Council shall be ex-officio President of the Executive Committee. Twelve members shall be elected by the Inter-Parliamentary Council; not less than ten shall be elected from among the members of the Inter-Parliamentary Council to which they shall continue to belong during their mandate. At least two of the members elected must be women.
3. In elections to the Executive Committee, consideration shall be given to the contribution made to the work of the Union by the candidate and the National Group concerned, and an endeavour will be made to ensure an equitable geographical distribution.
4. The term of office of members of the Executive Committee other than the President shall be four years. At least two members shall retire in rotation each year. A retiring member shall not be eligible for re-election for two years and shall be replaced by a member belonging to another National Group. The President of the Co-ordinating Committee of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians shall serve a two-year term which can be renewed once.
5. If a member of the Executive Committee dies, resigns or ceases to be a parliamentarian, the Group concerned shall appoint a substitute to serve until the next session of the Council, when an election shall be held. This member shall complete the term of office of the predecessor. If the President of the Co-ordinating Committee of the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians dies, resigns or ceases to be a parliamentarian, the First Vice-President or Second Vice-President, as the case may be, will complete the term of office of the predecessor.
6. If the President of the Co-ordinating Committee is already a member of the Executive Committee or belongs to the same National Group as one of the twelve members, she shall be replaced by the First Vice-President of the Co-ordinating Committee, or the Second Vice-President should the First Vice President be a member of the Executive Committee or belong to the same National Group as one of the twelve members.

7. If a member of the Executive Committee is elected President of the Inter-Parliamentary Council, the Council shall elect a member to fill the vacant seat. In such a case, the question shall be included automatically in the agenda of the Council. The term of office of the new person shall be four years.
8. Members of the Executive Committee shall not simultaneously hold office as President or Vice-President of a Study Committee.

*
* *

(b) Article 22 of the Statutes
(New wording underlined)

22. The Inter-Parliamentary Council shall have, in particular, the following functions:(...)
 - (h) To determine the categories of observers at IPU meetings and their rights and responsibilities and to decide which international organisations and other bodies shall have observer status at the Union's meetings on a regular basis (cf. Conference Rule 2; Council, Rule 4; Committees, Rules 3 and 5.2), in addition to inviting on an occasional basis observers that may contribute to the study of a particular item on the Conference agenda.

CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE UNION AND THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM
Overview of co-operation

*Report submitted by the Secretary General to the Inter-Parliamentary Council
at its 164th session (Brussels, 16 April 1999)*

1. The present report is designed to give the members of the Inter-Parliamentary Council a summary overview of the level and extent of co-operation that exists today between the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the United Nations system. In describing briefly the current situation, an effort has been made to follow the official classification of the UN system.

Programmes of the United Nations

With the establishment of the IPU Liaison Office in New York and the appointment of a Director for that Office who comes from the UN system, the IPU is now in constant interaction with the UN Headquarters in New York. Frequent contact is maintained with the *Executive Office of the UN Secretary-General* on a wide variety of issues, and his appointee, Assistant-Secretary-General Gillian Sorensen, is participating in the Preparatory Committee for the proposed Conference of Presiding Officers at UN Headquarters in the year 2000.

3. Similarly close co-operation is maintained with the main UN departments in New York. With the *Department of Political Affairs*, consultations take place frequently in relation to the evolving political situation in several countries in all regions of the world.

4. There are also consultations with the *Department for Disarmament Affairs*, particularly to prepare for the CSCM IIIrd Preparatory Meeting in Ljubljana on arms control and the disarmament debate that will take place at the 101st IPU Conference.

5. The IPU is further in contact with the *Department of Peace-Keeping Operations* as well as with the *Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs*. This latter unit has recently expressed a desire to strengthen co-operation with the IPU and to consider undertaking joint activities.

6. Co-operation with the *Department of Economic and Social Affairs* has been particularly intense. Recently, this has involved working closely with a number of its divisions:

- (a) The Division for Social Policy and Development, which has assisted in preparing the IPU survey of parliamentary action to follow up the 1995 World Summit on Social Development, participated in the meeting of IPU's Committee for Sustainable Development and helped organise the Tri-Partite Meeting at UN Headquarters. The Division is now expressing an interest in the IPU organising a parliamentary meeting in Geneva on the occasion of the UNGA Special Session which will take place in Geneva in June 2000.

- (b) The IPU also works closely with the Division for Sustainable Development in preparing for the work of the IPU Committee of the same name.
- (c) Moreover, the IPU interacts with the Division for the Advancement of Women. The co-operation relates to IPU's surveys on parliamentary action to follow up the 1995 Fourth World Conference on Women, as well as on women's contribution to democratic processes, to the IPU/UNESCO meeting that will take place in Paris later this year in association with that Division, and to the forthcoming UNGA Special Session to evaluate progress since the Beijing Conference. The Special Session will take place in New York in June 2000, and discussions have started on the possibility that the IPU could organise a meeting on this occasion.
- (d) Finally, and still within the same Department, the IPU works closely with the Statistics Division to which the IPU provides data on women in politics and parliament.

7. A closer relationship with the United Nations is also emerging in Geneva. Frequent consultations take place with the Director-General of the *UN Geneva Office*, who has expressed a strong interest in the IPU organising meetings for MPs in Geneva, in conjunction with the United Nations. Less frequent contacts are also maintained with the *UN Office in Vienna*, particularly on matters relating to drug control and crime prevention.

8. There is frequent interaction with the *Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights* in relation to IPU's usual work in defense of human rights. It is expected that this co-operation will expand significantly in the coming months and years as a result of the Memorandum of Understanding that the two Organisations propose to conclude. Already, the High Commissioner's Office has expressed an interest in preparing legislative handbooks on human rights issues, organising meetings with Members of Parliament on specific issues and adding a parliamentary dimension to the World Conference on Racism scheduled for the year 2001.

9. The *United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)* recently expressed keen interest in developing its co-operation with the IPU. Specific suggestions include facilitating data exchange with Parliaments on trade and development issues and that the IPU organise a Parliamentarians' Day during UNCTAD X, to be held in Bangkok in February 2000.

10. Co-operation with the *United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)* is of course already very extensive. The recently concluded joint parliamentary development programme has resulted in ever more frequent interaction on technical co-operation projects, regional seminars, strengthening of regional inter-parliamentary organisations and development of manuals and tools for use in Parliament. Close contact and co-operation is also maintained with the *UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM)* and the *Human Development Report*, both of which are part of UNDP.

11. The IPU is also working closely with the *Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS, (UNAIDS)*, and the two Organisations are currently working together on preparing a handbook for Members of Parliament to assist them in implementing international HIV/AIDS guidelines.

12. Recently, the *United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)* has expressed an interest in starting to work with the IPU. It is possible that it can be brought into some of the Union's technical co-operation projects.

13. Co-operation has also been initiated with the *United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD)*. It assisted the IPU in analysing the responses to the IPU

questionnaire on parliamentary action in the field of social development. UNRISD has also expressed interest in undertaking joint research with the IPU.

14. Finally, the IPU participates in and contributes via written and oral statements to the work of a number of United Nations Councils, Commissions and Committees. These include in alphabetical order the *Commission on Social Development*, *Commission on Human Rights*, *Commission on Sustainable Development*, *Commission on the Status of Women*, *Committee Against Torture*, *Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People*, *Disarmament Commission*, *Economic and Social Council*, *Human Rights Committee* and the *International Law Commission*.

Specialised Agencies of the UN System

15. The Council of the *International Labour Organization (ILO)* recently approved the text of a proposed agreement of co-operation with the IPU that is currently before the Union's governing bodies. It can be expected to lead to an increase in co-operation and the need to organise parliamentary meetings on issues relating to employment and social justice.

16. The IPU already has an agreement of co-operation with the *Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)*. This has developed into a close working relationship, initially focused on organising late last year a Specialised Conference in Rome on food security and now seeking to ensure its follow-up.

17. The situation with regard to the *United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO)* is similar insofar as an agreement of co-operation was concluded in 1997. The main collaborative efforts between the two Organisations today focus on organising a joint conference in Paris in December 1999 on democracy and gender.

18. The new Director-General of the *World Health Organisation (WHO)* recently wrote to the IPU expressing her wish to establish a much closer working relationship with the IPU. As an initial step, she would welcome it if an IPU Conference could debate WHO's tobacco-free initiative and give advice on a Framework Convention for Tobacco Control which Governments have asked WHO to prepare.

19. The *World Bank* has also expressed an interest in upgrading its relationship with the IPU. In initial discussions, it has indicated an interest in involving Members of Parliament in a dialogue on some of the issues with which it deals.

Autonomous Organisations

20. The IPU has worked with the *World Tourism Organisation (WTO)* in the past. Recently, the WTO invited the IPU to sponsor a Third International Forum on "Parliaments and Local Authorities: Tourism Policy-Makers", to be held in Brazil in November 1999.

Convention Secretariats

21. The IPU has developed close co-operation ties with the Secretariat for the *United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)*. Currently, the two Secretariats are working to prepare for a possible second Round Table of MPs coming together on the occasion of

**CO-OPERATION IN ARMAMENTS CONTROL IN THE MEDITERRANEAN WITH A
VIEW TO PREVENTING CONFLICTS IN THE REGION**

GENERAL REPORT

**on the results of the Third Thematic Preparatory Meeting of the
IIIrd Inter-Parliamentary Conference on Security and Co-operation in the Mediterranean
(Ljubljana, Slovenia, 12-13 March 1999) presented by Mr. M. H. Khelil (Tunisia)**

At its 164th session, the Inter-Parliamentary Council took note of the report

On behalf of all of us, may I begin by expressing our warm thanks to the National Assembly of Slovenia which has so generously welcomed us here in Ljubljana on 12 and 13 March 1999.

This is the Inter-Parliamentary Union's first visit to this young democracy, which joined our organisation in April 1993, shortly after acceding to sovereignty. This agreeable visit has shown us that the Slovenes' reputation for dynamism is fully justified and that the democratic process is taking firm root here. This is highly gratifying, and we offer our encouragement to the Slovene people and their institutions.

We are particularly grateful to the President of the Inter-Parliamentary Group of Slovenia and of this Meeting, Mr. Jelko Kacin. Having spent almost three years as Minister for Defence of Slovenia, he was especially well placed to direct our work. We extend our thanks to him for the manner in which he has led the debates of this Third Thematic Preparatory Meeting of the IIIrd CSCM, which is entered in next year's programme.

At the short inaugural ceremony which preceded our work, Mr. Kacin, as well as the President of the Inter-Parliamentary Council, Mr. Martínez, and the President of the National Assembly of Slovenia, Mr. Podobnik, took the floor in turn. Their speeches placed our work within a context of peace, democracy and sustainable

development for the Mediterranean, representing the aspirations of all our peoples.

The President of the Inter-Parliamentary Council invited us to consider the dynamics of multilateral co-operation. He recalled that our parliaments are now daily called on to legislate on questions whose scope exceeds our national frontiers, and that they are consequently led to play a determining role in the field of multilateral negotiations and diplomacy. With his usual power of conviction, he pleaded the case for a multilateral process where there would no longer be any confusion between State and government, as presently exists within world inter-State institutions. He called for a multilateral process which would better represent our societies, and in which, as on the national level, parliaments would contribute as institutions representing the full range of society in all its diversity. In this connection, he encouraged us to engage our parliaments and their presidencies more firmly in the action of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, establishing the latter as the true channel of parliamentary co-operation with the UN.

The President of the Inter-Parliamentary Council also drew our attention to the need to co-ordinate inter-parliamentary initiatives aiming to promote security and co-operation in the Mediterranean more fully. These had displayed a tendency to multiply, and he

hoped that the IPU would play a decisive role in this respect. We can only second him when he urges our parliaments to act more coherently, concertedly and responsibly in action in favour of the Mediterranean.

To return in more detail to the subject of our meeting, we noted that some 50 members of 19³ parliaments from the category of main participants to the CSCM process, five associate participants and two observers, took part in our work, and most of them intervened in our debates.

The theme which occupied us during these two days was complex and of major importance for our peoples: "Co-operation in armaments control in the Mediterranean with a view to preventing conflicts in the region".

Our debates were opened by an expert, Prof. Vicenç Fisas, who is the holder of the UNESCO Chair on Peace and Human Rights, University of Barcelona, to whom we extend our warm thanks for the clarity of his statement and the depth of the very precise ideas and recommendations that he presented, in particular on the question of small arms. Not only did he stimulate our reflection but he encouraged our debates.

We would also like to thank Mr. Hladnik-Milharic, Middle East correspondent of the Delo daily newspaper (Slovenia), specially invited by the Host Parliament to provide us with a substantive address. His intervention dealt principally with the political causes of armed conflicts, and the need fully to understand the context in which such conflicts break out and develop, if durable solutions to the problems are to be found.

Without aiming to reflect in detail the full depth of the debates, I shall here provide a

broad outline, with the principle objective of highlighting our concerns and our recommendations.

It goes without saying that the question of armaments control is primordial in a region like the Mediterranean where a number of open conflicts persist, where the Middle East peace process is at a critical phase, where there are several hotbeds of intra-national and inter-State tension, including those turning around questions concerning minorities, a region finally, where situations involving foreign occupation persist.

The serious risk of the eruption of new conflicts renders reflection on the means of preventing recourse to arms and the proliferation of armaments all the more important. Today, massive quantities of armaments of all sorts are available in our region and may be obtained without any real difficulty by States and by irregular groups.

As a result of the large socio-economic disparities which characterise our region, it is particularly vulnerable to conflicts. It is thus of the greatest concern that the region contains the highest concentration of armaments in the world.

We are fully aware that the prevention of conflicts cannot be understood in purely military terms. It is thus the structural roots of the situation which we, as parliamentarians, must address in priority. Indeed, it would be vain to treat the symptoms and not the causes, as many of us have pointed out. Clearly such action presupposes a political will.

We are nonetheless obliged to note that this political will is weak in the Mediterranean. Some speakers stated that this resulted from the fact that there was no true socio-economic policy based on mutual respect and dialogue. The fact that the recommendations that we formulated at the Ist Inter-Parliamentary Conference on Security and Co-operation in the Mediterranean, in Malaga in 1992 and subsequently at the IInd CSCM at Valletta, in 1995, remain almost entirely valid, bears witness to this.

³ Representatives of the following Parliaments and organisations took part in the session:

Main participants: Albania, Algeria, Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Morocco, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Yugoslavia

Associate participants: (i) Russian Federation; (ii) Palestine; (iii) Arab Inter-Parliamentary Union, Parliamentary Assembly of the Western European Union, Parliamentary Assembly for Black Sea Economic Co-operation

Observers: Poland, Romania

In fact, over a seven-year period, the armaments situation in the Mediterranean has far from improved. Several Mediterranean countries have not yet ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the implementation of this important international instrument is not at all satisfactory. The same is true of the 1980 Convention on Conventional Weapons; the Convention on Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and the Convention on Chemical Weapons.

The recent entry into force of the Ottawa Convention on anti-personnel mines, on the other hand, was greeted as a positive step; this must now be fully implemented: our role in this respect is a determining one, and we must play it to the full. In particular we should allocate or generate the credits necessary for demining and rehabilitating victims of anti-personnel mines. The massive presence of these mines in the Mediterranean poses a constant threat to our civilian population and hinders our development. In this connection, we would like to express our gratitude to the Host Parliament which made it possible for us to visit the Centre for Civil Protection and Disaster Relief at Ig, in Slovenia.

It is essential to make the Mediterranean a region free from weapons of mass destruction. This implies not only the destruction of existing stocks, but also a freeze on armament production. Some of us have called for international verification, and even the dismantling, of production units.

At all events, as parliamentarians, we are in a position to limit credits allocated to the acquisition of armaments and to turn over the sums thus liberated to the economic and social development to which our peoples aspire.

Transparency in respect of the transfer of armaments is far from being a reality. It is nevertheless of great importance: no effective action in the field of armaments can take place until an accurate inventory has been carried out. Within our role of monitoring the action of the Executive and with the aim of developing the parliamentary dimension of the United Nations, we should pay special attention to the maintenance of

the United Nations Register of Conventional Weapons. Some of us also highlighted the importance of mutual verification measures, stressing that they tended to increase confidence.

A number of speakers also called for a reduction in the military activity in the Mediterranean by means of banning foreign bases and fleets in the region.

We also called for greater transparency regarding routine military activities.

The expert, Prof. Fisas, invited us to give priority to the question of small arms. It is estimated that these arms have claimed 26 million victims since the end of the Second World War, and today, it is an alarming fact that some 40% of the trade in small arms is clandestine.

These arms are very easy to obtain. A large proportion of them, coming from various markets (demobilisation, changes brought about by the end of the Cold War, etc.), end up in the Mediterranean where they fuel insecurity and instability. Their low cost combined with relative ease of use and transfer have made them the favourite weapon of such irregular combatants as terrorists, guerrillas and mercenaries. They also find their way into the hands of mafias and criminal groups, illegal security companies and millions of individuals. Apart from those used by the armies and the forces of law and order, the vast majority of these arms escape register. Moreover, they have provided fertile ground for the growth of a "Kalashnikov culture" among many young people, further proof that priority must be given to education in the Mediterranean, including education for peace. In this respect the role of women and in a different way that of the media are crucial.

While most conflicts today are internal and civil, the growing proliferation of light automatic weapons has contributed to the increase of zones of violence in the Mediterranean and has rendered these conflicts not only more deadly but also longer-lasting and harder to solve. The humanitarian consequences of this situation are incalculable.

The massive availability of these weapons and the difficulty of collecting them at the end of a conflict makes political and economic reconstruction very hard. As Mediterranean parliamentarians, we should therefore pay particular attention to the question of small arms. It is important that we insist on transparency in all matters regarding the production and trade of these arms. This is an essential condition if our legislation in the field - if it is adequate - is to be respected.

We agreed that national and regional registers, and even a Mediterranean Register, of the production and export of small arms would considerably facilitate armaments control. Conscious that this would also help to create a climate of confidence, we recommend their establishment.

Priority must be given to the adoption of restrictive legislation making the holding of an official authorisation for the purchase of any firearm obligatory. If we are to prevent illegal use and misappropriation, it is also important that we establish effective machinery to verify the authenticity of certificates of end-users of these arms. Furthermore, we should take action to reinforce the capacity to control the flow of arms and to aid those of our States which, even having undertaken to do so, have neither sufficient economic nor technical means to do this.

We paid special attention to the idea of working towards the adoption of a Convention on small arms. We noted that a world campaign for the elimination of these arms, inspired by the Campaign which culminated in the adoption of the Ottawa Convention on anti-personnel mines, will be launched next May in the Hague. It is important that we join in this mobilisation and that, as representatives of the people, we relay it to the national and international political institutions.

In this connection, we welcomed the establishment by UNESCO of a Small Arms Liaison Office at the University of Barcelona as an important step forward, and we recommend that the Inter-Parliamentary Union ensures the regular publication of

information bulletins from this Office to national parliaments.

We cannot ignore the fact that small arms are widely used in terrorist activities. This scourge is a major source of concern in the Mediterranean and we have recommended reinforcement of inter-State co-operation to bring it to an end. We believe that the establishment of a Euro-Mediterranean Centre for data on terrorism would provide effective support for our struggle to control the financing of terrorist weapons and their supply. We further believe that mutual police-judicial assistance should be strengthened in the Mediterranean in respect of terrorist activity. Finally we call for a world summit meeting on terrorism.

At the parliamentary level we believe that it is useful and opportune to establish machinery to ensure exchanges and co-operation between parliamentary defence committees.

Our common objective is to transform the Mediterranean into a zone of stability and peace. There is no doubt that sustainable and balanced development in all the countries of the Mediterranean is one cornerstone to this stability, but not the only one. It is also necessary to strengthen confidence, understanding and respect between the Mediterranean States and the Mediterranean peoples. We must be the architects of this positive dynamic which is the very aim of the CSCM.

In this regard, we wish to retain as the theme for a further specialised session of the CSCM, the question of a dialogue on civilisations and religions. The absence, or shortcomings of this dialogue give constant rise to incomprehension and tension, and even conflict.

Beyond the Mediterranean, we recommend that the governing bodies of the Inter-Parliamentary Union enter the question of the control of armaments, and more particularly, of small arms, on the agenda of a forthcoming statutory Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, and we hope that they will allow the excellent report submitted by the expert in this connection to be made available at the Conference. The question of

small arms is becoming one of the gravest threats to peace in the world, and to the reconstruction of societies recently emerged from conflict.

As called for by the President of the Inter-Parliamentary Council, we undertake to submit the present report summarising our work to our parliaments and our governments. With a view to promoting a more co-ordinated and complementary approach, we intend to bring it to the attention of other initiatives for security and co-operation in the Mediterranean, in particular that of the Presidents of our Parliaments, whose Euro-Mediterranean Declaration of Mallorca we noted with interest. Finally, we shall take measures so that our governments ensure that the results of our meeting are submitted to the next session of the General Assembly of the United Nations under the item that it will again examine in this connection in 1999.

We appeal that the Middle East process should regain momentum in the spirit in which it was launched.

Moreover, we support the Bethlehem 2000 Project of the Palestinian Authority, which is sponsored by the United Nations and which should allow the renovation and development of this important zone of the Mediterranean as well as contribute to peace.

All our recommendations, which we have not set forth exhaustively here, will be presented to the XIVth session of the Meeting of Representatives of the Parties to the CSCM Process, which will take place in Brussels on 13 April 1999. They will enrich the work of our IIIrd CSCM which we hope will prove a decisive step forward for peace and stability and for mutual understanding in the Mediterranean.

**PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION
TO COMBAT DESERTIFICATION (UNCCD)**

*Declaration by the Round Table of Parliamentarians organised by the
Convention Secretariat and sponsored by the Inter-Parliamentary Union*

(Dakar, 7 December 1998)

I. **We, the Parliamentarians** invited to meet in Dakar, Senegal, on 7 December 1998 by the Convention Secretariat, the National Assembly of Senegal and the Inter-Parliamentary Union in the context of the second session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in those countries experiencing serious Drought and/or Desertification, particularly in Africa, declare that:

1. **We are deeply alarmed** by the impact of desertification which affects 3,600 million hectares, representing 70 per cent of the potential productive land in arid zones. The rapidity of this progression means that there is a loss of 6 million hectares annually. We are conscious of the gravity of the situation in different regions of the world as in Africa, a continent where deserts or arid zones constitute two-thirds of the total land area and 73 per cent of the arid land is already seriously or moderately degraded; in Asia where around 1,400 million hectares are affected by desertification, which corresponds to 71 per cent of the arid land of the continent which is moderately or severely degraded; in Latin America, where nearly three quarters of the arid land is moderately or severely degraded and the Mediterranean, where almost two-thirds of the arid land is severely degraded; the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, where 40 per cent to 80 per cent of the arid land is severely degraded;

2. **It is intolerable** that at the beginning of the twenty-first century near 1 billion men, women and children, are permanently threatened by desertification; that hundreds of millions of people suffer from a chronic shortage of basic necessities such as water; and that millions of "environmental refugees" are forced to abandon their native land to seek relief elsewhere;

3. **We share fully** the founding premise of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, according to which sustainable development cannot be attained unless:

- (i) it is oriented towards people in protecting the interests of the affected populations and eradicates poverty;
- (ii) it involves these populations fully in the decision-making process, in measures for the protection of the environment and in the struggle against desertification;
- (iii) it includes the dimension of the fight against poverty.

4. **We believe that** desertification, poverty, famine, social and political disturbances, wars, migration and the displacement of populations, which have led many times to new and most serious degradation of the natural environment, **are all interconnected;**

5. **We take note of the serious budgetary constraints** of the poorest affected countries, which still have to devote a considerable proportion of their scant financial resources to debt repayment and servicing.

II. Affirming our total commitment, as Parliamentarians, to contribute fully to the implementation of the Convention, in countries that are Parties to the Convention.

6. We **support** where necessary the adoption or the strengthening of legislation concerning the fight against desertification and the preservation of the ecosystems in all the affected countries,

7. We **subscribe** to the promotion of policies and the strengthening of appropriate institutional frameworks for the favourable development of co-operation among the countries affected by desertification and their partners in development;

8. We **support** the strengthening of social, education, health and policies through public awareness campaigns about the negative effects of desertification as well as the participation of youth and women in the development programmes;

9. We **subscribe** to the integration of the main provisions of the Convention in national policies for sustainable development;

10. We **subscribe** to the initiative that the year 2000 be the starting point of the decade to combat desertification;

11. We **support** fully the initiatives of agencies, donor countries and civil society to mobilise financial assistance for the promotion of sustainable development in poorest countries with fragile ecosystems, through the Convention's Global Mechanism.

III. We undertake to promote in our respective Parliaments:

12. **The follow-up of implementation** of the Convention, making full use of the mechanisms available in our Parliaments to monitor government action and thus ensure that the Convention is fully implemented;

13. **The formulation of national legislation** and its harmonisation with the provisions of the Convention;

14. **The inclusion of the combat** against desertification in the overall agendas of our national governments so as to make the combat a priority matter for our countries as for our regional and sub-regional organisations;

15. **The formulation of national action programmes** covering water management and applied agricultural research in the poorest countries affected by desertification and others as necessary, and their financing in accordance with the provisions of the Convention;

16. **The adoption of practical measures** to include environmental education, in particular the fight against desertification, in school curricula.

IV. We are deeply convinced of the need to undertake far-reaching action with the main priorities:

17. **To promote forms** of regional and sub-regional co-operation, favourable to improving relations between our relevant intergovernmental organisations;

18. **To set up, at the local level,** action programmes based on the reforestation and rehabilitation of land which involves all stakeholders in the field, in particular the education system and representatives of civil society, especially youth and women's associations;

19. **To define action programmes** involving international organisations, including United Nations agencies, donors, national institutions, elected representatives, NGOs, and the local population, in particular resource users, both men and women, to promote the objectives of the Convention;

20. As appropriate in the case of poorest affected countries **to expand debt-for-nature swaps** for land rehabilitation and reforestation.

V. We Parliamentarians address an urgent appeal:

21. **To all relevant participants in civil society,** such as financial institutions, personalities in the fields of finance, commerce, sport, the media and the arts, to support the mobilisation of financial resources to support the fight against desertification which is under way in the developing countries most seriously affected by desertification and drought;

22. **To academic institutions,** the scientific community and research centres for their support in the various tasks of implementing the Convention in affected countries with particular regard to the needs of developing countries;

23. **To the Inter-Parliamentary Union** to give the widest publicity possible to this Declaration and, notably that it be transmitted to all national parliaments for their attention;

24. **To the Secretariat of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification** to continue the actions taken up to this time to support the countries affected by desertification, and to take all necessary measures to the present declaration universally known;

25. **To the Secretariats of the CCD and the Inter-Parliamentary Union** to take follow-up action on the present meeting and organise similar meetings in conjunction with future conferences of the Parties.

TOURISM AND THE IMPERATIVES OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

*Statement of the Committee for Sustainable Development of the
Inter-Parliamentary Union endorsed by the Inter-Parliamentary Council
at its 164th session (Brussels, 16 April 1999)*

The Committee for Sustainable Development,

Recognising that the tourism industry has an increasingly important economic, social, cultural and environmental impact, both globally and on the national scale, and that the continuing growth of tourism and tourism-related activities has diverse implications for the achievement of sustainable development,

Recalling that issues of tourism were addressed by IPU on several occasions in recent years, such as the Inter-Parliamentary Conference on Tourism held in 1989 in The Hague and the two International Fora "Parliaments and Local Authorities: Tourism Policy-Makers" organised by the World Tourism Organization with the support of IPU respectively in Cadiz (Spain) in 1995 and Bali (Indonesia) in 1996,

Believing that the tourism sector is a major driving force behind the economic advancement of many countries, including developing ones, where it fosters job creation, stimulates economic diversification and boosts foreign exchange earnings,

Realising at the same time that over-reliance on tourism, especially mass tourism, entails significant risks for tourism-dependent economies,

Noting that demand for new forms of tourism, including ecotourism, is growing in many parts of the world and presents new challenges for the tourism industry, national governments, parliaments and the international community,

Recognising the important role played by the World Tourism Organization in shaping the future of the global tourism industry, and *recalling* in this regard the rich record of co-operation between IPU and this body,

1. *Believes* that projected sustained growth of the tourism industry will present serious challenges to environmental protection unless policy-makers develop effective regulatory policies and systems of economic incentives and disincentives and address the issue of promoting awareness of tourists, the tourism industry and the public at large of the importance of safeguarding the natural and cultural environment;

2. *Emphasises* that linkages of tourism with other economic sectors necessitate its full integration into national development plans as well as the provision of adequate legislative support, for which parliaments bear primary responsibility, so that tourism develops in harmony with overall economic, social and environmental goals;
3. *Considers* that an integrated policy framework for sustainable tourism development should include a mechanism ensuring that investment, employment, operational and other business decisions of tourism enterprises take full account of the wider implications of these actions for the long-term development and economic sustainability of the destinations in which they operate and that the carrying capacity of sites visited by tourists should be respected even if this implies restricting access to sites at certain periods or seasons;
4. *Supports* the development of new and alternative forms of tourism, including ecotourism, which favour closer contact and understanding between tourists and receiving populations, respect cultural identity and preserve distinctive and original tourist products and facilities;
5. *Urges* the international community to enhance and strengthen international co-ordination and relevant monitoring systems through liaison among governments, parliaments, the private sector and concerned parties with a view to promoting the positive aspects and minimising the negative impacts of tourism;
6. *Is convinced* that national parliaments should show increased concern for tourism development and review existing laws on tourism, consolidate them into comprehensive legislation and codify national policy and priorities for tourism including such aspects as safety and security of tourists, spread of epidemic diseases such as AIDS, and elimination of terrorism, in particular by addressing its root causes;
7. *Energetically supports* the view that the promotion of ecotourism should be given priority within overall tourism development planning and that effective mechanisms should be introduced to prevent and control tourism-related abuse and exploitation of people, particularly women and children;
8. *Urges* national parliaments and other tourism policy-makers to support the objectives of the International Year of Ecotourism - 2002;
9. With a view to deepening its reflection on the issue of tourism and sustainable development and in order to produce comprehensive recommendations for the Union's governing bodies in this regard, *resolves* to include a relevant item on the agenda of the session of the IPU Committee for Sustainable Development to be held in the year 2000.

**REPORT OF THE SECOND TRI-PARTITE MEETING ON FOLLOW-UP
OF THE WORLD SUMMIT FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
New York, 31 March 1999**

*Endorsed by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999)*

The present report contains a summary of the discussion that took place at the IInd Tri-Partite Meeting of Representatives of Parliaments, Governments and Inter-Governmental Organisations. The meeting took place at UN Headquarters on 30 and 31 March 1999 and was organised by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) in co-operation with the UN Division for Social Policy and Development and the United Nations Development Programme. The participants in the meeting – who took part in a personal capacity – are listed in Addendum A of this report.

To prepare for the meeting, the IPU conducted a survey of parliamentary action taken to implement the Declaration and Programme of Action adopted by the World Summit for Social Development (WSSD), seeking to identify possible constraints and proposals for future action. The survey was compiled with the assistance of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) and was discussed by IPU's Committee for Sustainable Development in early March 1999. The Committee's report, together with the survey, was submitted to the Tri-Partite Meeting and formed the basis for its discussions on parliamentary action to follow up the WSSD. It is included as Addendum B of this report.

The meeting also discussed new initiatives in which it also drew inspiration from the draft text (document E/CN.5/1999/L.8) submitted to the Commission for Social Development by its Bureau at the end of its 37th session in February 1999.

Finally, the meeting also considered some further measures which Parliaments could take in support of the WSSD at the national and international level.

1. Parliamentary action taken since the World Summit on Social Development (WSSD)

The discussions clearly demonstrated that national Parliaments had a considerable role to play in the follow-up to the WSSD. Action by Parliament and its Members is crucial for the implementation of social development policies and programmes. Parliament provides the legislative framework for social development and allocates financial resources. It can also influence and prompt action towards achieving the goals set at the WSSD and monitor their implementation. Moreover, it is instrumental in relaying and explaining to the public the issues involved and in forging popular support for action to implement social policies. Public awareness of social development issues and public discussion and promotion of policies to address them are prerequisites for problem-solving. Through direct and continuous dialogue with their constituents, members of Parliament are well placed to create awareness and foster discussion.

In light of the report of the IPU Committee for Sustainable Development and the survey carried out by the IPU, the meeting was pleased to note that Parliaments have been playing an active role in seeking to implement the WSSD Declaration and Programme of Action. Parliamentary action has helped to bring about dialogue on social development in the national context, and has popularised the various concepts and goals on which the WSSD was based. Parliaments have enacted legislation on many critical social questions. They have frequently made pledges in the field of social spending, designated focal institutions to oversee the implementation process, observed specific events and engaged in wider interaction with NGOs, welfare institutions and a host of other institutions of civil society and a few have also sought to define and interpret the Declaration and Programme of Action in their national context.

Nevertheless, the meeting also noted that on the whole, there was a lack of progress in implementing the Summit's commitments. This was especially noticeable in the failure of many countries, including the industrialised countries, to develop detailed, national strategies for addressing poverty, unemployment and social exclusion. There has also been a failure to meet international commitments agreed at the WSSD. National Parliaments have played an important role in focusing government efforts on elaborating long-term national development strategies. Targeting of the goals set at the WSSD in a more systematic manner, with corresponding allocation of resources, has occurred in only a minority of countries. Indeed, most countries report few or no tangible results in terms of reducing poverty, increasing productive employment and eliminating social exclusion.

The meeting acknowledged however that a period of four years since the Social Summit was insufficient to evaluate properly the effectiveness of policy measures. Furthermore, there have been formidable difficulties in implementing the Summit's Commitments at the national level. In developing countries, in particular, where poverty, unemployment and economic marginalisation are most acute, the State is often unable to provide comprehensive basic social services. At a time when economic liberalisation and rapid integration into the global economy have frequently implied impoverishment of a growing number of people and rising inequalities, these same processes have reduced both Government's autonomy and its capacity to plan social provisioning programmes. As a result, social problems have multiplied and in some cases have become too complex to be handled by individual countries on their own. In formerly socialist transitional countries, on the other hand, changes in the economy have resulted in weakened social security measures. Unemployment has grown, while health care, pensions and social insurance have shrunk. Income inequalities have also increased. The meeting thought that special attention needed to be paid to these regions' problems.

2. Prospects for further action

A number of suggestions were made regarding issues that had to be addressed as a matter of priority. Globalisation had both positive and negative effects on social development. It is important to address how the social agenda can be implemented in the context of market-driven economic policies. It was strongly suggested that Governments and Parliaments address the potential conflict between social development and the market and seek to reconcile social and economic policies at both national and international levels. The long term progress of developing countries with a view to their greater integration into the process of globalisation to increase their ability to compete in the international economic environment needs to be addressed urgently. New partnerships involving governments, parliaments, business, civil society and international economic fora need to be explored.

The issue of protecting vulnerable groups from the negative effects of structural adjustment programmes was considered to be especially crucial. The point was made that although good macro-economic management matters, there is a need to balance economic policy with a longer-

term social agenda. This needed to go together with the cancellation of debt, possibly in the form of debt-swapping for social development. The meeting also reiterated the need to reverse the declining trend in official development assistance (ODA) and to reach the target of 0.7 per cent of GNP for the industrialised countries. Foreign direct investment can also be of substantial value provided it occurs in a framework designed to ensure benefits for recipient countries and, in any case, should not be considered a substitute for ODA. The suggestion was further made to explore the potential of the 20:20 initiative for the social sector. In this context, the point was also made that there is a great deal of inequality between as well as within countries.

A number of other suggestions were made. Good governance, democracy and respect for human rights are crucial to establishing an enabling environment for social development and for poverty reduction. Similarly, it is important at national and international level to combat corruption, which negatively affects the availability of resources for social development. There is a need to strive for an ethical dimension to development and increase social awareness in order to achieve social development. Also underlined was the importance of achieving education for all through universal primary education as well as access to basic health care for all.

A further proposal was that the international community should develop social indicators for use in social programmes and the budget process at the national level. There was also a need for social impact analysis. Moreover, monitoring social progress necessitated specific tools.

There is an important gender perspective to social development and the point was made that gender issues should be mainstreamed. Particularly in areas of poverty and employment, women were at a disadvantage. The issue of their participation in politics was raised and some suggested that affirmative action would be needed to make progress towards a real partnership between men and women in politics.

In addition to the above proposals, the meeting also discussed what other new initiatives could be proposed to the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the UNGA in June 2000. Having reviewed the draft text circulated to the Commission for Social development by its Bureau at its 37th session in February 1999 and in light of the report of the IPU Committee for Sustainable Development, the following priority initiatives were highlighted in the discussion (they are listed under the ten commitments contained in the WSSD Programme of Action):

Commitment 1. An enabling environment for social development

- A necessary condition for effective social development is sustained improvement in the international environment for social development
- The centrality of effective, participatory governance including through free and regular elections and democratic national and international economic and social institutions, emphasising the role of parliament at all levels and civil society at large
- Preparation of basic socio-economic principles for use in responding to domestic and international crises that affect social development
- Principles on the social responsibilities of business
- Refocusing policies so that social goals and priorities become central and are in a sophisticated balance with economic priorities

Commitment 2. Eradication of poverty

- Strengthening national and international commitments to poverty reduction targets as the foundation for encouraging the adoption or review of national poverty reduction strategies
- A global poverty reduction target of halving absolute poverty, if possible by 2015
- Establishing, strengthening or improving social protection systems and their management

Commitment 3. Employment

- Strengthening commitment to the universal goal of full, productive, and appropriately and adequately remunerated and freely chosen employment as an essential underpinning for social development and achievement of the right to work
- Adoption of national employment growth strategies, including setting time-bound targets for employment growth, supported by national strategies including measures aimed at stimulating small and medium businesses; facilitating use of new technologies; encouraging rural development; improving the employment prospects of youth through active labour market policies such as direct employment creation, retraining, and redeployment assistance; ensuring gender equality in employment opportunities
- Particular attention could be focused on measures to increase productivity in the informal sector
- Establishing mechanisms to address effectively the shadow economy
- Strengthening commitment to social dialogue, including through commitment to freedom of association and to effective labour relations institutions
- The importance of universal adoption and national implementation of the core labour standards agreed by the Social Summit and reaffirmed by the International Labour Conference

Commitment 4. Social integration

- A necessary condition for social harmony is commitment to social justice which must include policies aimed at reducing extremes of wealth and poverty as well as at integrating groups with special needs
- Consideration of more effective ways of dealing with intra-national conflicts

Commitment 5. Equality and equity between women and men

- Making recommendations for means of gender mainstreaming may well be the most effective contribution that the Special Session can make to this Commitment
- Affirmative action as an instrument of social integration

Commitment 6. Universal and equitable access to quality education and health services

- Efforts to meet the target of achieving education for all through universal primary education in all countries before the year 2015 should be stepped up even further.

- Consideration should be given to a new strategy for achieving the goal of access to basic health care for all. Such a strategy could include attention to major debilitating diseases such as tuberculosis and malaria

Commitment 7. Accelerate the development of Africa and the least developed countries

- A high priority for not only Africa but also the world is agreement on an international strategy for minimising the spread of HIV/AIDS, including benchmarks for stages of achievement
- Strengthening of South-South co-operation

Commitment 8. Ensure that structural adjustment programmes include social development goals

- Structural adjustment programmes must be reviewed to ensure that social development goals and policies are included in all phases of macroeconomic strategy
- Means of increasing the transparency and accountability of the Bretton Woods institutions and the World Trade Organization should be studied; a more open dialogue is needed, including with national parliaments

Commitment 9. Increase resources allocated to social development

- Protect the resources allocated for social development against the negative forces of globalisation
- Adequate, effective social policies require the availability of sufficient revenue within countries to pay for social services collected through a progressive tax structure and social insurance funds
- In a globalising world, tax interactions between countries must be reviewed to minimise tax competition between countries, to prevent tax evasion and to increase international co-operation on tax policy.
- The need to reverse the current decline in the proportion of ODA to GNP in each of the next five years with a view to reaching the agreed target of 0.7 percent of GNP
- Debt reduction is essential to creating conditions for implementation of the other commitments. One approach worth exploring would be the introduction of debt reduction for social development swaps

Commitment 10. Implementation and institutional reform

- Social impact assessments are a useful technique for evaluating national policy and programme initiatives and major projects
- Measures should be prepared to ensure that the objectives and policy approaches of the Social Summit are reflected effectively in the mandates, programmes and co-ordination arrangements of the United Nations, its funds and programmes, the Specialised Agencies and the Bretton Woods institutions

- The important role of Parliaments and legislative assemblies in furthering the implementation of the Copenhagen commitments should be emphasised
- National commissions for social development should be established to oversee implementation, complemented by parliamentary committees for social development.
- Consider development of minimum standards for social policy
- Standardisation of social development indicators taking into account different levels of development

3. Parliamentary follow-up to the meeting

At the end of their deliberations, the participants considered possible further follow-up action that could be taken by Parliaments nationally and at the international level.

At the national level, the meeting recognised that Parliaments themselves must be more effectively mobilised. For example, the core labour standards agreed by the Social Summit and reaffirmed by the International Labour Conference need to be translated into legislation. They must also ensure that the WSSD Programme of Action is integrated in the longer-term development plan together with adequate resources and political support. In this regard, it is important that Parliaments have the necessary financial resources, access to data and experts, ability to carry out independent research, office equipment and technology, and trained staff.

Moreover, it was suggested that each Parliament that does not already have a special mechanism – for example a parliamentary committee on social development – to constantly review and promote parliamentary action in support of the WSSD Programme of Action consider establishing one. It was also proposed that Parliament work towards the establishment of a national commission on social development and that this commission should be invited to submit an annual report on its activities to be debated in Parliament. Yet another proposal was for Parliaments to hold a special debate on social development to assess progress in implementing the WSSD Programme of Action as part of the preparations for the UNGA Special Session in June 2000.

At the international level, the IPU was encouraged to follow up the proposals put forward in the discussions. Particularly, it was suggested that the IPU arrange a special parliamentary meeting with the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Both the report of the IPU Committee for Sustainable Development and the report of the present meeting should be circulated at the May 1999 session of the Preparatory Committee. The IPU could also encourage a parliamentary presence in the national delegations to the Preparatory Committee and, of course, also at the UNGA Special Session. Moreover, it was suggested that the IPU consider organising a parliamentary meeting in conjunction with the UNGA Special Session.

**IInd TRIPARTITE MEETING ON FOLLOW-UP TO THE
WORLD SUMMIT FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
(UN Headquarters, 30 and 31 March 1999)**

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Parliamentary representatives

- Dr. Refaat Eremesy, MP, Egypt
- Dr. P. Upendra, MP, India (Chairman of the IInd Tripartite Meeting)
- Mrs. Sangaré Oumou Ba, Vice-President of the National Assembly of the Republic of Mali
- Dr. Luis Campos Baca, MP, Chairman of the Committee on Environment and Amazona, Peru
- Mr. V. Lisitchkin, MP, Chairman of the Committee on Labour and Social Policy, Russian Federation
- Mr. Roman Jakic, MP, Republic of Slovenia
- Congressman Barney Frank, United States Congress
- Mr. Daniel McGlinchey, Office of Congressman Frank
- Ms. Jane Chikwata, MP, Deputy Minister of Community Development and Social Services, Zambia

Ambassadors and Permanent Representatives to the United Nations in New York

- Mrs. Dalila Samah, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Algeria
- Dr. Patricia Flor, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Germany
- Mr. Gautam Mukhopadhaya, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of India
- H.E. Mr. Bagher Asadi, Ambassador, Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran
- H.E. Mr. Ion Gorita, Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Romania
- Mr. Andrei A. Nikiforov, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation

Representatives of inter-governmental organisations

- **United National Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA)**
Mr. John Langmore, Director for Social Policy and Development
Ms. Gloria Kan, Chief, Intergovernmental Policy Branch
- **United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**
Mr. G. Shabbir Cheema, Director, Management Development and Governance Division
Ms. Randi Davis, Adviser, Management Development and Governance Division
- **United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)**
Mrs. Nina Sibal, Director of the New York Liaison Office
Ms. Claudia Valencia, Liaison Officer, New York Office
- **United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD)**
Mr. Krishna Ghimire, Project Officer
- **International Labour Organisation (ILO)**
Mr. Garth Howell, Officer-in-charge of the ILO New York Liaison Office
Ms. Alina Pastiu, Associate, ILO New York Liaison Office
- **World Bank**
Mr. Alfredo Sfeir-Youmis, Special Representative to the UN
- **IPU**
Mr. Anders B. Johnsson, Secretary General
Mr. Santiago Romero-Perez, Director of the Liaison Office with the UN, New York

IMPLEMENTING WSSD COMMITMENTS: A REVIEW OF PARLIAMENTARY ACTIONS

Analysis of replies to the IPU questionnaire on parliamentary action to implement the WSSD outcome prepared for the IPU Committee for Sustainable Development by Krishna Ghimire of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development

◆ **Parliamentary action to implement the WSSD agenda**

According to the survey results, the WSSD Declaration and Programme of Action were “presented and endorsed” by a small number of parliaments (e.g. Denmark, Finland), and a few sought to incorporate them in their development plans (e.g. Ethiopia). For the most part, the Copenhagen commitments were “introduced” in parliament, and some discussions took place. In the preparation of laws, adaptation of annual budgets, plenary debates and parliamentary hearings, questioning and motions, the commitments made at the WSSD were frequently considered. Some of these parliamentary actions reflecting the Social Summit’s commitments are described below.

Parliamentary debates and enactment of relevant laws. National parliaments reported the enactment of laws on social development issues as their primary means of implementing the WSSD commitments. In the industrialised countries, where many laws on social questions already exist, attention was directed toward defining more accurately both the concept and context of poverty, unemployment and exclusion. Denmark, France, Sweden, Canada and Japan have also promulgated laws involving the rights of women, children, disabled persons, immigrant populations, etc. France, for instance, has enacted laws to address urban exclusion and insecurity, illegal immigrants and the legal recognition of homosexuality; it has further sought to reduce weekly working hours to create new employment.

In Eastern Europe, Belarus, Bulgaria, Poland and Slovenia have passed laws seeking to provide assistance to the jobless, as well as integrating young people and disabled persons in the labour market. They have also taken legal steps to provide new safety nets for people affected by the abandonment of the previous systems of social provisioning. Health-care and pension schemes in particular have been given high priority.

Unemployment has remained a serious concern in all developing countries. South Africa, for example, passed an Employment Equity Bill in 1995 aimed at changing the previously dominant discriminatory labour relations in recruitment, promotion, salaries, etc. Costa Rica has adopted laws on public employment, social security and health in the construction sector, the promotion of employment and protection against unemployment. In Gabon, detailed policy measures on investment have been developed to promote employment. India has enacted the Worker Compensation and Bonus Amendment Acts. In Niger, a law has been passed on new economic and investment priorities. Zambia has enacted laws encouraging small enterprises and more flexible labour relations.

Education has also received attention. In Costa Rica, laws on the use of radio and television as means for educational development have been adopted. Niger has passed a law on the orientation of the educational system. Turkey has promulgated a law on compulsory education to eight years and on the improvement of vocational education.

Developing countries answering the questionnaire also cite the special attention given to women and children's rights. For example, Costa Rica has adopted laws on women's social equality, assistance to women living in poverty and domestic violence. South Africa has introduced a Gender Management System to ensure gender equality in socio-economic spheres. India has directed its Ninth Five-Year Plan (1997-2002) toward the empowerment of women and children and passed legislation on maternity benefits. Viet Nam has adopted a law stipulating women's equal rights to employment and professional training and equal salaries. The Philippines adopted the child and youth welfare code, street children programme, and women in especially difficult circumstances programme. In Namibia, a national gender policy was adopted in 1997. The Republic of Korea has also adopted an act favouring women's development and child welfare. Many countries have introduced reforms and new laws on the provision of health-care. Niger, Senegal, South Africa and Gabon have elaborated detailed health policies and action programmes. Different laws were also passed for the well-being of disabled and aged persons in a number of countries (including Zambia and India).

Budgetary provisions. Most parliaments have acknowledged the need to direct resources toward social development goals, especially in areas such as education and health-care. Costa Rica has revised its Constitution to guarantee not less than 6 per cent of its GDP for education. South Africa allocated as much as 6.5 per cent of its GDP to the education sector in 1997/98. Egypt and Turkey have also increased their education budgets.

A number of countries have sought to create social safety nets against unemployment and other precarious situations. Poland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Slovenia have increased social expenditure to alleviate the negative impacts of economic restructuring. The Republic of Korea has created special funds for people suffering from the recent economic difficulties. Viet Nam has created an employment fund. Gabon has created social solidarity funds to fight against poverty and to help integrate unemployed people into the waged labour market. Egypt has established a social fund to protect workers against the negative impacts of privatisation. Senegal has been studying the establishment of a national fund for employment beginning in 1999. Jordan has set the target of securing a minimum income of 140 JD for families with seven members. India has seen an increase in social services and rural development from 1.47 per cent of GDP in 1990/91 to 1.75 per cent in 1997/98.

In the industrialised countries, Canada has increased the budget for child benefits and student scholarships. It has also reallocated 25 per cent of its overseas development assistance (ODA) to meeting basic human needs in poorer countries. Denmark has allocated 1 per cent of its GDP to ODA, especially to the least developed countries. Japan has expanded its foreign aid for social development, including the environment, population, gender and AIDS, surpassing the ODA's 20 per cent commitment for the social sector since 1993.

Establishment of special institutions. Several countries have created commissions or committees within their parliaments to focus on social development issues, including those referred to in the WSSD commitments. Japan has established a Liaison Meeting consisting of 23 relevant ministries and agencies aimed at studying and implementing the commitments made at the WSSD. Niger has set up a commission on social and cultural affairs and plans to establish an independent ministry on national solidarity. According to Mali's questionnaire responses, the second term of the present President was exclusively aimed at fighting poverty. Various parliamentary committees have been set up in Zambia to consider the Summit's commitments and the necessary policy measures. In Jordan, a high-level ministerial committee has been established to address social issues and, in particular, the government's goal of eradicating abject poverty by the year 2000. India has appointed a ministerial committee on empowerment of women. In Thailand, the National Economic and Social Development Board has been appointed as a national focal point on WSSD commitments.

Special events. A few countries have organised special events on social development. The Belarus Parliament held three public hearings on social issues, including public education and human rights, between 1997-1998. South Africa conducted a national workshop in May 1998 to review the constraints, obstacles and possible solutions for social development in the country. In Mali, October is “solidarity month” during which different activities are organised (especially by NGOs) to offer help to the most marginalised population groups. In France, 20 November is legally recognised as national “Children’s Day”.

Data collection and studies. Several parliaments have sought to gather information on specific problems faced by the population or to help them to propose concrete policy measures. Gabon and Togo (with the World Bank and UNDP respectively) have carried out studies to evaluate absolute poverty in their countries. Niger has sought to elaborate a detailed policy for social development and has also been collaborating with UNICEF in a study on possibilities for mobilising internal resources to meet the goal of 20 per cent investment in the social sector. The Belgian Commission on Social Affairs produced a report on unemployment and social exclusion in 1997. The German Parliament has commissioned a study to assess the social welfare effects of demographic changes for different age groups. Sweden has been helping 12 countries in Africa and six in Asia to produce gender-disaggregated statistics and basic data on living conditions. Denmark is also providing technical assistance to Uganda to develop statistical capacity for a better assessment of the objectives and problems of social development. Similarly, Switzerland has expressed interest in conducting pilot studies on the implementation of 20:20 initiatives at the country level in Burkina Faso, Tanzania and Bolivia.

Wider consultation. A number of parliaments have engaged in wider interaction with the academic community, NGOs, welfare institutions, regional and national authorities, and the international community. Public hearings and the celebration of the types of special events referred to above are channels for wider discussion and exchange. In Canada, parliamentary actions have frequently involved wide-ranging consultations with the provinces and civil society organisations. In Switzerland, the parliament and the government have made an effort to raise public awareness on such major social questions as debt, inequality and sustainable development with an active participation of the NGO sector. Egypt has sought to mobilise NGOs to provide assistance to the poorer groups in society. Niger has also encouraged NGOs and the voluntary sector to better serve the needs of women, children and other vulnerable groups. The Parliament of Mali has interacted with national NGOs, for example, in the context of celebrations to mark Solidarity Month in October. South Africa has conducted extensive consultative processes involving the public, NGOs and expert advisers through public hearings, workshops and committee debates on the finalisation of various government policies on employment, poverty, education, health and housing. The Philippines has also reported that, during the period 1995-98 there has been greater collaboration among the central government, local government units, NGOs, people’s organizations, the private sector and the local communities in the planning, implementation and monitoring of the various social development projects.

◆ **Elaboration of time-bound national strategies**

At the Summit, it was agreed that countries should attempt to set target dates for eliminating absolute poverty and for addressing other pressing social development questions. National parliaments have played an important role in focusing government efforts at achieving poverty alleviation by specified dates, for instance, in their five-year or longer term development plans and strategies. Sectoral initiatives (education, health, gender) have also incorporated specific time frames. Some of these development initiatives specifically incorporate the WSSD agenda items. Ethiopia, for example, has included the principal recommendations of the Summit in its current Five-Year Plan, with food self-sufficiency being the principal short-term aim. Namibia also developed a long-term food security and

nutrition policy following the Social Summit. In 1997, Senegal elaborated a long-term employment policy. Similarly, Costa Rica and Jordan have elaborated specific programmes to eradicate absolute poverty by the years 2000 and 2001, respectively. India, too, has developed a national programme aimed at generating greater productive employment between 1997 and 2002. Belarus has elaborated a national strategy for sustainable development (1996-2000), while Poland designed a programme to tackle unemployment by 2000. Bulgaria implemented the "Programme 2001" - a medium-term economic strategy to overcome the crisis in the country, with legislative initiatives to reform the public sector and provide social protection to ease the burden of the transitional period. Thailand has included the Summit's commitments in its Eighth National Economic and Social Development Plan (1997-2001). The Philippines developed a National Development Plan: 1999-2004 with the goal of raising the quality of life of the citizens. The Republic of Korea has prepared a national plan for the welfare of the disabled until the year 2000, and also intends to provide training and education to 30,000 foreign workers by 2010. Gabon has set 2005 as its target year to reduce poverty substantially. Slovenia has developed a strategy on the development of the job market during 1999-2006. Egypt and the former Republic of Macedonia have developed long-term national development strategies to tackle poverty and unemployment issues, extending until 2016/17 and 2020 respectively.

◆ **Tangible results**

Have the actions taken by these countries led to any concrete results in terms of reducing poverty, increasing productive employment and strengthening social solidarity? Very few of the replies provide direct answers to this question. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the Russian Federation acknowledge limited tangible results; Belarus mentions the decline in the quality of health-care; and the Slovak Republic cites rising unemployment. Israel reports that the incidence of poverty has risen in recent years. Developed countries, such as Canada, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, France and Finland, also report few or no tangible results. Some developing countries cite their enactment of laws and budgetary provisions as "measurable results". Among the developing countries citing tangible results, Costa Rica, for instance, states the decline in unemployment in rural areas, as well as falling female unemployment in general. Viet Nam mentions that it created 1.3 million jobs in 1998 through the recently established Employment Creation Fund and claims to have cut the number of extremely poor households by 15.7 per cent in 1998. The Philippines states that poverty has decreased from 35.5 per cent in 1994 to 32.1 per cent in 1997. Turkey mentions a reduction in the unemployment rate from 6.9 per cent in 1995 to 6.4 per cent in 1998, and an increase in the proportion of the population covered by social security from 78.6 per cent in 1995 to 85.3 per cent in 1998.

◆ **Constraints and obstacles**

Among the industrialised countries, Finland, France, Denmark, Germany and Belgium did not respond. Canada cites the complexity of its federal-provincial relations, explaining that many of the WSSD commitments fall between federal and provincial jurisdiction and that independent actions are complicated at both levels. Federal transfers of resources to the provinces for health, education and welfare programmes have been cut. Sweden, too, mentions that recent economic recession forced the country to reduce development aid from 1 per cent of GDP in 1992/93 to 0.7 per cent since 1996.

The Eastern European countries answering the questionnaire cite the shortage of financial resources as being the primary constraint in implementing WSSD commitments. Economic and financial crises, as well as frequent government changes affecting policy-making in the Russian Federation have limited the effectiveness of programmes aimed at providing pensions, wages and welfare payments.

Belarus cites inflation, lingering health hazards and other social costs related to the Chernobyl accident. Poland identifies labour unrest, underdevelopment of rural areas and the widening gap between rich and poor as the main obstacles to social development in the country. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia states its specific problems of being a landlocked country, lack of international political recognition and the organisation of its economy around the Yugoslav economy and market. Slovenia points out the increase in unemployment and budget cuts in health, pension and social insurance that have resulted from the shifts to a market-based economy. Similar problems are raised by the Slovak Republic. A low level of economic development, the absence of a consolidated national poverty eradication strategy and neglect of human and minority rights are suggested as being the chief problem areas for Hungary.

Developing countries have identified a wide range of obstacles and constraints to the implementation of the Summit's commitments. India, the Philippines, Israel, Jordan, Mali, Niger, and Togo mention insufficient financial resources and budgetary pressure as key obstacles. Some African countries, such as Zambia, Tunisia and Mali, consider foreign debt to be the major constraint. Niger points out the reticence on the part of donors to cancel debt or convert it to finance development plans; furthermore, it asserts that influential development partners lack interest in supporting the social sector. Viet Nam and the Philippines note that the region's recent financial crisis has led to cuts in external investment in the country. Tunisia cites a reduction in aid by major donor countries as a prominent handicap. Structural adjustment, economic recession and privatisation are mentioned by Gabon, Jordan and Niger. Apart from financial resources, Ethiopia notes the scarcity of skilled manpower, capital and experience as obstacles, while Turkey points out the lack of statistical data and adequate indicators. Zambia and Niger also view the unfavourable environment (e.g., drought, desertification) and famine as critical problems. These two countries, as well as India, consider high population growth rates and rural-to-urban migration additional difficulties. Namibia views food insecurity as a major social development challenge in the country; highly unequal income distribution is also cited (10 per cent of the population controls more than 80 per cent of the country's resources). Togo perceives the slow progress in decentralisation and the lack of active popular participation in social development projects as important pitfalls. Other constraints mentioned by different countries include gender, caste and tribal disparities, internal and regional political instability and overlapping of social development initiatives between government institutions.

◆ **Prospects for further action by parliaments**

Many replies suggest that parliaments could adopt a more prominent role in assisting with the implementation of the commitments made at the Summit. Among the industrialised countries, Canada perceives a need to create greater opportunities for the public to make inputs in policy-making processes, and the political parties in particular should contribute to increasing the representation of vulnerable groups (e.g., women, disabled persons, aboriginal peoples, etc.) in the House of Commons. Switzerland has also emphasised the need to increase public interest in the major social issues included in the WSSD commitments.

In responses from Eastern European countries, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia suggests that the Assembly could conduct a wider discussion of the Summit's commitments by organising public debates and studies on the relevant issues. The Russian Federation states that the Constitution should be amended to allow for a more efficient role of the Federal Assembly in social policy-making. Parliament would thus increase its influence over the Executive and would have more effective control over the implementation of programmes and measures. The Slovak Republic suggests that issues relating to social development should be discussed in the national parliament and not only in committee.

Jordan, Mali, Namibia and South Africa suggest the need to establish a research unit to improve the quality of the information available to parliament. Niger and Togo suggest setting up parliamentary committees to monitor implementation of the commitments. Niger also proposes an interregional committee of parliaments to deal with the Summit's agenda. According to Ethiopia, parliaments should exchange experiences and increase co-operation. India believes that various mechanisms of parliamentary scrutiny need to be strengthened to make parliament more administratively accountable. Furthermore, national parliaments should study the obstacles they identified in the questionnaire and allocate sufficient funds for population control programmes and other aspects of social development. Namibia believes that members of parliament should increase their contact with "technocrats" to improve the level of information. MPs' visits to project sites would also be useful. Egypt, too, points out that MPs are often not able to identify the priority issues that need to be addressed. Mali and Zambia suggest that proper functioning of their parliaments requires better equipment, in terms of not only technical means (e.g. computers) but also skilled manpower.

Many countries' questionnaire responses point out the lack of co-ordination between social and economic goals and policies. They call for a reorganisation and restructuring of government agencies and parliamentary structures to fulfil their role as promoters of social development. For instance, Niger gives priority to the reorganisation of structures working to promote social development, and urges greater co-ordination between social development and national planning. Turkey calls for the restructuring of the government to better integrate social and economic issues in policy making. The Republic of Korea points out the need for long-term plans to consider both economic growth and social development. Thailand recommends closer co-operation between national legislative and executive branches. The Philippines considers that, due to different budgetary priorities between the Executive and the Parliament, transparency in budget issues and preliminary budget consultations should be promoted. The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia calls for reinforcement and integration of general development, and sectoral strategies and plans.

◆ **Parliamentary proposals for international action**

Diverse proposals have been made in terms of the further international initiatives required, especially in the context of the planned Special Session of the UN General Assembly ("Copenhagen Plus Five"). This Session will take place in June 2000 (five years after the Copenhagen Summit) to assess progress in the implementation of the WSSD commitments. Canada is planning to conduct a five-year review of its achievements, and Denmark is organising a series of seminars to pursue the international dialogue on implementation of Summit commitments. The results and recommendations of the review process will be presented at Copenhagen Plus Five. Belarus is also planning to hold an international conference in 1999 to discuss, among other things, issues related to follow-up of the WSSD commitments.

According to Egypt, Jordan, Mali, Niger and Zambia, a critical issue that needs to be urgently dealt with at the international level is the cancellation of developing countries' foreign debt. Zambia also cites the need to find ways to reduce the negative impact of structural adjustment programmes on the lives of people in poor countries. Niger recommends that discussion of the 20:20 initiative should continue, as should the organisation of round tables with donors to redirect funds towards the social sector. The Republic of Korea exhorts governments and parliaments to engage in a global partnership to maximise the benefits and minimise the risks of globalisation. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia calls for more substantial financial aid and technical support as well as regional co-operation; it also urges international financial organisations to incorporate social goals and instruments in their forms of support to developing countries. The Russian Federation also suggests that there should be an increase in international humanitarian aid. The Philippines considers that it is necessary to establish a more refined monitoring system and to embark in further research on such

issues as external debt, regional peace and stability, human rights, drug and human trafficking, and the improvement of bilateral relations.

Most countries believe that it is important to increase international co-operation in one way or another. Costa Rica pleads for increased technical co-operation. Turkey calls for the inclusion of developing countries in the information superhighways, as well as examination of the positive and negative effects of the expansion in communication and information technologies. Niger states that improved co-ordination at the regional and sub-regional levels is indispensable to fight poverty. Egypt calls for the exchange of experiences among parliaments. Thailand intends to propose a parliamentary meeting prior to Copenhagen Plus Five to discuss relevant issues and make specific suggestions to the international community.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MIDDLE EAST QUESTIONS

Rapporteur: Mr. A. Philippou (Cyprus)

***Report of which the Inter-Parliamentary Council took note at its 164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999)***

1. At its 163rd session (Moscow, September 1998), the Inter-Parliamentary Council decided that the Committee on Middle East Questions would hold its XXIVth session in Brussels during the 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference and report to the Council at its 164th session.
2. The Committee met on 13 and 14 April 1999. It elected Mr. C.E. Ndebele, Speaker of the Parliament of Zimbabwe, as its President and Mr. A. Philippou (Cyprus) as Rapporteur. Mrs. O. Ausdal Starrfelt (Norway) was the third member of the Committee. Mr. Q. Anwar (Indonesia), Mr. Y. Tavernier (France) and Mr. C. Valantin (Senegal) were unable to attend.
3. In view of the ongoing need for a parliamentary dialogue on Middle East questions, the representatives of the Arab Groups (Egypt, Jordan and Palestine) and of Israel agreed to meet together. The President of the Council, Mr. Miguel Angel Martínez, as former Committee member and having recently visited the region, joined the Committee for part of the meeting and gave his views.

Views of the representatives of the Arab Groups and of Israel

4. At the start of the meeting, the parties expressed their sorrow at the death of His Majesty King Hussein of Jordan and praised him as a man who stood for peace, mutual understanding and prosperity in the region.
5. The parties recognised that the peace process was at a standstill; nevertheless, both sides expressed a renewed optimism and, in the course of a frank and open dialogue, also recognised that there was no alternative to that process.
6. Both parties requested the Committee to take note of the positive atmosphere and spirit of understanding that had prevailed in the exchange of views.
7. At this crucial juncture, the parties expressed similar views on the need to address important issues affecting the region such as unemployment, water resources, and housing, so as to avert terrorism and other obstacles to the peace process. Positive references were made in that connection to Israeli efforts to build an industrial park as a concrete effort to provide employment for Palestinians.
8. Both parties expressed their support for the UN-sponsored Bethlehem 2000 initiative and hoped that co-operation would be extended to Nazareth.

9. The Palestinians welcomed the position taken by the European Community earlier in the year, supporting the Palestinian people and calling for a negotiated solution on the basis of existing agreements.

10. The parties reported occasional parliamentary contacts between Israel and the Palestinian Authority, acknowledging that they were personal rather than institutional in nature.

Views and findings of the Committee

11. The members of the Committee welcomed the spirit of co-operation which prevailed throughout the meeting. The Committee recognised that efforts currently under way in the region to put the peace process back on course require the political and economic support of the international community.

12. In that context, the parties expressed the wish to work together in building peace. The Committee called on the parties to broaden the dialogue by including among their members at future Committee meetings representatives from the various political parties in the Knesset and the Palestinian Legislative Council.

13. The Committee calls on the parties to pursue their positive dialogue and report on the concrete steps taken to give their attendance at the Committee a more representative base and to institutionalise dialogue between the Knesset and the Palestinian Authority and on projects to address economic development issues.

14. The Committee strongly urges the international community to provide practical support for the parties' initiatives. The Committee also underlines the importance of the international community's continued economic support for the Palestinians in general, and specifically for the UN-sponsored Bethlehem 2000 initiative.

**PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN
AT THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION**

***Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999)***

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Informed of the work and recommendations of the Gender Partnership Group set up within the Executive Committee⁴,

Recalling that at its 160th session (April 1997), the Inter-Parliamentary Council instructed the Gender Partnership Group to study "*the possibility of establishing in the Union a rule which would apply equally to all delegations failing to include at least one woman among their members and which would decrease by two the number of votes to which those delegations would be entitled at the IPU Conference*",

Recalling that Article 11, paragraph 1 of the Union's Statutes strongly encourages National Groups with women MPs to include at least one woman in their delegation to the Union's Meetings,

Taking into account the proportion of men and women MPs in the delegations to the Brussels Inter-Parliamentary Meetings, and the evolution over the past quarter-century in the Inter-Parliamentary Union with regard to the participation of women MPs in its activities,

Taking note of the proportion of men and women within each of the National Parliaments represented at the Inter-Parliamentary Union, as shown by the data contained on the Union's Internet site (<http://www.ipu.org>), updated to 1 April 1999,

Recalling that the *Universal Declaration on Democracy*, adopted by the Inter-Parliamentary Union in September 1997, states that "*the achievement of democracy presupposes a genuine partnership between men and women in the conduct of the affairs of society in which they work in equality and complementarity, drawing mutual enrichment from their differences*"; further recalling that the Inter-Parliamentary Council proclaimed in April 1992 that "*the concept of democracy will only assume true and dynamic significance when political policies and national legislation are decided upon jointly by men and women with equitable regard for the interests and aptitudes of both halves of the population*",

1. *Notes* that the proportion of women MPs in delegations to the Inter-Parliamentary Meetings has risen steadily on a regular basis to reach nearly 20 per cent at the Brussels

⁴ The Gender Partnership Group is composed of the following parliamentarians: Mrs. Najma Heptulla (India), Vice-President of the Executive Committee, Moderator, Mrs. Barbara Imiolczyk (Poland), Mr. Fernando Solana (Mexico) and Mr. Maurice Melegué Traoré (Burkina Faso).

Meetings, but that nearly 30 per cent of parliaments with women members still fail to include women in their delegations;

2. *Welcomes* the overall positive trend seen in recent years, and *is convinced* that it will continue and will be consolidated and that all Parliaments which come under the provisions of Article 11 of the Statutes will take steps to respect them at future meetings;
3. *Therefore decides* to postpone until its 166th session (April 2000) any decision concerning the imposition of any form of sanction for non-compliance with these provisions;
4. *Notes* that of the Union's 137 Member Parliaments, three have no women among their members, and *notes further* that in one of the countries concerned, women have yet to be granted the right to vote and to stand for election;
5. *Is of the view* that banning women from taking part in the electoral process is no longer tolerable in a modern democracy and that, in all the countries concerned, society as a whole would benefit from women's contribution to the democratic process, which would thus be consolidated accordingly;
6. *Invites* the Parliaments of these countries to take all the necessary steps to enable and encourage women's access to these Parliaments in the near future and, in this connection, *urges* them to resort to the technical support of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, if they deem it appropriate and useful;
7. *Further invites* the Meeting of Women Parliamentarians to authorise the delegations of these Parliaments to follow its work as observers and, as appropriate, to enable them to take part in exchanges of views concerning women's participation in the electoral process and political life, so as to create a dynamic fostering women's political integration in the countries concerned.

**RESULTS OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE ON
"ATTAINING THE WORLD FOOD SUMMIT'S OBJECTIVES
THROUGH A SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY"
(Rome, 29 November - 2 December 1998)**

*Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Bruxelles, 16 April 1999)*

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Having taken note of the results of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference on "Attaining the World Food Summit's objectives through a sustainable development strategy", which was organised by IPU with the support of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and hosted by the Italian Parliament in Rome from 29 November - 2 December 1998,

Recalling that at its 161st session (Cairo, September 1997) the Inter-Parliamentary Council decided to organise a Specialised Inter-Parliamentary Conference in Rome with the aim of reviewing and promoting, at parliamentary level, the implementation of commitments made by the States at the World Food Summit (Rome, November 1996),

Satisfied that the relations of close collaboration and interaction between IPU and FAO were further strengthened in the course of the Conference preparation, thus attesting to the efficiency of the Co-operation Agreement signed between the two Organisations in August 1997,

Believing that the reflection and dialogue started at the Parliamentarians' Day on the occasion of the World Food Summit and continued during the Inter-Parliamentary Conference in Rome should be further pursued by IPU, taking into account the multidimensional nature of food security issues,

1. *Commends* the results of the Specialised Inter-Parliamentary Conference in Rome which fully achieved its aims, as is reflected in its Final Document adopted by consensus at the closing session;
2. *Thanks* the Italian Inter-Parliamentary Group and the Italian authorities for their warm welcome to the delegates and for the excellent working conditions on the premises of the Italian Chamber of Deputies where the Conference deliberated on the first day of its work;
3. *Expresses gratitude* to FAO which hosted the second part of the Conference proceedings and contributed to the success of the Conference in many other ways;
4. *Thanks* the Conference participants, observers and keynote speakers for their efforts to ensure that the Conference was conducted in a constructive and fruitful atmosphere;

5. *Calls on* all National Groups to see to it that the results of the Conference are given proper attention by their respective parliaments and governments, particularly the parliamentary bodies dealing with issues of food and agricultural development, and that the greatest publicity is provided to the Conference recommendations by disseminating them to media, special interest groups and relevant non-governmental organizations;
6. *Endorses* the content of the Conference Final Document, and *urges* national Parliaments to make full use of it with a view to playing a more proactive role in the implementation of State commitments made at the World Food Summit;
7. *Encourages* all National Groups to give practical follow-up to the Conference recommendation that parliaments should harmonise existing laws and, as appropriate, adopt new legislation so as to develop a comprehensive legislative framework conducive to the achievement of food security for all;
8. *Mandates* the IPU Committee for Sustainable Development to consider food security as an integral part of its work and to prepare reports and statements on specific issues relating to food security for the attention of the United Nations system;
9. *Requests* the IPU Committee for Sustainable Development to elaborate proposals on ways of further advancing institutional links between IPU and FAO including the holding of joint events and activities;
10. *Supports* the idea that IPU should work with the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and FAO on normative aspects of the right to food, and *entrusts* the IPU Secretary General with taking practical steps in this regard;
11. *Entrusts* the IPU Secretary General with exploring possibilities for co-operation with the World Trade Organization, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development on trade and financial issues relating to food security.

**AGENDA OF THE
102nd INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE**

(Berlin, 10-16 October 1999)

1. Election of the President and Vice-Presidents of the 102nd Conference
2. Consideration of possible requests for the inclusion of a supplementary item in the Conference agenda
3. General Debate on the political, economic and social situation in the world
4. Contribution of parliaments to ensuring respect for and promoting international humanitarian law on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Geneva Conventions
5. The need to revise the current global financial and economic model

**LIST OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS AND OTHER BODIES TO BE INVITED
TO FOLLOW THE WORK OF THE 102nd CONFERENCE AS OBSERVERS**

Palestine

United Nations
 International Labour Organization (ILO)
 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
 United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
 World Health Organization (WHO)
 World Bank
 International Monetary Fund (IMF)
 International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
 United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)
 World Trade Organization (WTO-OMC)

Council of Europe
 International Organization for Migration (IOM)
 Latin American Economic System (LAES)
 League of Arab States
 Organization of African Unity (OAU)
 Organization of American States (OAS)

Amazonian Parliament
 Arab Inter-Parliamentary Union
 ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Organization (AIPO)
 Asian and Pacific Parliamentarians' Union
 Assemblée parlementaire de la Francophonie
 Assembly of the Western European Union (WEU)
 Association of European Parliamentarians for (Southern) Africa (AWEPA)
 Baltic Assembly
 Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA)
 Consultative Council of the Arab Maghreb Union
 Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of the Commonwealth of Independent States
 Inter-Parliamentary Council against Antisemitism
 Nordic Council
 Parliamentary Assembly of the Black Sea Economic Co-operation
 Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE
 Parliamentary Association for Euro-Arab Co-operation (PAEAC)
 Union of African Parliaments (UAP)

Amnesty International
 International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)
 International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
 World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA)

FUTURE MEETINGS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

Seminar on relations between majority and minority parties in African Parliaments	LIBREVILLE (Gabon) 17-19 May 1999
Preparatory Committee of the Joint UNESCO/IPU Meeting on the theme " <i>Perspectives on Democracy: How Women Make a Difference</i> "	PARIS (UNESCO Headquarters) 12 June 1999
Working Group on a refounding Charter for the Union	ARLES (France) 5 - 7 July 1999
86 th session of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians	GENEVA (IPU Headquarters) July 1999
Meeting of IPU National Groups from the Asia-Pacific Region, with IPU sponsorship	ULAN BATOR (Mongolia) 26 - 31 July 1999
II nd meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the Conference of Presiding Officers of National Parliaments	RABAT (Morocco) 8 - 9 September 1999
102nd Inter-Parliamentary Conference and related meetings	BERLIN (Germany) 8 - 16 October 1999
- Executive Committee (229 th session)	8, 9 and 14 October
- Gender Partnership Group	8 and 9 October
- Meeting of Women Parliamentarians	10 October
- Co-ordinating Committee of Women Parliamentarians	10 and 15 October
- Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (87 th session)	10 - 15 October
- Committee to Promote Respect for International Humanitarian Law	11 and 15 October
- Inter-Parliamentary Council (165 th session)	11 and 16 October
- Inter-Parliamentary Conference	11 - 15 October
- Group of Facilitators for Cyprus	12 and 14 October
- Committee on Middle East Questions	13 and 14 October
- Meeting of Parties to the CSCM	13 October
Meeting of parliamentarians attending the 54 th session of the UN General Assembly	NEW YORK (UN Headquarters) 25 October 1999
Debate in the United Nations General Assembly on UN-IPU co-operation	NEW YORK (UN Headquarters) 27 October 1999

Information Seminar on the Functioning of the Union (English language)	GENEVA (IPU Headquarters) October/November 1999
Third International Forum on " <i>Parliaments and Local Authorities: Tourism Policy-Makers</i> ", organised by the World Tourism Organization and hosted by the Brazilian Inter-Parliamentary Group with IPU sponsorship	RIO DE JANEIRO (Brazil) 24 - 26 November 1999
Second Meeting of Parliamentarians on the Convention to Combat Desertification, organised by the Secretariat of the Convention, with IPU sponsorship	RECIFE (Brazil) November 1999
Forum on the theme " <i>Perspectives on Democracy: How Women Make a Difference</i> "	PARIS (UNESCO Headquarters) 1-3 December 1999
88 th session of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians	GENEVA (IPU Headquarters) January 2000
Committee for Sustainable Development	GENEVA (IPU Headquarters) March 2000
103rd Inter-Parliamentary Conference and related meetings	AMMAN (Jordan) April/May 2000
III rd Inter-Parliamentary Conference on Security and Co-operation in the Mediterranean	France May 2000
Tripartite Meeting on " <i>Democracy through Partnership between Men and Women</i> " on the occasion of the " <i>Beijing+5</i> " Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly (5-9 June 2000)	NEW YORK (UN Headquarters) 1-2 June 2000
Parliaments' Day on the occasion of the " <i>Copenhagen +5</i> " Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly (26-30 June 2000)	GENEVA (UN Office) June 2000
Conference of Presiding Officers of National Parliaments	NEW YORK (UN Headquarters) 18 September 2000
104th Inter-Parliamentary Conference and related meetings	JAKARTA (Indonesia) October 2000

**PRACTICAL MODALITIES OF THE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
OF OBSERVERS AT IPU MEETINGS**

*Approved by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Brussels, 11 April 1999)*

- ◆ As in the past, bodies to which observer status has been granted by the UN General Assembly and international organisations can be invited as observers to IPU meetings. International organisations are understood to include (a) organisations of the United Nations system, (b) regional inter-governmental organisations, (c) regional or geo-political parliamentary assemblies or associations, and (d) world-wide non-governmental organisations.
- ◆ The status of observer can only be granted to those inter-parliamentary organisations which have an official status and whose general objectives and working methods are shared by the Union.
- ◆ The current practice will be maintained whereby a distinction is made between those observers invited on a regular basis and others on a "one-off" basis in the light of the items placed on the agenda of a Conference.
- ◆ Observers will be entitled to register a maximum of two delegates to IPU statutory meetings. However, each programme and organ of the United Nations will be allowed to send one delegate. Seating arrangements at IPU statutory meetings will be made accordingly.
- ◆ Observers will be entitled to register one speaker only in plenary debates of the IPU statutory Conference and its Study Committees. However, each programme and organ of the United Nations will be allowed to register one speaker each.
- ◆ Observers will not enjoy the right of reply or the right to raise points of order.
- ◆ In the General Debate of the statutory Conference, the speaking time of observers will be limited to five minutes. Some flexibility will be shown to executive heads of organisations of the United Nations system who wish to address the Union.
- ◆ Observers will not enjoy voting rights and the right to present candidatures.
- ◆ Representatives of international organisations having particular expertise in a subject considered by the statutory Conference may be invited by the Presidents of Study Committees, with the authorisation of the Committee, to be present in an advisory capacity to provide technical advice, if need be, during the work of a drafting committee.
- ◆ Observers cannot present memoranda and draft resolutions. They may however make information material available on the special table set aside for this purpose.
- ◆ International organisations having special competence for an item placed on the Conference agenda may be invited by the Secretary General to provide an information document on the item.

- ◆ Observers may be invited by the President to address the Inter-Parliamentary Council in exceptional circumstances only.
- ◆ An evaluation of the situation of observers will be made every four years. Such a periodic review will be undertaken by the Executive Committee on a dual basis: (i) a factual note by the Secretariat on the actual participation of each observer in the period under review, and (ii) the views of the observers themselves regarding their interest in being represented at IPU meetings, on the basis of a short enquiry designed to solicit their views.

BURUNDI

CASE N° BDI/01 - SYLVESTRE MFAYOKURERA

CASE N° BDI/05 - INNOCENT NDIKUMANA

CASE N° BDI/06 - GÉRARD GAHUNGU

CASE N° BDI/07 - BIBIANE NTAMUTUMBA

CASE N° BDI/29 - PAUL SIRAHENDA

CASE N° BDI/02 - N. NDIHOKUBWAYO

CASE N° BDI/03 - L. NTIBAYAZI

CASE N° BDI/08 - A. NAHINDAVYI NDANGA

CASE N° BDI/09 - I. KUBWAYO

CASE N° BDI/11 - I. BAPFEGUHITA

CASE N° BDI/12 - P. NIZIGIRE

CASE N° BDI/13 - P. BURARAME

CASE N° BDI/14 - S. BIYOMBERA

CASE N° BDI/15 - J. NDEZAKO

CASE N° BDI/16 - D. SERWENDA

CASE N° BDI/17 - A. NTIRANDEKURA

CASE N° BDI/18 - D. BIGIRIMANA

CASE N° BDI/19 - T. SIBOMANA

CASE N° BDI/20 - T. BUKURU

CASE N° BDI/21 - S. MUREKAMBANZE

CASE N° BDI/22 - G. NDUWIMANA

CASE N° BDI/23 - C. MANIRAMONA

CASE N° BDI/24 - S. NTAKHOMENYEREYE

CASE N° BDI/25 - D. NGARUKIRINKA

CASE N° BDI/27 - N. NTAHOMUKIYE

CASE N° BDI/28 - C. BUCUMI

CASE N° BDI/30 - A. KIRARA

CASE N° BDI/31 - J.-P. NTIMPIRONGREA

CASE N° BDI/26 - NEPHTALI NDIKUMANA

CASE N° BDI/33 - AUGUSTIN NZOJIBWAMI

***Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999)***

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Referring to the outline of the case, as contained in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/164/13(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 163rd session (September 1998) concerning the case of the above-mentioned parliamentarians,

Taking account of the information supplied by the President of the National Assembly at the hearing held on the occasion of the 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference (Brussels, April 1999),

Recalling that Mr. Mfayokurera, Mr. Ndikumana, Mr. Gahungu and Ms. Ntamutumba, all of whom were elected in 1993 on a FRODEBU ticket, were assassinated on 20 August 1994, 16 December 1995 and in April and May 1996, respectively; *also recalling* the failed attempts on the lives of Mr. Ndiokubwayo and Mr. Ntibayazi in September 1994 and September 1995, respectively; *recalling further* the « disappearance » of Deputy Sirahenda on 1 August 1997 who, according to eyewitness reports, was abducted by military personnel in the market town of Mutobo and taken to Mabanda camp, where he was reportedly extrajudicially executed,

Considering that, according to the President of the National Assembly, the file on Mr. Mfayokurera was shelved for want of evidence and that the suspect was released; that the file on Mr. Ndikumana (RMPG 1548/Si) was pending before the Criminal Chamber of the Bujumbura Court and would be heard publicly for the first time on 5 May 1999; that, however, the accused was at large; that the file on Mr. Gahungu (RMPG 1378/NT.T) was still pending and would soon be heard in open court,

Recalling that, according to information supplied by the Minister of Human Rights on 26 March 1998, the investigations into the murder of Ms. Ntamutumba have not permitted identification of the attackers, so that the case has been provisionally shelved,

Recalling also that in the case of Mr. Ndiwokubwayo the attackers were arrested but later released by the judge,

Considering that, according to the «*Agreement on the Political Platform of the Transition Regime*» and the «*Constitutional Act of Transition*» of 6 June 1998, the transitional institutions are in particular entrusted with combating impunity for crimes and promoting equitable and reconciliatory justice; *mindful* in this connection of the recommendation made by the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in Burundi in his report to the 53rd session of the General Assembly (A/53/490) emphasising «*the imperative need to formulate adequate strategies for ending impunity ...*»,

Considering that, according to the President of the National Assembly, three charges are still pending against Mr. Nzojibwami, who has been elected second Vice-President of the National Assembly: one offence relating to Mr. Nzojibwami's statements on the BBC, the second to a military uprising in the province of which he was the Governor at that time and of which he was reportedly aware, and the third to the election of a person in exile, Mr. Minani, to the presidency of FRODEBU at its Congress in 1997,

Recalling that, in January 1997, Mr. Nzojibwami denounced on the BBC the policy of forced regrouping of the population in what he called concentration camps; *recalling* in this connection the recommendation made at that time by the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in Burundi (A/52/505) and by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights (E/CN.4/1997/150) to demolish and dismantle the regroupment camps,

Recalling that Mr. Nephtali Ndikumana, who has been in exile since August 1996, was reportedly found guilty *in absentia* on 7 March 1997 of incitement to ethnic hatred for having, in May 1994, made a statement alleging massacres and ethnic cleansing of those who had been and were supporting FRODEBU; that he made it on behalf of the FRODEBU parliamentary group, whose Vice-President he was at the time; *considering* that, according to the President of the National Assembly, he has not yet been sentenced and that the case is to be heard shortly,

Recalling also that the United Nations Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, in his report to the 52nd session of the United Nations Human Rights Commission, denounced grave violations of the right to life reportedly committed by the army in the period mentioned in the above FRODEBU statement,

Recalling that, in the wake of the military coup d'Etat of July 1996, many FRODEBU MPs went into exile for fear of their lives; *considering* that as part of the negotiations concerning the establishment of the transition regime, representations were initially made with a view to repatriation of the parliamentarians in exile, some of whom have indeed returned; that, however, as the President of the National Assembly stated at the hearing held at the Brussels Conference, it had also been agreed that those who failed to return by the stipulated deadline would be replaced by their substitutes; consequently, those who return now will be placed on the list of substitutes,

1. *Thanks* the President of the National Assembly for his co-operation and the information he supplied; *regrets*, however, that the Minister for Human Rights, Institutional Reform and Relations with the National Assembly has not replied to the requests for information addressed to him;
2. *Deeply regrets* that to date the investigations into the assassination of the MPs concerned has been unavailing, and *urges* the competent authorities to make every effort, in conformity with their commitment to combat impunity, to identify and bring to justice those responsible for the murders and attempts on the lives of the MPs concerned, in particular when eyewitness testimony is available and, as in the case of Mr. Ndiokubwayo, the culprits are known since they had formerly been arrested;
3. *Remains concerned* at the prosecution of Mr. Nzojibwami and Mr. Ndikumana, whose statements - particularly in view of the subject-matter of United Nations documents regarding the human rights situation in Burundi - are undoubtedly covered by their freedom of speech;
4. *Regrets* that the MPs still in exile will be ranked as substitutes in the event of their return;
5. *Stresses once again* that a more marked effort to combat impunity, one of the priorities of the transition regime, would most clearly reflect the resolve of the authorities to restore the rule of law;
6. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the competent authorities and to maintain contact with the United Nations bodies and commissions dealing with the human rights situation in Burundi;
7. *Requests* the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians to continue examining the case and report to it at its next session (October 1999).

CAMBODIA

CASE N° CMBD/01 - SAM RAINSY
CASE N° CMBD/02 - SON SOUBERT
CASE N° CMBD/03 - POL HAM

CASE N° CMBD/04 - SON SANN
CASE N° CMBD/05 - KEM SOKHA

***Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999)***

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Referring to the outline of the case, as contained in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/164/13(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 163rd session (September 1998) concerning the case of Mr. Sam Rainsy and that of Mr. Son Soubert, Mr. Pol Ham, Mr. Son Sann and Mr. Kem Sokha, of Cambodia,

Considering the observations made by the President of the National Assembly of Cambodia, Prince Ranariddh, at the Committee's hearing of the Cambodian delegation held on the occasion of the 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference (Brussels, April 1999),

Recalling that the above parliamentarians were elected in the 1993 elections organised by UNTAC (United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia); that Mr. Sam Rainsy was elected on a FUNCINPEC ticket and the other four MPs on a BLDP (Buddhist Liberal Democratic Party) ticket,

Recalling that FUNCINPEC, the winner of the elections, formed a coalition with the Cambodia People's Party (CPP), the runner-up; that Mr. Sam Rainsy was expelled from his party in May 1995 and subsequently from the National Assembly; that in November 1995 he founded a new political party, the Khmer Nation Party (KNP); that the BLDP split in 1995 into two factions; that the one headed by Information Minister Mr. Ieng Mouly obtained government recognition, while the other faction, led by Mr. Son Sann, suffered a grenade attack when attempting to hold a congress in October 1995; that in March 1997 an authorised and peaceful demonstration of the KNP led by Mr. Sam Rainsy was also the victim of a grenade attack, resulting in at least 16 dead and over 100 injured,

Recalling that the investigations into both attacks have so far been unavailing,

Bearing in mind that in his successive reports to the General Assembly and to the Commission on Human Rights, the United Nations Special Representative of the Secretary-General on the situation of human rights in Cambodia consistently stated that the problem of impunity was one of the key issues of the establishment of the rule of law in the country, impunity in this particular case meaning that those who violated human rights - in particular military personnel, police, the gendarmes and other members of the armed forces - were neither arrested nor prosecuted, even though the authorities and the public at large were fully aware of their guilt,

Recalling the observation by the Cambodian delegation to the 99th Inter-Parliamentary Conference (April 1998) that the current priority was the preparation of the elections; and that the investigations in question would be fully addressed once the elections were over,

Recalling the violent ousting of First Prime Minister Prince Ranariddh in July 1997, resulting in scores of individuals loyal to Prince Ranariddh and his political party being extrajudicially executed without anybody having so far been brought to justice; that others, including the above former or incumbent parliamentarians concerned, were forced into exile; that, in November 1997, Mr. Sam Rainsy returned to Cambodia followed in early 1998 by the other MPs in question in an attempt to prepare for the July 1998 elections,

Noting that in the legislative elections of July 1998 only Mr. Sam Rainsy was re-elected among the MPs concerned, while Mr. Son San did not stand for re-election; *noting also* that the election results were disputed by the opposition, which made accusations of vote fraud and manipulation of the parliamentary seat allocation formula,

Noting further that the new National Assembly, following post-electoral conflict and violence, finally convened at the end of September 1998, and that in November 1998 it swore in the new Government; that Mr. Sam Rainsy now has the official status of leader of the opposition; *recalling*, however, that, subsequent to a grenade attack on Mr. Hun Sen's home on 7 September 1998, a warrant was issued for the arrest of Mr. Sam Rainsy and that he escaped arrest owing to United Nations protection,

Considering that on 10 September 1998, while according to the source he still enjoyed parliamentary immunity, Mr. Kem Sokha was prevented from leaving the country; that, subsequently, an arrest warrant was issued against him and he was summoned to an interrogation on criminal activities he allegedly committed and that he went underground for fear of his safety; that, on 15 December 1998, he resurfaced and attended a court summons at which he was questioned for two hours in connection with charges of incitement to violence, destruction of property, racism and other criminal acts, all of which he denies,

Considering that Mr. Kem Sokha joined FUNCINPEC and was appointed one of its members in the Senate; that, according to the President of the National Assembly, he has been cleared of any charges and enjoys full liberty; that likewise Mr. Son Sann and Mr. Pol Ham joined FUNCINPEC and occupy important functions within it,

Considering that Mr. Son Soubert was appointed a member of the Constitutional Council,

Noting that in letters dated 8 and 9 April 1999 respectively, Mr. Son Soubert, on behalf of his former parliamentary colleagues, and Mr. Sam Rainsy expressed their wish that the Inter-Parliamentary Union continue examining their cases with a view to finally identifying those responsible for the grenade attacks and bringing them to justice,

Considering that, according to the President of the National Assembly, the Programme of Common Politics which FUNCINPEC concluded on 23 November 1998 with its coalition partner, the Cambodia People's Party (CPP), provides for combating impunity and for investigations into the crimes of the past, a point which is also part of the General Programme of Politics which the Prime Minister presented to the National Assembly on 30 March 1999,

Bearing in mind that, in the resolution it adopted at its 54th session on the situation of human rights in Cambodia, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights expressed grave

concern at the situation of impunity in Cambodia and stressed, *inter alia*, that bringing to justice those responsible for human rights violations remained a matter of critical and urgent priority,

1. *Thanks* the President of the National Assembly for his co-operation and is *gratified* at his determination both to guarantee the rights of the parliamentary opposition and to ensure that impunity no longer prevails in Cambodia;
2. *Earnestly hopes* that the newly elected Parliament will do its utmost to combat impunity and ensure respect for human rights, and *trusts* therefore that the attempts on the lives of the former and incumbent MPs concerned will no longer remain unpunished;
3. *Would appreciate* information on the steps the National Assembly plans to take or has already taken to combat impunity, and in particular to ensure that the past grenade attacks on Mr. Sam Rainsy, Mr. Kem Sokha and their former parliamentary colleagues do not remain unpunished, and *wishes to ascertain* any progress achieved in the investigations under way;
4. *Would appreciate* confirmation that the arrest warrants issued in autumn 1998 against Mr. Sam Rainsy and Mr. Kem Sokha have both been withdrawn and that no proceedings are under way against them;
5. *Recalls* that it is the duty of the State to ensure the safety and physical integrity of the persons living in its territory;
6. *Reaffirms* that impunity can only be an incentive to the repetition of crime and poses a major threat to democracy and respect for human rights;
7. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the parliamentary and other competent authorities, inviting them to provide the requested information;
8. *Requests* the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians to continue examining the case and report to it at its next session (October 1999).

CASE N° CHD/01 - NGARLÉJY YORONGAR - CHAD***Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999)***

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Referring to the resolution adopted at its 163rd session (September 1998) concerning Mr. Ngarléjy Yorongar, of Chad, whereby, in the light of a number of serious concerns, the Council considered the sending of a Committee delegation to Chad at the kind invitation of the country's authorities,

Having studied the detailed report of the delegation which visited Chad from 21 to 27 November 1998,

Having taken note of communications dated 28 January and 3 February 1999, supplemented by oral information on 4 February 1999, from the Minister of Justice of the Republic of Chad announcing that Mr. Yorongar had been pardoned and consequently released on 4 February and that he would be resuming his seat in the National Assembly,

Having also taken note of Decree N° 047/PR/MJ/99, which states: « *Article 1: On humanitarian grounds, a pardon is granted to Yorongar Ngarléjy who had been sentenced to 3 years' imprisonment and a fine of 500,000 CFA francs by decision N° 372 of 24 December 1998 of the Court of Appeal, and to Yaya Batit Ali who had been sentenced by decision N° 55/99 to 1 year's imprisonment and a fine of 25,000 CFA francs; Article 2: This pardon is without prejudice to the rights of the State* »,

Considering that, according to the explanations supplied by the Director of the Civil Cabinet of the Presidency of the Republic on 18 March 1999, the notion of « *droits de l'Etat* » (State rights or dues) in Article 2 of that decree means that the pardon granted Mr. Yorongar does not cancel the fine imposed on him or the costs he is required to pay, and that the sentence will stay on his police record,

Considering that, after his release, Mr. Yorongar and his home were reportedly once more subjected to close surveillance by National Security Agency personnel; *considering further* that, according to Mr. Yorongar, the President of the Republic and the Minister of Justice gave him to understand that he would in future have to keep silent if he wished to avoid trouble,

Noting finally that Mr. Yorongar is at present in Europe for medical treatment and that, according to the sources, he will shortly be returning to Chad,

1. *Takes note with great interest* of the delegation's report and *endorses* its conclusions and recommendations; *warmly thanks* the delegation for the manner in which it fulfilled its mandate;

2. *Extends special thanks* to the parliamentary, governmental and judicial authorities of the Republic of Chad for the welcome they gave the delegation and the facilities and authorisations they afforded it, including permission to meet Mr. Yorongar at N'Djamena central prison without witnesses and without time constraints or any other restrictions, and for the precise and detailed information they supplied to it;
3. *Also thanks* all those persons and organisations that provided the delegation with support and information;
4. *Takes note with satisfaction* of the pardon granted Mr. Yorongar and of his release in line with the recommendations of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, which release will enable him to resume his parliamentary activities;
5. *Nevertheless notes* that on leaving prison Mr. Yorongar was reportedly once more placed under surveillance and advised to remain silent;
6. *Decides* to close public examination of this case; *nevertheless requests* the Committee to continue examining it under its confidential procedure pending Mr. Yorongar's return to Chad and resumption of parliamentary activities.

CASE N° CO/01 - PEDRO NEL JIMÉNEZ OBANDO)
CASE N° CO/02 - LEONARDO POSADA PEDRAZA)
CASE N° CO/03 - OCTAVIO VARGAS CUÉLLAR) COLOMBIA
CASE N° CO/04 - PEDRO LUIS VALENCIA GIRALDO)
CASE N° CO/06 - BERNARDO JARAMILLO OSSA)
CASE N° CO/08 - MANUEL CEPEDA VARGAS)

***Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999)***

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Referring to the outline of the case, as contained in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/164/13(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 163rd session (September 1998) concerning the case of Mr. Pedro Nel Jiménez Obando, Mr. Leonardo Posada Pedraza, Mr. Octavio Vargas Cuéllar, Mr. Pedro Luis Valencia Giraldo, Mr. Bernardo Jaramillo Ossa and Mr. Manuel Cepeda Vargas, of Colombia,

Taking account of the information provided by the Office of the High Counsellor for Human Rights, dated 25 February 1999,

Also taking account of the observations supplied by members of the Colombian delegation on the occasion of the 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference (Brussels, April 1999),

Considering that, according to the information at present before it, (i) the investigation into the murder of Mr. Posada Pedraza was suspended in April 1996 but new evidence has since emerged which permits reactivation of the case; (ii) on 12 May 1998, the National Director of Prosecution ordered the Regional Director of Prosecution of Villavicencio to reopen the investigation conducted by the now defunct Penal Investigation Chamber N° 10 into the killing of Mr. Jiménez Obando for the purpose of entrusting the Technical Investigation Corps with pursuing inquiries to identify the culprits; that, registered under N° 5021, the preliminary investigation is being conducted by Examining Judge 16, who is seeking new evidence; (iii) the investigation in the case of Mr. Vargas Cuéllar remains suspended since no fresh evidence has arisen that would permit its reopening; (iv) preliminary investigations registered under N° 4298 at the Regional Prosecutor's Office in Medellín are still under way in the case of Mr. Luis Valencia; (v) the prosecution was about to close the investigation in the case of Mr. Jaramillo Ossa; (vi) Mr. Carlos Castaño Gil, the head of the paramilitary groups of Córdoba and Urabá, Mr. Justo Gil Zúñiga Labrador and Mr. Hernando Medina Camacho, army sergeants in the 9th Brigade, have been formally accused of the murder of Senator Cepeda Vargas and the latter two have been remanded in custody,

Considering also that, according to one of the sources, the judgment in this case is expected in two months' time; *considering nevertheless* the fears of the source making mention of death threats against the Prosecutor in this case and of the abduction of the wife and daughter of the main witness in this case,

Recalling that Mr. Carlos Castaño Gil is wanted for the murder of Senators Jaramillo and Cepeda; that a « *Search Squad for private justice groups* » was set up in December 1997 with a mandate, *inter alia*, to act in support of the Fiscalía General in executing arrest warrants,

Noting that, in her report of 9 March 1998 on the work of the field office in Colombia, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights urged the Colombian Government *inter alia* to « ... *conduct independent and exhaustive investigations into all violations of the right to life, bring the culprits to justice and properly compensate their victims in order to put an end to the spiral of violence and impunity* »,

1. *Thanks* the Office of the High Counsellor for Human Rights for the information supplied;
2. *Also thanks* the Colombian delegation to the 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference for its co-operation;
3. *Notes with satisfaction* that, in the case of the murder of Senator Cepeda, the judgment is to be pronounced shortly; *nevertheless* expresses its grave concern at the threats reportedly made against the Prosecutor in this case and the abduction of the wife and daughter of the main witness;
4. *Urges* the authorities to take all necessary measures to guarantee the security of persons involved in this trial, to ensure that persons abducted are released and to bring the culprits to justice, as is their duty;
5. *Reiterates its wish* to receive information about any steps taken to ensure the execution of the arrest warrants issued against Mr. Carlos Castaño Gil and the efforts undertaken to this end by the « *Search Squad for private justice groups* » set up in December 1997;
6. *Takes note with satisfaction* of the pledge given by the Colombian delegation that it would inquire into the progress of the investigations in the other cases and ensure that the National Congress was informed of the Union's concerns regarding those cases;
7. *Requests* the Secretary General to bring this decision to the attention of the Colombian parliamentary authorities and of the Office of the High Counsellor for Human Rights;
8. *Requests* the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians to continue examining the case and report to it at its next session (October 1999).

CASE N° CO/09 - HERNAN MOTTA MOTTA) COLOMBIA
CASE N° CO/10 - NELSON VELORIA)

*Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
 (Brussels, 16 April 1999)*

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Referring to the outline of the case, as contained in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/164/13(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 163rd session (September 1998) concerning the case of Senator Hernán Motta Motta and Congressman Nelson Veloria, of Colombia,

Noting that the investigation launched in 1995 into death threats against Senator Motta has still not reached any conclusion, in common with the preliminary investigation (N° 32695) concerning the allegations of violations of the human rights of members and sympathisers of the Colombian Communist Party and the Patriotic Union lodged on 29 January 1998 by Senator Motta, among others,

Noting that the death threats against Mr. Veloria have, according to the Office of the Presidential Adviser for Human Rights, been investigated in order to meet the concerns of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, but that Mr. Veloria has not replied to inquiries as to whether he wishes the Union to continue examining his case,

Noting that the Colombian authorities contacted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians have not supplied the Committee with any fresh information,

Having nevertheless heard the delegation of Colombia to the 101st Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

1. *Notes* that Mr. Motta, who is at present living outside Colombia, has signified that he wishes examination of his case to continue in order to identify and punish those responsible for the death threats against him; *considers* that such a request is in line with the Union's action to combat impunity;
2. *Notes* that, on the other hand, the fact that Mr. Veloria has failed to reply to the repeated inquiries addressed to him seems to indicate conclusively that he does not feel it necessary that his case should continue to be examined, and *decides therefore* to close the file where he is concerned;
3. *Thanks* the delegation of Colombia for its diligent co-operation and *is confident* that, as it pledged before the Committee, it will take the necessary steps both to make known the precise progress of the investigations and to inform the National Congress of the Union's concerns regarding the risks of impunity;
4. *Requests* the Secretary General to continue gathering information on Mr. Motta's case, and *invites* the Committee to report to it on the case at its next session (October 1999).

COLOMBIA

- CASE N° CO/11 - JULIO ACOSTA BERNAL
 CASE N° CO/12 - ALONSO ACOSTA OSIO
 CASE N° CO/13 - RAFAEL ACOSTA
 CASE N° CO/14 - PABLO EMIRO AGÁMEZ
 CASE N° CO/15 - F. LUIS ALMARIO ROJAS
 CASE N° CO/16 - JOSÉ G. ALVARADO R.
 CASE N° CO/17 - JAVIER ALVAREZ M.
 CASE N° CO/18 - JAIME ARANGO PEDRAZA
 CASE N° CO/19 - ALVARO ARAÚJO C.
 CASE N° CO/20 - OSCAR ARIAS C.
 CASE N° CO/21 - JOSÉ ARISTIDES ANDRADE
 CASE N° CO/22 - JULIO BAHAMÓN V.
 CASE N° CO/23 - ORLANDO BELTRÁN C.
 CASE N° CO/24 - EDUARDO M. BENÍTEZ
 CASE N° CO/25 - JAIRO BERRÍO
 CASE N° CO/26 - NUBIA BRAND H.
 CASE N° CO/27 - GUILLERMO BRITO G.
 CASE N° CO/28 - TOMÁS CAICEDO H.
 CASE N° CO/29 - HELÍ CALA LÓPEZ
 CASE N° CO/30 - LÁZARO CALDERÓN G.
 CASE N° CO/31 - JOSÉ A. CARVAJAL M.
 CASE N° CO/32 - ISABEL CELIS YÁÑEZ
 CASE N° CO/33 - JUAN JOSÉ CHAUX M.
 CASE N° CO/34 - JAIRO CHAVARRIAGA W.
 CASE N° CO/35 - MICAEL COTES MEJÍA
 CASE N° CO/36 - COIN CRAWFORD
 CASE N° CO/37 - CIRO CRISPÍN L.
 CASE N° CO/38 - ALFREDO CUELLO DÁVILA
 CASE N° CO/39 - MARTHA DANIELS G.
 CASE N° CO/40 - JOSÉ DÁVILA ARMENTA
 CASE N° CO/41 - JUSTO GUZMÁN N.
 CASE N° CO/42 - MIGUEL DE LA ESPRIELLA
 CASE N° CO/43 - TOMÁS DEVIA LOZANO
 CASE N° CO/44 - LUÍS DUQUE GARCÍA
 CASE N° CO/45 - RAMÓN ELEJALDE A.
 CASE N° CO/46 - EDUARDO ENRIQUEZ M.
 CASE N° CO/47 - YOLIMA ESPINOSA
 CASE N° CO/48 - JULIO GALLARDO A.
 CASE N° CO/49 - JAIRO GANEN BUELVAS
 CASE N° CO/50 - ALBINO GARCÍA F.
 CASE N° CO/51 - FRANKLIN GARCÍA R.
 CASE N° CO/52 - JESÚS GARCÍA V.
 CASE N° CO/53 - GUILLERMO GAVIRIA Z.
 CASE N° CO/54 - JORGE GÓMEZ CELIS
 CASE N° CO/55 - JORGE GÓNGORA A.
 CASE N° CO/56 - JOSÉ OSCAR GONZÁLEZ G.
 CASE N° CO/57 - JAIME GONZÁLEZ M.
 CASE N° CO/58 - RAFAEL GUZMÁN N.
 CASE N° CO/59 - BARLAHÁN HENAO H.
 CASE N° CO/60 - FERNANDO HERNÁNDEZ V.
 CASE N° CO/61 - GERMÁN HUERTAS C.
 CASE N° CO/62 - OSCAR CELIO JIMÉNEZ
 CASE N° CO/63 - OCTAVIO Z. JARAMILLO Z.
 CASE N° CO/64 - HAROLD LEÓN B.
 CASE N° CO/65 - JOSÉ LINAS R.
 CASE N° CO/66 - ALFONSO LÓPEZ COSSIO
 CASE N° CO/67 - JORGE LOZANO O.
 CASE N° CO/68 - CARLOS LUCIO LOPEZ
 CASE N° CO/69 - JOSÉ R. RICAURTE A.
 CASE N° CO/70 - JOSÉ MAYA BURBANO
 CASE N° CO/71 - JOSÉ MAYA GARCIA
 CASE N° CO/72 - JUAN J. MEDINA BARRIOS
 CASE N° CO/73 - M. MEJÍA MARULANDA
 CASE N° CO/74 - ZULIA MENA GARCÍA
 CASE N° CO/75 - JORGE MENDIETA P.
 CASE N° CO/76 - ELIÉCER MENESES L.
 CASE N° CO/77 - ERNESTO MESA ARANGO
 CASE N° CO/78 - HEYNE MOGOLLÓN M.
 CASE N° CO/79 - JULIO MORA ACOSTA
 CASE N° CO/80 - NORBERTO MORALES B.
 CASE N° CO/81 - VIVIANE MORALES H.
 CASE N° CO/82 - ROBERTO MOYA ÁNGEL
 CASE N° CO/83 - JORGE OLAYA LUCENA
 CASE N° CO/84 - GRACIELA ORTÍZ DE M.
 CASE N° CO/85 - ALVARO N. ORDÓÑEZ V.
 CASE N° CO/86 - RUBÉN OROZCO P.
 CASE N° CO/87 - CARLOS OVIEDO ALFARO
 CASE N° CO/88 - TARQUINO PACHECO C.
 CASE N° CO/89 - AMÉRICO PELÁEZ C.
 CASE N° CO/90 - EMMA PELÁEZ F.
 CASE N° CO/91 - ROBERTO PÉREZ SANTOS
 CASE N° CO/92 - JORGE PÉREZ ALVARADO
 CASE N° CO/93 - TITO PÉREZ PÉREZ
 CASE N° CO/94 - CARLOS PINEDA G.
 CASE N° CO/95 - ANTONIO PINILLOS A.
 CASE N° CO/96 - EVELIO RAMÍREZ M.
 CASE N° CO/97 - LORENZO RIVERA H.
 CASE N° CO/98 - MIGUEL ROA VANEGAS
 CASE N° CO/99 - CARLINA RODRÍGUEZ
 CASE N° CO/100 - JULIO CÉSAR RODRÍGUEZ
 CASE N° CO/101 - SALOMÓN SAADE A.
 CASE N° CO/102 - FRANCO SALAZAR B.
 CASE N° CO/103 - DARIO SARAVIA GÓMEZ
 CASE N° CO/104 - LUÍS SERRANO SILVA
 CASE N° CO/105 - JUAN SILVA HAAD
 CASE N° CO/106 - FERNANDO TELLO D.
 CASE N° CO/107 - JAIME TORRES E.
 CASE N° CO/108 - ÉDGAR TORRES M.
 CASE N° CO/109 - LUÍS VALENCIA DÍAZ
 CASE N° CO/110 - AGUSTÍN VALENCIA
 CASE N° CO/111 - MARIO VARÓN OLARTE
 CASE N° CO/112 - FRANCISCO VELÁSQUEZ B.
 CASE N° CO/113 - WILLIAM VELEZ MESA
 CASE N° CO/114 - AUGUSTO VIDAL P.
 CASE N° CO/115 - BASILIO VILLAMIZAR T.
 CASE N° CO/116 - HERNANDO ZAMBRANO L.
 CASE N° CO/117 - ZORAIDA ZAMBRANO L.
 CASE N° CO/118 - R. ZAPATA MÚÑOZ
 CASE N° CO/119 - OCTAVIO ZAPATA R.

***Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999)***

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Referring to the outline of the case, as contained in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/164/13(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 163rd session (September 1998) concerning the case of the above-mentioned incumbent and former parliamentarians of Colombia,

Recalling that the 109 persons concerned were all members of the former House of Representatives sitting from 1994 to 1998, of whom 47 were re-elected in 1998,

Recalling that in February 1996 the House of Representatives was seized of a complaint of the Prosecutor General (*Fiscalía General de la Nación*) against the then President of the Republic, Dr. Ernesto Samper Pizano seeking, in conformity with the Constitution, its consent to the institution of judicial proceedings against him; that, after having conducted an investigation, the House of Representatives, on 12 June 1996, by a vote of 111 representatives for and 43 against, decided in favour of a preclusion of the investigation against President Samper,

Recalling that individuals lodged complaints in the Supreme Court of Justice against those who had voted for and those who had voted against the preclusion of the investigation; that on 26 June 1998, two years after the filing of those complaints, the Supreme Court decided to exculpate the minority who had voted against the preclusion of the investigation and to pursue the investigation regarding those who had voted in its favour,

Recalling that some MPs concerned lodged a petition with the Constitutional Court regarding their prosecution; *considering* that, in autumn 1998, the Court ruled in their favour and that the proceedings against all MPs concerned have consequently been dropped,

1. *Notes with satisfaction* that the prosecution against the former and incumbent members of Parliament concerned has been abandoned, thus ensuring respect for one of the basic principles of parliamentary democracy, parliamentary non-accountability, which protects members of Parliament from any form of prosecution for all acts carried out in performance of their parliamentary duties thereby enabling them to discharge their mandate without fear of any retaliatory measures on account of their opinions expressed and votes cast;
2. *Decides* consequently to close the case.

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

CASE N° ZRE/25 - JOSEPH OLENHANKOY

CASE N° ZRE/26 - EUGÈNE DIOMI NDONGALA NZOMAMBU

CASE N° ZRE/27 - ÉTIENNE TSHISEKEDI

*Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999)*

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Referring to the outline of the case, as contained in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/164/13(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 163rd session (September 1998) concerning the case of Mr. Joseph Olenghankoy, Mr. Eugène Diomi Ndongala Nzomambu and Mr. Etienne Tshisekedi, members of the High Council of the Republic - Transitional Parliament (HCR-TP) dissolved in May 1997,

Considering the information supplied by the sources on 29 January and on 29 and 31 March 1999,

Recalling that Mr. Ndongala was detained at his home on 10 December 1997 by members of the military police without an arrest warrant and taken to a military camp; that he was so severely beaten that he had to be taken to hospital; that he was released on 24 January 1998 following international pressure,

Also recalling that Mr. Tshisekedi was questioned on 12 February 1998 by members of the Congolese armed forces who had no arrest warrant and, after being detained for several hours, was placed under house arrest in his village and accused of breaking the ban on political activity; *considering* that the house arrest was lifted on 5 July 1998 and that no criminal proceedings are currently pending against him,

Recalling that Mr. Olenghankoy was arrested at his office on 20 January 1998 by elements of the National Intelligence Agency (ANR) and taken to the ANR jail, where he was held *incommunicado* before being transferred during the night of 28 to 29 January 1998 to the Kokolo military camp and later to Lubumbashi and finally to Buluwo high security prison near Likasi/Shaba in Katanga Province; that he was subjected to « *close* » interrogation and detained under harsh conditions,

Noting in this connection that, according to the report of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights (E/CN.4/1999/31), Buluwo prison « *is not a legally authorised establishment and has been described as ‘ the antechamber of death ’ because of its filth and bad food and because prisoners are permitted to leave the isolation cells only to use the toilet* »,

Considering that the information concerning the accusation brought against him differs: according to one source he was accused of having broken the activity ban imposed on political parties and, according to another, of having stirred up members of the armed forces against President Kabila,

Considering that, following an escape attempt in April 1998, Mr. Olenghankoy and two of his fellow detainees were recaptured by the security forces and, on 18 May 1998, found guilty by the Military Order Court of endangering State security and sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment,

Considering that, according to the report of the United Nations Special Rapporteur referred to above and the source, Mr. Olenghankoy's trial was unlawful as (a) he and his co-accused were not brought before a judge without delay, (b) their lawyers were given only three hours to prepare a defence, (c) the lawyer was unable to talk to the defendant just before the hearing, (d) he was tortured, (e) there was no equal access to evidence and much of it was illegal and could not be objected, and (f) there is no right of appeal,

Mindful of the recommendations made by the Special Rapporteur in his report to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, in particular regarding the need for the immediate restoration of freedom of expression, the immediate cessation of operation of the Military Order Court, and the restoration of the right to fair trial,

1. *Expresses deep concern* at the reports of violation of Mr. Olenghankoy's right to freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention, right to freedom from torture and ill-treatment and right to fair trial, and *urges* the authorities consequently to release him immediately and unconditionally and to restore his rights;
2. *Wishes* to receive a copy of the judgment handed down on him by the Military Order Court;
3. *Urges* the authorities to comply with their duty under the international human rights norms to which their country has subscribed, to investigate the accusation of torture and ill-treatment in this case and to bring to justice those responsible for this criminal act;
4. *Wishes to ascertain* whether the competent authorities have instituted any investigations to identify and bring to justice, as is their duty, those responsible for assaulting Mr. Ndongala while he was in detention;
5. *Affirms* that impunity can only encourage the repetition of crime and poses a major threat to democracy and respect for human rights;
6. *Recalls* that the Democratic Republic of the Congo is a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and to the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights and, by virtue of its obligations under those norms, is bound to respect the right to freedom from torture and ill-treatment, the right to freedom from arbitrary arrest, the right to fair trial, the right of anyone who has been the victim of arbitrary arrest or detention to compensation, and the right to freedom of expression and association;
7. *Notes* that Mr. Tshisekedi is no longer subjected to any restriction of his freedom of movement and that no judicial proceedings are pending against him; *decides* to close the file concerning him while *expressing its deep regret* at his arrest and detention on account of having exercised his fundamental rights of freedom of speech, association and assembly;
8. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the competent authorities, in particular the Minister for Human Rights, inviting them to provide the requested information;
9. *Requests* the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians to continue examining the case and report to it at its next session (October 1999).

CASE N° DJI/09 - AHMED BOULALEH BARREH) DJIBOUTI
CASE N° DJI/10 - ALI MAHAMADE HOUMED)
CASE N° DJI/11 - MOUMIN BAHDON FARAH)

*Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
 (Brussels, 16 April 1999)*

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Referring to the outline of the case, as contained in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/164/13(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 163rd session (September 1998) concerning the case of Mr. Ahmed Boulaleh Barreh, Mr. Ali Mahamade Houmed and Mr. Moumin Bahdon Farah, of Djibouti,

Taking account of the communications from one of the sources dated 24 September 1998 and 17 January 1999,

Recalling that the Bureau of the National Assembly met on 12 and 15 June 1996 to decide on a request for the lifting of the parliamentary immunity of Mr. Boulaleh Barreh, Mr. Mahamade Houmed and Mr. Bahdon Farah to permit their prosecution for insulting the Head of State, whom they had accused of « *ruling by terror and force while trampling underfoot our Constitution and republican institutions* »; that the Bureau decided to authorise their prosecution and adopted a resolution to that effect; that, by letter N° 141/AN/FW of 15 June 1996, the President of the National Assembly informed the Minister of Justice of that decision,

Recalling that, seized of an appeal against that decision, the Constitutional Council, on 31 July 1996, ruled that the failure of the National Assembly Bureau to hear the deputies concerned constituted a violation of the right of defence as guaranteed by national law, and further held that the letter from the President of the Assembly to the Minister of Justice informing him of the Bureau's decision did not constitute a resolution as required under the National Assembly's Standing Orders,

Recalling that, notwithstanding Article 81 of the Djibouti Constitution, which stipulates that decisions by the Constitutional Council carry the weight of *res judicata* and are binding upon all authorities, including the judicial authorities, the trial went ahead and on 7 August 1996 Mr. Boulaleh Barreh, Mr. Mahamade Houmed and Mr. Bahdon Farah were sentenced to a six-month prison term, a heavy fine and forfeiture of their civic rights for five years,

Noting that Article 175(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides for nullity of the investigation « *should the rules specifically designed to ensure respect for the fundamental principles of the investigative procedure and the rights of the defence be violated* »; *noting moreover* that Article 472(5) of the Code makes provision for a case to be reviewed when a decision is flawed by an obvious error of fact or of law such as to influence the sentence; that, however, according to the authorities, these provisions do not permit a review of their trial,

Recalling that, in January 1997, the President reduced the sentences and they were released but remained deprived of their political rights, as a result of which they were prevented from participating in the legislative elections of December 1997 and contesting the presidential elections of 9 April 1999,

Recalling further that, on 26 June 1996, Mr. Bahdon Farah was charged with misappropriating, at a time when he was Minister of Justice, two small pieces of ivory which had been seized by the gendarmerie and that two years later, on 16 June 1998, he was found guilty of that offence and given a suspended two-month prison sentence; that, moreover, Mr. Bahdon Farah is being prosecuted on charges of receiving since his daughter bought from an import-export store a generating unit which, according to the authorities, had been stolen but in respect of which an invoice has been forwarded to the Committee,

Considering that, according to the sources, Mr. Boulaleh Barreh and Mr. Bahdon Farah were arrested on 1 September 1998 and held for questioning for several hours in connection with a case concerning a plot against State security; that, at the first hearing before the court on 5 September 1998, the case was adjourned to 12 September so as to enable the lawyer from France to prepare the defence; that, however, the latter being unable to obtain a visa, a Djiboutian lawyer was appointed by the court on 9 September; that, at the hearing on 12 September 1998, his request for a further adjournment of the case to enable him to prepare the defence was rejected and the judge, after deliberation, found Mr. Boulaleh Barreh and Mr. Bahdon Farah guilty of inciting « *the armed forces to disobedience with a view to harming national defence* » (Article 157 of the Penal Code) and gave them a one-year suspended prison sentence, two years of probation and a definitive fine of one million Djibouti francs,

Noting that, according to the sources, Mr. Bahdon Farah's passport was again confiscated on 1 October 1998, which has prevented him from travelling to Saudi Arabia to receive medical treatment,

Mindful of the fact that the defence counsel of the three former deputies, Mr. Aref, a well-known human rights advocate, was accused on 23 January 1997 of fraud and banned from exercising his profession and that, on 15 February 1999, he was sentenced to two years' imprisonment, including six months unsuspended; that, according to many reports, he is being held in Gabode Prison in inhuman conditions; for he is reportedly shut up in lavatories of the high-security part of the prison, a space one metre square without a roof; that the French lawyers who were to assist him in his trial were not authorised to travel to Djibouti, despite the existence of a Franco-Djiboutian legal assistance convention,

1. *Regrets* that the Djiboutian authorities have failed to respond to the requests for information addressed to them;
2. *Reaffirms* that, in making the offending statement, the former deputies concerned were merely exercising their fundamental right to freedom of speech, which would be quite meaningless if it did not permit criticism of the Executive, and *considers* that Parliament should have a particular interest in ensuring that its members may exercise this right essential to their function to the fullest possible extent and, in particular, without fear of criminal prosecution and imprisonment;
3. *Remains concerned* that Djiboutian justice has not taken account of the Constitutional Court's decision of 31 July 1996 which is binding on all organs of the State, including the Judiciary; *is therefore compelled to consider* that the trial of the former MPs concerned, on account of that failure alone, is flawed by irregularities;

4. *Expresses particular concern* at the repeated prosecution and sentencing of Mr. Bahdon Farah and the confiscation of his passport, and at the sentencing and imprisonment of the defence counsel of the former MPs concerned;
5. *Calls on* the new Head of State to grant an amnesty to the three former MPs concerned and their lawyer and to restore their rights in full;
6. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey these considerations to the newly-elected President of the Republic and the competent authorities;
7. *Requests* the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians to continue examining the case and report to it at its next session (October 1999).

CASE N° GMB/01 - LAMIN WAA JUWARA - GAMBIA

***Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999)***

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Referring to the outline of the case, as contained in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/164/13(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 163rd session (September 1998) concerning the case of Mr. Lamin Waa Juwara, a member of the House of Representatives of the Gambia dissolved in 1994,

Taking account of a communication from the Attorney General's Chambers and Department of State for Justice dated 16 March 1999 and of a communication from one of the sources, dated 8 March and 1 April 1999,

Recalling that on 30 June 1997 Mr. Juwara filed against the Attorney General, the Secretary of State for the Interior, the Inspector General of Police and the Director General of the National Intelligence Agency a lawsuit claiming compensation for the many arbitrary arrests and detentions he had suffered at the hands of officials acting under the authority of the Armed Forces Provisional Ruling Council (AFPRC), which was in power from July 1994 to January 1997,

Recalling that on 29 July 1998 the High Court ruled that the incriminated conduct of the defendants in this action was not justiciable as Section 13 of Schedule 2 of the 1997 Constitution guaranteed members of the AFPRC and its officers and appointees immunity from any prosecution in respect of any act or omission attributable to them under the AFPRC administration,

Considering that Mr. Juwara appealed against that judgment but decided to withdraw his appeal following a reform of the court system in the Gambia whereby the Supreme Court of the Gambia henceforth replaces the Privy Council in London as the highest court of appeal in the country,

Recalling that Mr. Juwara was re-arrested without any arrest warrant on the night of 18 May 1998 at his home and held *incommunicado* until the Supreme Court ordered his release on bail on 8 June 1998 on the proviso that he might not leave the country without previously informing the judicial authorities,

Recalling that on the night of his arrest Mr. Juwara was subjected to severe ill-treatment by security agents, sustaining serious injuries as a result; that according to newspaper reports relying on Mr. Juwara's statements and carrying photographs, he was first assaulted in his house by officers under the command of Major Amadou Suwareh; that on the way to the Mile Two Central Prison where he was detained, the police vehicle transporting him stopped at Denton Bridge and Mr. Juwara was reportedly pulled out of the vehicle and badly beaten with cable wires and rubber straps until somebody shouted « *Baba Jobe, Baba Jobe, it's enough* »; that he was reportedly denied any medical care while in prison, apparently on orders of the Secretary of State for the Interior, Mr. Momoudou Bojang; *recalling also* that, according to the authorities, investigations into these allegations are under way,

Considering, however, that according to one of the sources the matter has never been investigated despite the fact that the identity of the perpetrators is public knowledge,

Recalling that Mr. Juwara, together with others, was arraigned in Brikama Magistrate's Court and charged in June 1998 with « *conspiracy to cause unlawful damage to property* » and « *causing unlawful damage to property* » on account of « *wilful and unlawful damage to construction works at the Brikama Mosque* »; *considering* that the Magistrates Court acquitted them ruling that there was no case; that, however, the State filed an appeal against that judgment and that the case was adjourned to 4 May 1999 « *for mention* »,

Bearing in mind the many resolutions of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, most recently resolution 1998/53, which recognises that, for the victims of human rights violations, public knowledge of their suffering and the truth about perpetrators of these violations are essential steps towards rehabilitation and reconciliation, and *urging* States to intensify their efforts to provide victims of human rights violations with a fair and equitable procedure whereby such violations can be investigated and made public and to encourage victims to participate therein,

1. *Thanks* the Attorney General and Secretary of State for Justice for her co-operation and is *pleased to note* that she contemplates attending the next session of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians;
2. *Remains deeply concerned* at Mr. Juwara's arrest and *incommunicado* detention in May and June 1998 and the ill-treatment inflicted upon him while he was in State custody;
3. *Recalls* that the Gambia is a party to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, as well as to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the African Charter of Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR), both of which guarantee the right to freedom from arbitrary arrest or detention and from torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment; *also recalls* that Articles 9 and 6 of the Constitution of the Gambia contain the same guarantees, and *insists* consequently that the Gambian authorities have a duty to ensure respect for these fundamental rights;
4. *Wishes to ascertain* the result of the investigations instituted to punish those responsible for assaulting Mr. Juwara whose identity is seemingly known;
5. *Notes* that the State has appealed against the acquittal pronounced by the Magistrates Court in the Brikama Mosque case; *would appreciate* receiving a copy of the judgment together with information on the grounds for the State's appeal;
6. *Remains deeply concerned* at the provision in Section 13(1) of Schedule 2 to the 1997 Constitution in that it establishes impunity for all acts and omissions of public officials committed between July 1994 and January 1997, and *points out* that the United Nations has consistently urged member States to combat impunity and take the necessary action to this end;
7. *Recalls* that, as a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, including its First Optional Protocol, and to other international and regional human rights instruments, the Gambia has subscribed to international human rights norms which its authorities have to respect and implement at the national level, and *affirms* that it is the duty of the judiciary to review the conformity of national law with such international norms;

8. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the competent authorities, including the Attorney General and Secretary of State for Justice and the Secretary of State for the Interior, inviting them to provide the requested information;
9. *Requests* the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians to continue examining the case and report to it at its next session (October 1999).

CASE N° GMB/03 - OMAR JALLOW - GAMBIA***Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999)***

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Referring to the outline of the case, as contained in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/164/13(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 163rd session (September 1998) concerning the case of Mr. Omar Jallow, of the Gambia,

Taking account of a communication from the Attorney General's Chambers and Department of State for Justice dated 16 March 1999 conveying a copy of Decree N° 11 (Public Assets and Properties Recovery Decree, 1994), Decree N° 89 (Political Activities Resumption Decree, 1996) and Decree N° 31 (National Goals and Objectives Decree, 1995),

Also taking account of the communication from one of the sources dated 2 March 1999,

Recalling that Mr. Jallow, a member of the House of Representatives dissolved in 1994 and Minister from 1981 to 1994, was arrested in October 1995 and held without charge until November 1996, when he was released; *recalling* that he was reportedly arrested a further eight times between July 1994 and October 1995,

Recalling that the « Public Assets Recovery Commission » established by the Armed Forces Provisional Ruling Council (AFPRC) to investigate « *the existence, nature, extent and method of acquisition of assets ...* » of public office-holders prior to the military takeover of 22 July 1994, also examined Mr. Jallow's financial situation and dealings and found some financial improprieties on his part; that it recommended, in addition to certain financial adjustments, that he be debarred from public office for five years, the latter measure being endorsed by the Government White Paper established on the basis of the Commission's findings; that, according to information supplied by the Attorney General's Chambers and Department of State for Justice on 27 August 1998, Mr. Jallow can seek redress in the Gambian Courts of Law against the Commission's decision, as many others have done, sometimes successfully,

Recalling in this connection that, according to the constitutional provision incorporating in the 1997 Constitution the commissions of inquiries established under the AFPRC rule, « *any order, ruling, finding or fact, seizure, sale or alienation of property or penalty imposed or thing done by or carried out under the authority of any commission of inquiry established in accordance with a Decree of the AFPRC shall not be questioned or reversed by any court or other authority under this Constitution or any other law* »,

Recalling that, in addition to being debarred from public office for five years, Mr. Jallow is banned from « *participation in any political activity, sponsoring or nominating any person contesting election, contest for any election for any political or other elective office, form or participate in the formation of any political party or organisation* » by virtue of Decree N° 89 (Political Activities Resumption Decree, 1996), which bans for an indefinite period from any such

activity, among others, « *all persons who held the offices of President, Vice-President and Ministers in the Government of the Republic of the Gambia during the thirty years preceding 22 July 1994* »; considering that under its Article 4, paragraph 1, « *any person who contravenes this Decree commits an offence and shall on conviction be liable to imprisonment for life* »,

Recalling that, in August 1998, the parliamentary opposition tabled in Parliament an amendment to abolish this Decree by means of an Act to amend the « *Political Activities Resumption Decree* » with the express aim of bringing the law into conformity with the Constitution's fundamental human rights guarantees; that, however, it failed to obtain the required majority in Parliament,

Bearing in mind that the Gambia is a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR), both of which guarantee freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention, freedom of movement and freedom of expression, assembly and association; that these rights are also enshrined in the Constitution of the Gambia and that, moreover, by virtue of Decree 31 (National Goals and Objectives Decree, 1995) the adherence to the principles and objectives of *inter alia* the United Nations « *shall remain the cornerstone of the Foreign Policy of the Gambia* »,

1. *Thanks* the Attorney General and Secretary of State for Justice for her co-operation and is *pleased to note* that she contemplates attending the next session of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians;
2. *Can but remain deeply concerned* at Decree 89 depriving for an indefinite period specific individuals, including Mr. Jallow, of their civil and political rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the Gambia and the international human rights norms to which the Gambia has subscribed and which it has pledged to uphold; *recalls* the basic principle of law that a criminal sanction such as deprivation of political rights can only be the result of a judgment handed down at an independent and impartial court after due process of law;
3. *Calls on* the Gambian Parliament, as guardian of human rights, to take the necessary steps to ensure that statutory law is brought into conformity with constitutional and international human rights norms without further delay;
4. *Remains perplexed* at the apparent contradiction between the constitutional provision excluding an appeal against a decision of a commission of inquiry established under the AFPRC rule and the affirmation of the Attorney General's Chambers and Department of State for Justice that such an appeal is possible, and *reiterates its wish* to receive a clarification of this point of law;
5. *Reaffirms* that under Article 9, paragraph 5, of the ICCPR, Mr. Jallow has an enforceable right to compensation for the arbitrary arrest and detention he suffered;
6. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the parliamentary and other competent authorities inviting them to supply the requested details;
7. *Requests* the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians to continue examining the case and report to it at its next session (October 1999).

CASE N° GUI/04 - ALPHA CONDÉ)
CASE N° GUI/05 - EL-HADJ AMIATA MADY KABA)
CASE N° GUI/06 - KOUMBAFING KEITA) **GUINEA**
CASE N° GUI/07 - MAMADY YÖ KOUYATE)
CASE N° GUI/08 - IBRAHIMA KALIL KEITA)

***Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999)***

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Having before it the case of Mr. Alpha Condé, Mr. El-Hadj Amiata Mady Kaba, Ms. Koumbafing Keïta, Mr. Mamady Yö Kouyate and Mr. Ibrahima Kalil Keïta, members of the National Assembly of Guinea, which has been the subject of a study and report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians in accordance with the « *Procedure for the examination and treatment by the Inter-Parliamentary Union of communications concerning violations of human rights of parliamentarians* »,

Taking note of the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/164/13(b)-R.1), which contains a detailed outline of the case,

Also taking account of the information supplied by members of the delegation of the Republic of Guinea belonging to the majority party, on the one hand, and one belonging to the opposition on the other, at two hearings held with the Committee on the occasion of the 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference in Brussels,

Considering that Mr. Condé, President of the *Rassemblement du Peuple de Guinée* - RPG (Guinean People's Rally), member of the National Assembly and a candidate in the presidential elections of December 1998, was arrested on 15 December 1998 prior to the announcement of the provisional results and charged in January 1999 with « *attempt to cross borders, fraudulent export of foreign currency, attempt to recruit mercenaries and breach of State security* »,

Considering that, according to the members of the delegation of Guinea belonging to the majority party, Mr. Condé, having been absent from the country for a long time, returned only shortly before the election; that a television team sent to cover the electoral campaign of all five candidates to the election, seeking a brief statement from each of them the day of the vote, went to Mr. Condé's house but noted that he was absent and wondered where he could be on the day of the vote; that, according to their statement, Mr. Condé's arrest took place under the following circumstances:

- A car had attracted the attention of the Chief of a village close to the border with Côte d'Ivoire. He reported the presence of the car to the military but when they came, the car had already left the village. The military then headed towards the border where they found Mr. Condé calmly seated. When he saw the military coming he returned and after a chase the soldiers arrested Mr. Condé, who resisted and reportedly even bit one of them. He was taken to the Sub-prefecture whose officers decided to send him immediately by plane to Conakry when they realised whom they had arrested. Mr. Condé was in fact disguised and wore jeans, a small boubou and sandals.

Considering that, according to the same members of the delegation, he had violated several provisions, in particular a decree prohibiting any circulation between the provinces and one providing for an interdiction to cross the border at the time of the vote. It was clear that Mr. Condé had attempted to cross the border overland. Moreover, a bag was found in his possession containing large sums of money in different currencies and a notebook with details of expenditure on weapons and other related items,

Considering that the versions of Mr. Condé's conditions of detention and the judicial proceedings presented by the two members of the delegation and the sources differ widely:

- According to the sources, Professor Condé, who is held at Conakry Central Prison is denied the most elementary rights, namely the right to visits from his family and friends and to regular meetings with his lawyers, « *who are able to see him neither when they want nor how they should* ». The few visits allowed have reportedly always taken place under close military supervision. Furthermore, prominent foreigners including, for example, a group of deputies from the National Assembly of Mali and two Senegalese lawyers, were refused permission to meet him. A French member of the group of lawyers defending Mr. Condé, was turned back at Conakry Airport on the grounds that « *his presence in Guinean territory is likely to cause a breach of the peace* ». Moreover, the judicial authorities handling Mr. Condé's case are said to refer constantly to the Executive for all decisions, for which reason, on 22 February 1999, the group of lawyers defending Mr. Condé preferred to withdraw rather than condone « *a parody of justice* ». Mr. Condé went on hunger strike for some time in protest against his treatment. His state of health is said to be very worrying,
- According to the two members of the Guinean delegation, Mr. Condé was first detained in a villa of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) where he received visits without limitation and gave interviews, for which reason he was transferred to prison, where he is held in a cell equipped with electricity, a water tap, two beds, a table and a chair, a flushing lavatory, a corridor and a terrace. His medical situation is followed by his personal doctor, Dr. Cissé, who confirmed to one of the members of the delegation that Mr. Condé's state of health was good. Dr. Condé's defence team consists of five lawyers of his choice, including the French lawyer who was refused entry as there is no reciprocal legal practice agreement. Mr. Condé is interrogated only in the presence of his lawyers,

Considering also that, according to the source, on Sunday morning, 20 December 1998, the opposition staged a peaceful march in Siguiri to call for the release of Professor Alpha Condé and that demonstrators « *had neither stones nor sticks nor tom-toms* »; that after three-quarters of the route had been covered, the riot police and the military reportedly fired on the crowd, and that Mr. Keïta and Mr. Kouyate were reportedly arrested as they were carrying the wounded, beaten and thrown into a van, then taken to the Prefect's home, questioned and finally taken back to their homes,

Considering further that, around 11 a.m. on the following day, they were re-arrested and taken to the constabulary, that later, towards 7 p.m., they were taken to Kankan military camp where they joined up with Ms. Keïta and Mr. Mady Kaba, arrested at their respective homes, and nearly 70 men and women from Kankan. On 27 December 1998, the deputies were transferred to Kankan Central Prison and released reportedly after three months of detention subsequent to their sentencing, on 16 March 1999, by the Kankan Court of First Instance which found the four MPs guilty of causing a breach of the peace and holding unauthorised demonstrations,

Considering that, according to the sources, they were all sentenced to four months' imprisonment unsuspended and a fine of 150,000 Guinean francs each and, according to the two members of the Guinean delegation, to four months, one month being suspended; that they have resumed their parliamentary activity,

Noting that, in a letter dated 5 January 1999 addressed to the President of the Republic, the President of the National Assembly wished to ascertain the legal reasons for the arrest and detention of these MPs in view of the fundamental law of the Republic of Guinea, which stipulates in Article 9 that: «*No one shall be arrested, detained or condemned unless on such grounds and motives as are established by law*»; and in Article 52 which states that: «*No deputy may, for the duration of the sessions, be prosecuted or arrested in a penal affair without the authorisation of the National Assembly, barring cases of flagrante delicto (paragraph 2)*»,

Noting that, according to information provided at the hearing, a prison sentence exceeding three months entails forfeiture of any parliamentary mandate and a ban on standing for election,

Bearing in mind that Guinea is a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and to the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR), which guarantee the right to freedom of the person (Articles 9 and 6, respectively) and the right to fair trial (Articles 14 and 7, respectively),

1. *Thanks* the Guinean delegation for its co-operation and the information supplied;
2. *Recalls* that the immunity granted to MPs is designed to enable them to exercise their mandate fully and freely and to shield them from any proceedings that may be politically motivated;
3. *Affirms* that mutual respect for the competences, prerogatives, rights and privileges of the different State authorities is indispensable for the primacy of the law and the proper functioning of parliamentary democracy;
4. *Expresses deep concern* at the arrest of Mr. Condé, Mr. Kaba, Ms. Keïta, Mr. Kouyate and Mr. Keïta without any authorisation and without the National Assembly having been informed; *recalls* that under Article 52 of the Constitution the arrest or detaining of a Deputy requires the prior authorisation of the Assembly, except in cases of *flagrante delicto*, and *wishes to know* the reasons and facts invoked by the Executive to justify such action;
5. *Recalls* the general principle of human rights, enshrined in international norms to which the Republic of Guinea has subscribed, that no one shall be deprived of their liberty except on such grounds and in accordance with such procedures as are established by law;
6. *Expresses deep concern* at the circumstances of Mr. Condé's arrest as presented to it by members of the Guinean delegation and at the circumstances of the arrests of the other deputies concerned, and *wishes to ascertain* whether proper arrest warrants had been issued;
7. *Is also concerned* at the sentencing of Mr. Kaba, Ms. Keïta, Mr. Kouyate and Mr. Keïta to a prison term - four months unsuspended according to one source, and three months unsuspended and one month suspended according to the other - which in either case appears to ban them from standing for election; *would appreciate* clarification in this respect together with a copy of the judgment;

8. *Expresses deep concern* at the fundamentally divergent accounts of Mr. Condé's conditions of detention and state of health, and *would appreciate* fuller information in this respect;
9. *Notes with concern* that a foreign lawyer was refused entry into the country on the grounds, according to the authorities, that no reciprocal legal practice agreement existed, whereas it would seem that there should be nothing to prevent anyone with a valid visa from entering the country and advising national lawyers;
10. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the President of the Republic, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice and the Speaker of the National Assembly, inviting them to provide the requested information;
11. *Requests* the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians to continue examining the case and report to it at its next session (October 1999).

CASE N° HOND/02 - MIGUEL ANGEL PAVÓN SALAZAR - HONDURAS

***Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999)***

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Referring to the outline of the case, as contained in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/164/13(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 163rd session (September 1998) concerning the case of Mr. Miguel Angel Pavón Salazar, of Honduras,

Recalling that Mr. Pavón Salazar was shot dead on 14 January 1988; that the judicial investigations which established a link between his murder and evidence he gave in October 1987 before the Inter-American Court of Human Rights concerning « *disappearances* » in Honduras came to a standstill until, in 1994, the Honduran National Commissioner for Human Rights published a report concluding that the investigations had not been carried out properly, thereby causing oversight of the investigation to be entrusted to the Special Prosecutor for Human Rights; that after having long remained unproductive, the judicial investigation was relaunched on 4 July 1996 by the Criminal Investigation Branch (DIC) of the Prosecutor General's Office, bringing new evidence to light,

Recalling that in April 1998 the Court of San Pedro Sula issued arrest warrants against the presumed culprits, Colonel Mario Asdrubal Quiñones and Sergeant-Major Jaime Rosales, and that the former has been in preventive detention in the 105th Infantry Brigade since 28 April 1998, whereas an arrest warrant could not be served on the latter since he is living in the United States of America,

Recalling the decisive role of the National Congress of Honduras in relaunching and activating the investigation, for which it paid tribute to that Parliament,

Noting that the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians, at its 84th session (February 1999), adjourned examination of this case in view of the emergency situation in Honduras caused by Hurricane Mitch,

1. *Requests* the Secretary General to resume contact with the Honduran authorities with a view to ascertaining whether any progress has meanwhile been made in the relevant investigation;
2. *Requests* the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians to continue examining the case and report to it at its next session (October 1999).

CASE N° MAL/11 - LIM GUAN ENG - MALAYSIA***Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999) ****

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Referring to the outline of the case, as contained in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/164/13(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 163rd session (September 1998) concerning the case of Mr. Lim Guan Eng, a member of the House of Representatives of Malaysia, whereby it requested the Committee to carry out an on-site mission to « *gather further information directly from the authorities, the parliamentarian concerned and his lawyers* » and to act in support of a full pardon for Mr. Lim Guan Eng,

Recalling that the Malaysian delegation at the Moscow Conference (September 1998) had expressed support for such a mission, stating that an IPU delegation would be most welcome in Malaysia and not restricted as to whom it met,

Recalling further that the Malaysian National Group was fully informed and aware of IPU's strict rule requiring the Organisation's human rights missions « *to ensure that no witnesses are present during its contacts with the parliamentarian(s) whose situation is the subject of the mission ...* »,

Having studied the report of the mission (30 November to 2 December 1998) revealing that the delegation was unable to visit Mr. Lim Guan Eng in the absence of a prison official and was unable to meet a number of authorities with whom it had requested appointments,

Considering the observations made at the hearing with the Committee on the occasion of the 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference (Brussels, April 1999) by the Malaysian delegation, led by the Deputy Minister for Home Affairs, and the written observations it submitted regarding this matter,

Noting that there are considerable discrepancies in the information supplied by Mr. Lim Guan Eng's family, party and lawyers and the authorities regarding the conditions of Mr. Lim Guan Eng's imprisonment and state of health:

- (i) whereas the authorities affirm that Mr. Lim Guan Eng's health does not give rise to any concern and that he has only lost 3 kilos during his detention, his family affirms that he is suffering from ailments which he never had before (severe backache and migraine and inflammation of the nose) and has lost 10 kilos, explaining the difference by the existence of two weighing machines in prison, one in the prison hospital and the other in the prison record office,
- (ii) whereas the authorities affirm that he receives preferential treatment and is kept in a single cell, his family states that in the Asingan Security Block where Mr. Lim Guan Eng is jailed, 25 cells are at present occupied of which only two accommodate more than one prisoner, all the others being kept in single cells like Mr. Lim Guan Eng,

* The Malaysian delegation expressed reservations about the resolution adopted by the Inter-Parliamentary Council.
Inter-Parliamentary Union, Geneva *101st Conference, Brussels, April 1999*

Considering that Mr. Lim Guan Eng petitioned both the Governor of Malacca and H.M. the King for full pardon giving him a clean slate, which they turned down respectively 21 March and 10 April 1999 and that, as a result, Mr. Lim Guan Eng has now lost his parliamentary status; *considering* that, according to the sources, the Pardon Board, on whose advice the Governor of Malacca and H.M. the King must act, was biased as it comprised the Attorney General, who had not delegated his membership in the Board as he may do and since all other members, according to the source, as members of parties allied with the ruling United Malay National Organisation Party (UMNO), had a vested partisan interest in « *finishing off* » Mr. Lim Guan Eng, as his party had held the Malacca town parliamentary seat without interruption for the past 30 years,

Considering that Mr. Lim Guan Eng may be granted a one-third reduction of his prison sentence for good conduct, in which case he would be released from prison in August 1999,

Considering also that Mr. Lim Guan Eng will remain deprived of his civic rights for five years, such period commencing on the date of his release from prison,

1. *Wishes to thank* the Malaysian delegation and in particular the Deputy Home Minister for his expression of concern at the way in which the mission had taken place, and *accepts* the apology offered by the delegation;
2. *Notes with deep concern* the conflicting accounts of Mr. Lim Guan Eng's state of health and conditions of imprisonment given by Mr. Lim Guan Eng's party and family on the one hand, and by the Deputy Home Minister on the other, and *can but be all the more concerned* that the mission was prevented from gathering independent information on his conditions of imprisonment and state of health;
3. *Reiterates its firm conviction* that, in making the alleged statements deemed offensive, Mr. Lim Guan Eng was merely exercising his right to freedom of speech and function of oversight of the Executive, which would be meaningless if it did not include the right to scrutinise the administration of justice; *affirms* that, in exercising their oversight function, parliamentarians are essential actors in the promotion and protection of human rights; *remains therefore deeply concerned* at the harshness of the judgment and the limits it sets on freedom of speech and on the right and duty of the people's elected representatives to exercise their essential function of oversight of the Executive;
4. *Is deeply saddened* that Mr. Lim Guan Eng's petition for pardon for which the Inter-Parliamentary Union had expressed its strong support was turned down and that he has thus lost his parliamentary mandate and his right to stand for election;
5. *Expresses the hope* that this decision may be reconsidered and *appeals* to the Malaysian Parliament to make every effort to this end;
6. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Chairman of the Malaysian IPU Group and all other competent authorities;
7. *Requests* the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians to continue examining the case and report to it at its next session (October 1999).

CASE N° MAL/15 - ANWAR IBRAHIM - MALAYSIA

**Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its
164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999) ***

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Having before it the case of Mr. Anwar Ibrahim, a member of the House of Representatives of Malaysia, which has been the subject of a study and report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians in accordance with the « *Procedure for the examination and treatment by the Inter-Parliamentary Union of communications concerning violations of human rights of parliamentarians* »,

Taking note of the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/164/13(b)-R.1), which contains a detailed outline of the case,

Also taking account of the information and observations supplied by the Malaysian delegation to the 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference (Brussels, April 1999),

Considering that Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad dismissed Mr. Ibrahim from his posts as Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister on 2 September 1998, arguing that he was « *morally unfit to govern* »; that the next day police announced publicly that Mr. Ibrahim was under criminal investigation and lodged with the High Court a number of affidavits alleging that Mr. Ibrahim had been involved in acts of sexual misconduct, tampering with evidence, bribery and threatening national security; that, although the allegations were unsubstantiated and Mr. Ibrahim had not formally been charged, the full contents of the affidavits were publicly released and received extensive one-sided coverage in the local press; *considering* that Mr. Ibrahim denies all the accusations,

Noting that allegations of sexual misconduct on the part of Mr. Ibrahim were circulated for the first time in June 1997, when he was serving as Acting President of the United Malays National Organisation (UMNO) and Acting Prime Minister; that police investigations instituted upon Prime Minister Mahathir's return to office in August 1997 dismissed the allegations as groundless; that in June 1998, the sex allegations resurfaced in a book published under the title « *50 reasons why Anwar Ibrahim cannot become Prime Minister* » which alleges, *inter alia*, that Mr. Ibrahim was not only « *a womaniser and sodomite but also a murderer who had abused power and was at the same time a CIA agent and a traitor to the Nation* »; *considering* that, despite a court injunction describing

* The Deputy Home Minister, leader of the Malaysian delegation to the 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference, stated that all Malaysians had been distressed to learn of the ill-treatment suffered by Mr. Anwar Ibrahim. He stressed that the Royal Commission of Inquiry had established that the Inspector General of Police was responsible for this and that he would be brought to justice.

the book as « *one long poison-pen letter* » and restraining the distributor from circulating it or its contents, « *50 reasons* » was distributed free to party delegates at the UMNO General Assembly,

Considering that on 20 September 1998, after he had led some 30,000 demonstrators through the streets of Kuala Lumpur calling on Prime Minister Mahathir to resign, Mr. Ibrahim was arrested although not under the sexual and corruption charges brought against him but under the Internal Security Act (ISA), which permits indefinite ministerial detention and is not subject to judicial review; that he was denied bail on the grounds that he was being detained under the ISA; *noting* in this connection that, according to the Malaysian delegation to the Conference, the ISA permits the filing of a writ of *habeas corpus*,

Considering that, according to the authorities, upon his dismissal as Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Ibrahim took to the streets, which was completely contrary to the political culture and Malaysian law; that he was openly exhorting street rebellion against the Government, instigating mob attacks against Parliament and the Prime Minister and consequently was detained under the ISA; that as soon as the rest of the charges were ready he was properly brought to court and charged,

Considering that when brought to court on 29 September 1998, after having been held *incommunicado* for nine days, Mr. Ibrahim showed visible signs of ill-treatment including a swollen eye and a bruised arm; that he complained of having been handcuffed and blindfolded after his arrest and that the police had then proceeded to « *beat him severely, causing serious injuries* » until he « *virtually passed out until the next morning* »; that he was not allowed to see a doctor until the fifth day of his detention; that he lodged a formal complaint about beatings he received while in custody and that a doctor who examined him on 29 September released a medical report stating that Mr. Ibrahim had been assaulted « *over the left forehead and received blunt trauma that resulted in residual bruises over the left upper and lower eyelids ...* »,

Noting that a Special Investigation Team of police officers set up to investigate the allegations of ill-treatment drew up a report which has as yet not been released; that on 5 January 1999, the Attorney General made a public statement admitting that « *there are injuries on certain parts of his [Anwar Ibrahim's] body which are proved to have been caused by police officers while in police custody* »; that, however, the Investigation Team was unable to identify the person or persons responsible for such injuries; that, subsequent to the resignation on 7 January 1999 of the Inspector-General of Police (IGP) Mr. Rahim Noor, the Prime Minister announced on 27 January the establishment of an independent Royal Commission of Inquiry to investigate the police assault on Mr. Ibrahim; that, according to the Malaysian delegation to the 101st Inter-Parliamentary Conference (April 1999), the Commission, after open hearings, reported to H.M. the King, who conveyed the report to the Government, which has not yet released it,

Also noting that Mr. Ibrahim filed two applications for bail which were both rejected by the competent High Court Judge; that, in its decision of 16 January 1999 on the appeal submitted by Mr. Ibrahim against that decision, the Appeal Court dismissed the appeal, holding that an order for the granting or refusal of bail was not subject to appeal,

Considering that, on 2 November 1998, Mr. Ibrahim went on trial on six charges of sexual misconduct (sodomy) and four charges of corrupt practices, the latter relating to accusations that Mr. Ibrahim had abused his ministerial office by directing two senior police officers in August 1997 to obtain denial letters from Mr. Azizan (the former driver of Mr. Ibrahim's wife) and Ms. Umami Hafilda Ali, the two key witnesses in the trial, the latter having made the sodomy allegations in August 1997 in a letter addressed to the Prime Minister accompanied by a sworn statement by Mr. Azizan in which he alleged that Mr. Ibrahim sodomised him; *also considering* that each of the corruption counts carries a maximum penalty of 14 years' imprisonment or a 20,000 ringitt fine (US\$ 5,000), or both, and that each sodomy charge carries a maximum penalty of 20 years' imprisonment and whipping,

Considering in this connection that, according to the authorities, the whole case was caused by people very close to him and that the evidence that has come to the prosecution derived from police investigations arising from his own police report; that great efforts were made by the Prime Minister himself to avoid Mr. Ibrahim being charged in court but to no avail; *considering also* that, according to the delegation, Malaysia is a very conservative society and charges of sexual misconduct are highly damaging, particularly for a politician,

Considering that in mid-January 1999 the trial judge, holding that the « *commission of sexual misconduct and sodomy ... is not really a substantive element to be proved* », admitted a prosecution amendment to the « *corrupt practices* » charges to the effect that the witnesses only alleged but did not assert that Mr. Ibrahim committed acts of sexual misconduct; that all evidence regarding the sex allegations has consequently been expunged from the file; *noting* in this connection that the dropping of the sexual misconduct charges may, according to the sources, put Mr. Ibrahim at graver risk of conviction as the amended charges lower the burden of proof and he may be convicted under Section 2(1) of the Emergency (Essential Powers) Ordinance 1970 which punishes an attempt to influence public officials with the aim of obtaining a « *personal advantage* »,

Considering that, according to information supplied by the Malaysian delegation to the Brussels Conference (April 1999), the sexual misconduct charges are still pending and may be taken up once the other case is ruled on,

Taking into consideration the allegations that the charges held against Mr. Ibrahim are fabricated with the aim of discrediting him and thus eliminating him from politics, and *noting* in this connection the following:

- (i) On 14 September 1998, two of Mr. Ibrahim's associates, Mr. Sukma Darmawan, Mr. Ibrahim's adopted brother, and Dr. Munawar Ahmad Anees, a Pakistani national and friend of Mr. Ibrahim, were arrested. On 19 September 1998, one day before Mr. Ibrahim's arrest, they were each sentenced to six months in jail after having pleaded guilty under Section 277D of the Penal Code of having allowed Mr. Ibrahim to sodomise them. During pre-trial detention, both were reportedly denied access to their families or to the lawyers their families had appointed for them but instead were reportedly represented in court by lawyers assigned to them. There are serious allegations of grave ill-treatment in detention and of forced confessions. Both men have appealed against their convictions on the ground that their guilty pleas were not made voluntarily;
- (ii) Mr. Ibrahim's associate, Mr. S. Nallakaruppan, was arrested in July 1998 under the Internal Security Act and went on trial on charges of illegal possession of firearms, a charge carrying a mandatory death penalty under the ISA. When searching his home during an investigation into the allegations of sodomy regarding Mr. Ibrahim, police had discovered 125 bullets. The bullets were previously held under a licence for a firearm, but Mr. Nallakaruppan had neglected to return them to the authorities together with the firearm for which they were meant. In an affidavit filed by Mr. Nallakaruppan's lawyer in the High Court on 28 November 1998, it was alleged that prosecutors in the Anwar Ibrahim trial had offered to consider trying Mr. Nallakaruppan on lesser charges should he co-operate in implicating Mr. Ibrahim in the commission of sexual misconduct. On the basis of this affidavit, Mr. Zainur Zakaria, a member of Mr. Ibrahim's defence team, objected to the prosecutors. The presiding judge considered this to be contempt of court and sentenced Mr. Zakaria to three months' imprisonment and ordered the arrest of Mr. Nallakaruppan's lawyer;
- (iii) There are reportedly serious inconsistencies in the different testimonies given by the key witnesses. One of the senior police officers whom Mr. Ibrahim allegedly directed to have statements withdrawn, when called by the prosecution, produced a report he had

written to Prime Minister Mahathir in 1997, stating that the sexual allegations were groundless and « deliberately created » as part of a conspiracy. In early January 1999, the government chemist who had conducted DNA tests of stains on a mattress conceded that the stains could have been planted by police and that the tests could not warrant a conviction,

Considering that, on 14 April 1999, Justice Augustin Paul found Mr. Ibrahim guilty under the corruption charges and sentenced him to six years' imprisonment,

Considering that Mr. Ibrahim has launched defamation suits against Prime Minister Mahathir and others for having publicly referred to him as a sodomite,

Noting that Mr. Ibrahim has lodged a lawsuit against the Prime Minister for wrongful dismissal from his post as Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister on the grounds that, according to the law, only H.M. the King can dismiss him and that until now H.M. the King has not signed such a dismissal letter,

Noting finally that according to the information on file, Mr. Ibrahim still enjoys his status as a Member of Parliament; that on 28 March 1999 he filed an application in the High Court seeking an order to allow him to attend the House of Representatives sitting starting on 5 April 1999; that he claims that the House of Representatives recognises his right to attend the sitting as he was notified of the sitting and invited to submit oral questions or motions for the sitting,

1. *Is alarmed* at Mr. Ibrahim's sentencing to six years' imprisonment and *has every reason to fear*, as elaborated on below, that Mr. Ibrahim may be prosecuted not on account of any criminal act but rather on political grounds;
2. *Refers* in particular to the foundation of the charges and, in this connection, *wishes to point out* in particular the following disturbing facts among many others:
 - (i) When the accusations of sexual misconduct were first made in August 1997 by the persons who are now acting as key witnesses, a police investigation ordered by the Prime Minister discarded them as groundless and unfounded; despite this, they were brought up again by the prosecution;
 - (ii) The day following Mr. Ibrahim's dismissal from his posts, the police announced publicly that he was under criminal investigation for acts of sexual misconduct, tampering with evidence and other criminal acts; on 20 September 1998, he was arrested not under such criminal charges, which can be challenged in court, but under the Internal Security Act;
 - (iii) Just the day before his arrest, two persons were convicted of having allowed Mr. Ibrahim to sodomise them and sentenced to imprisonment; both have meanwhile retracted their testimonies affirming they were coerced; there is an affidavit attesting that prosecutors in Mr. Ibrahim's case attempted to pressure Mr. Nallakaruppan, who is charged under a penal norm which carries the death penalty, to implicate Mr. Ibrahim; instead of investigating such unlawful behaviour, the lawyer who brought this matter before court was charged with contempt of court and an arrest warrant was issued against the lawyer who had made the affidavit;
3. *Notes* that the corruption charges were amended in such a way that the prosecution was no longer obliged to prove the sexual misconduct charges which had been the subject of hearings of witnesses and presentation of evidence for over two months; *cannot but consider* that this clearly shows the absence of any case for the prosecution;
4. *Points out with concern* that the amendment of the charges and expunging from the file of evidence regarding the sexual misconduct charges prevented Mr. Ibrahim's defence

from presenting its arguments and evidence and thus from clearing him immediately of any such unfounded accusations;

5. *Finds this all the more disturbing* since, as the Malaysian delegation pointed out, charges of sexual misconduct are highly damaging in Malaysia, particularly for politicians;
6. *Notes* that the corrupt practice charges are intimately linked to the sexual misconduct charges insofar as Mr. Ibrahim is said to have directed two police officers to obtain denial statements from the persons accusing him of sexual misconduct; *recalls* that one of the police officers concerned had stated that the accusations brought against Mr. Ibrahim were groundless, and *fails to understand* how attempting to obtain a denial of false statements defaming a person can be a criminal offence; *rather believes* that Mr. Ibrahim has a right to obtain redress for damage caused to his reputation and personal integrity by such groundless accusations;
7. *Expresses its indignation* at the ill-treatment inflicted upon Mr. Ibrahim while in police custody, and *urges* the authorities to make public without further delay the findings of the Royal Commission of Inquiry and bring to justice those responsible; *fears* that if such treatment can be inflicted upon a Deputy Prime Minister, this lends credence to the allegations of coercion of witnesses' statements;
8. *Strongly urges* the authorities to respect due process of law and Mr. Ibrahim's right to fair trial and to investigate fully and without any further delay all allegations of undue interference with the course of justice in his case;
9. *Would appreciate receiving*:
 - (i) a copy of the judgment handed down on Mr. Ibrahim;
 - (ii) fuller information on the possibility Mr. Ibrahim has of attending parliamentary sessions;
 - (iii) information on the outcome of or stage reached in the defamation proceedings Mr. Ibrahim launched against the Prime Minister;
 - (iv) information on the progress of his complaint of unlawful dismissal from his post of Deputy Prime Minister;
10. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the competent Malaysian authorities, inviting them to provide their observations;
11. *Requests* the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians to continue examining the case and report to it at its next session (October 1999).

MYANMAR

Parliamentarians arrested between 1990 and 1993 and still detained:

CASE N° MYN/01 - OHN KYAING	CASE N° MYN/36 - MYINT NAING
CASE N° MYN/04 - KHIN MAUNG SWE	CASE N° MYN/41 - ZAW MYINT
CASE N° MYN/09 - SEIN HLA OO	CASE N° MYN/42 - MYA WIN
CASE N° MYN/10 - WIN HLAING	CASE N° MYN/60 - ZAW MYINT MAUNG
CASE N° MYN/13 - NAING NAING	CASE N° MYN/68 - AUNG KHIN SINT
CASE N° MYN/26 - HLA TUN	CASE N° MYN/71 - KYI MYINT
CASE N° MYN/28 - TIN AUNG AUNG	CASE N° MYN/73 - FAZAL AHMED

Parliamentarians arrested between 1996 and May 1998:

CASE N° MYN/64 - DAVID HLA MYINT	CASE N° MYN/112 - HLA WIN
CASE N° MYN/83 - KYAW MIN	CASE N° MYN/113 - AYE THAN
CASE N° MYN/84 - SOE THEIN	CASE N° MYN/114 - OHN NAING
CASE N° MYN/85 - KHUN MYINT HTUN	CASE N° MYN/115 - THEIN ZAN
CASE N° MYN/86 - AYE SAN	CASE N° MYN/116 - NYUNT HLAING
CASE N° MYN/87 - DO HTAUNG	CASE N° MYN/117 - KYAW MYINT
CASE N° MYN/88 - CHIT HTWE	CASE N° MYN/118 - THAN NYEIN
CASE N° MYN/89 - MYO NYUNT	CASE N° MYN/119 - MAY WIN MYINT
CASE N° MYN/100 - HLA MYINT	CASE N° MYN/120 - SAN SAN
CASE N° MYN/101 - SAW OO REH	CASE N° MYN/121 - TIN OO
CASE N° MYN/102 - HLA MIN	CASE N° MYN/122 - MIN SOE LIN
CASE N° MYN/103 - TIN AUNG	CASE N° MYN/123 - NAN KHIN HTWE MYINT
CASE N° MYN/104 - KYAW KHIN	CASE N° MYN/124 - OHN MAUNG
CASE N° MYN/105 - KYIN THEIN	CASE N° MYN/125 - MAHN KYAW NI
CASE N° MYN/106 - KYAW TIN	CASE N° MYN/126 - TUN WIN
CASE N° MYN/107 - SAN MYINT	CASE N° MYN/127 - BO HTWAY
CASE N° MYN/108 - MIN SWE	CASE N° MYN/128 - THA AUNG
CASE N° MYN/109 - THAN AUNG	CASE N° MYN/129 - KYI LWIN
CASE N° MYN/110 - TIN MIN HTUT	CASE N° MYN/130 - TIN WIN
CASE N° MYN/111 - SAW LWIN	

Since September 1998, 150 MPs elect have been arrested and are in detention as at April 1999

Parliamentarians deceased:

CASE N° MYN/53 - U HLA THAN	CASE N° MYN/67 - HLA PE
CASE N° MYN/55 - TIN MAUNG WIN	CASE N° MYN/72 - SAW WIN
CASE N° MYN/66 - WIN KO	

Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session (Brussels, 16 April 1999)

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Referring to the outline of the case, as contained in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/164/13(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 163rd session (September 1998) concerning the case of the above-mentioned elected members of the Pyithu Hluttaw (People's Assembly) of the Union of Myanmar,

Recalling that on 27 May 1990 a national election called by the then State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC) was held to constitute a new Parliament (Pyithu Hluttaw) and that the National League for Democracy (NLD) won 392 of the 485 seats (about 81% of total seats), all the above persons being among those elected; that, however, instead of transferring power as it had pledged before the election, SLORC ruled, in Declaration 1/90, that the duties of the elected representatives were merely to draft a State Constitution and convene a « National Convention » to lay down the fundamental principles of a new democratic Constitution; that, under severe pressure from SLORC, the National League of Democracy participated in the Convention's work but withdrew in November 1995 thus severing whatever link there may have been between the Convention and the popular will as expressed in the 1990 elections,

Considering that, since 1990, SLORC not only systematically impeded the functioning of the National League for Democracy, in particular, but eliminated from the political process the MPs elected in 1990, first by invalidating election results, dismissing them from Parliament and banning them from future elections, by forcing them to resign and finally by arresting, detaining and sentencing them on the basis of laws (such as the Emergency Provision Act, State Protection Act, Official Secrets Act, Printers and Publishers Registration Act, Unlawful Associations Act, etc.) considered by the competent United Nations human rights bodies to be in breach of international civil and political rights standards,

Considering that, as a result of such measures, out of the 392 NLD MPs-elect, over 160 have been deprived of their status as MPs-elect,

Considering that on 27 May 1998 the NLD leadership demanded that the ruling State Peace and Development Council (SPDC, former SLORC) convene the Parliament elected in 1990 within three months; that, in view of the impossibility of doing this, a Committee was constituted on 16 September 1998 « *to act for and on behalf of the 1990 Multiparty General Elections People's Parliament* » composed of 10 MPs-elect belonging to different political parties and regions,

Considering that as a result of the NLD demand to convene Parliament and the establishment of the « *Committee representing the People's Parliament* », the SPDC called in NLD MPs-elect outside Rangoon demanding that they sign a declaration not to leave their home towns in the foreseeable future; that restraining orders have been issued against all NLD MPs-elect, who are required to stay within the confines of their respective municipalities for a year; that those who refused have either been arrested or are subject to judicial prosecution and that since September 1998, approximately 150 MPs-elect have been arrested and are still in detention; *considering* that, according to the SPDC, these MPs-elect have merely been « *called in temporarily at guest houses for the purpose of exchanging views on the consequences of the actions of the party (the NLD) for the peace and stability of the State* ». Sixty-three NLD MPs-elect and 321 party members who undertook not to participate in such illegal activities were returned to their homes,

Considering in this connection the situation of Dr. Saw Mra Aung, an 80-year-old medical doctor arrested on 8 September 1998 and the fears expressed by the United Nations Rapporteurs on torture and the Chairman-Rapporteur of the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention as regards his health while in detention, together with the reply of the Permanent Representative of Myanmar to the United Nations Office in Geneva that he had not been arrested but was « *comfortably accommodated at the government guest house where he is accorded due courtesy*

and respect », has unlimited access to his family and was « *chauffeured to his residence for overnight reunions with his family* »,

Recalling the death in prison of Tin Maung Win, Hla Tan and Saw Win in January 1991, August 1996 and August 1998 respectively, and *considering* in this connection the many reports and testimonies gathered from former detainees to the effect that prisoners are denied adequate food and health care, housed in insanitary and degrading conditions and subjected to cruel disciplinary practices and torture,

Recalling in this connection that the present United Nations Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in Myanmar has not been able to visit Myanmar, that the former Rapporteur was denied access to prison cells and could not meet any detainee while visiting Myanmar, and that the Government of that country rejected the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) standard requirements for visits to places of detention; *recalling also* that the authorities of Myanmar have never responded to the IPU's request for information as to the places and conditions of detention of the detained MPs-elect,

Bearing in mind that, in its resolution 1998/63, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights « *expressed its deep concern that the Government of Myanmar has still not implemented its commitment to take all necessary steps towards democracy in the light of the democratic elections of 1990, while noting that the absence of respect for the rights pertaining to democratic government is at the root of all major violations of human rights in Myanmar* », and called on it « *to take urgent and meaningful measures to ensure the establishment of democracy in accordance with the will of the people as expressed in the democratic elections held in 1990 ...* »; that, likewise the United Nations General Assembly, in resolution 53/162 of 25 February 1999, strongly urged the Government of Myanmar, « *taking into account its assurances given at various times, to take all necessary steps towards the restoration of democracy in accordance with the will of the people as expressed in the democratic elections held in 1990* » and to « *release immediately and unconditionally detained political leaders and all political prisoners ...* »,

1. *Strongly condemns* the continuing deliberate policy of the Government of the Union of Myanmar to disregard the outcome of the elections of 1990 and its unwillingness to hand over power to those democratically elected, and *reaffirms* that its refusal to convene the Parliament elected in 1990 constitutes a violation of the principle established in Article 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that « *the will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government* »;
2. *Affirms* that in demanding that Parliament be convened and in setting up the « *Committee representing the People's Parliament* », the MPs-elect are merely defending the rights of their constituents to take part in the conduct of public affairs through representatives of their choice, as guaranteed under Article 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and exercising their right to discharge the mandate entrusted to them in 1990;
3. *Calls on* its member Parliaments to press for respect for democratic principles in Myanmar and show, by whatever means they deem appropriate, particularly through support for the « *Committee representing the People's Parliament* », their solidarity with their colleagues from the Pyithu Hluttaw elected in 1990;
4. *Expresses its indignation* at the massive arrests and detention of NLD MPs-elect and other members of the NLD, seemingly on no legal basis, and *strongly urges* the authorities to release them all immediately and unconditionally;
5. *Is outraged* at the restrictions imposed on NLD MPs-elect and the pressures exerted on them to relinquish their status as MPs-elect, and *urges* the authorities to put an immediate end to such practices and to reinstate those MPs already forced to resign;

6. *Reiterates* the concerns and considerations expressed in its previous resolutions regarding the detention and death in prison of MPs-elect;
7. *Recalls* that the Union of Myanmar, as a member of the United Nations, is bound to respect the rights established in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which is recognised as a general standard on human rights, in particular the right of all to take part in the conduct of public affairs, the right to liberty and security of person, the right to be treated with dignity and humanity, the right to fair trial and the right to freedom of expression and association;
8. *Regrets* the authorities' lack of response to its consistent requests to conduct an on-site mission to the Union of Myanmar, which it *wishes formally to reiterate* in order to meet with the authorities and the leaders of the opposition, in addition to visiting arrested or imprisoned MPs-elect, to shed light on the alleged facts;
9. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this resolution to the authorities;
10. *Requests* the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians to continue examining the case and report to it at its next session (October 1999).

NIGERIA

CASE N° NIG/42 - AMADI OKORAFOR
CASE N° NIG/43 - REV. MAC NWULU
CASE N° NIG/44 - POLYCAP NWITE
CASE N° NIG/45 - ABU IBRAHIM

CASE N° NIG/46 - BOLA AHMED TINUBU
CASE N° NIG/47 - OLAWALE OSHUN
CASE N° NIG/48 - O. J. ADEWUNMI

*Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999)*

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Referring to the outline of the case, as contained in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/164/13(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 163rd session (September 1998) concerning the case of the above-mentioned members of the Parliament of Nigeria dissolved in 1993,

Taking account of the information supplied by the National Human Rights Commission of Nigeria dated 25 August 1998 and received on 25 November 1998,

Also taking account of the information supplied by one of the sources on 19 October 1998 and on 12 February and 1 April 1999,

Recalling that following the death of former Head of State, General Sani Abacha, on 8 June 1998, the new military government headed by General Abdulsalam Abubakar has embarked on a new « transition to civil rule process », that elections have been held and that a civilian government is due to take over on 29 May 1999,

Considering that, according to information provided by one of the sources, all former Members of Parliament concerned, with the exception of Mr. Adewunmi, have regained their freedom, including that of expression and movement and are no longer under threat,

Considering that Mr. Bola Ahmed Tinubu returned to Nigeria in September 1998 and was elected Governor of Lagos State in January 1999,

Recalling that Senator Adewunmi has been in detention in Okoyi Prison for almost two years without charge; that he was ill when arrested and that his health has reportedly worsened owing to the lack of any medical facilities in prison; *considering* that, according to the National Human Rights Commission, he is detained under the provisions of the « Failed Banks (Recovery of Debts) and Financial Malpractices in Banks Decree » N° 18 of 1994,

Considering that, in its letter of 25 August 1998, the National Human Rights Commission stated that its Governing Council had requested the police, the detaining authority and the Attorney General of Nigeria to ensure his speedy trial in a competent court of jurisdiction,

Considering that, according to one of the sources, the Minister of Justice said that Decree N°18 of 1994 would be amended to allow release on bail,

1. *Welcomes* the process under way in Nigeria for the restoration of democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights, which has brought about a positive change in the situation of the former MPs concerned except in that of Mr. Adewunmi, who is still in prison;
2. *Thanks* the National Human Rights Commission for the information it supplied and the steps it has taken to ensure that Mr. Adewunmi is tried without any further delay by a competent court; *trusts* that its efforts will be successful and that Mr. Adewunmi will be either rapidly tried or released immediately; and *recalls* in this connection that under the international human rights norms to which Nigeria has subscribed anyone arrested or detained is entitled to trial within a reasonable time or to release;
3. *Notes* the election of Mr. Tinubu to the post of Governor of Lagos State, which clearly demonstrates that he has fully recovered his civil and political rights, and *is gratified to learn* that Mr. Okorafor, Rev. Mac Nwulu, Mr. Ibrahim and Mr. Nwite have regained their freedom of expression and movement and that Mr. Oshun may return to his country without any fear for his safety;
4. *Decides* consequently to close their cases;
5. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the competent authorities and the National Human Rights Commission, requesting them to inform him of Mr. Adewunmi's situation;
6. *Requests* the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians to continue examining the case of Mr. Adewunmi and report to it at its next session (October 1999).

CASE N° TG/01 - MARC ATIDÉPÉ)
CASE N° TG/02 - TAVIO AMORIN) **TOGO**
CASE N° TG/03 - GASTON AZIADUVO EDEH)

***Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999)***

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Referring to the outline of the case, as contained in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/164/13(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 163rd session (September 1998) concerning the case of Mr. Marc Atidépé, Mr. Tavio Amorin and Mr. Gaston Aziaduvo Edeh, of Togo,

Recalling that Mr. Atidépé and Mr. Amorin, both members of the High Council of the Republic of Togo, the former transitional legislative body, were assassinated in May and July 1992, respectively; that Mr. Edeh, MP-elect, was murdered in February 1994 and that the killings of all three parliamentarians were allegedly carried out by military personnel, there being an eyewitness of Mr. Edeh's murder who had to leave Togo for fear of his life,

Recalling that, under a general amnesty law for all politically motivated crimes and offences committed before 15 December 1994, the investigations into those murders were closed, which was tantamount to their recognition as « *political or politically motivated crimes* »,

Recalling that the Togolese Government, which had expressed its intention of considering the question of compensation, finally decided by Decree N° 1237 of the State Minister of Economy and Finance, dated 25 November 1997, to award compensation of 10,000,000 CFA francs each to the families of the parliamentarians concerned « *by way of support* »,

Considering that the compensation was paid to Mrs. Edeh for « *accidental death* »; that, according to information supplied by one of the sources in March 1999, the families of Mr. Amorin and Mr. Atidépé consider that they will not be able to receive compensation until the circumstances of the two MPs' assassination have been elucidated,

1. *Stresses* the general human rights principle that victims of violations of human rights are entitled to know the truth, to enjoy justice and to receive fair and adequate compensation;
2. *Commends* the National Assembly and its President for the efforts made to ensure that the families of the three assassinated MPs receive compensation;
3. *Deeply regrets* that the right of the victims to know the truth and to enjoy justice has not prevailed, these crimes having remained unpunished so far, and *emphasises* that, in accordance with relevant international standards, payment of compensation to the victims of human rights violations or their families in no way relieves the State of its duty to dispense justice;
4. *Decides* to close the file.

TURKEY

CASE N° TK/39 - LEYLA ZANA	CASE N° TK/52 - SELIM SADAK
CASE N° TK/40 - SEDAT YURTDAS	CASE N° TK/53 - NIZAMETTIN TOGUÇ
CASE N° TK/41 - HATIP DICLE	CASE N° TK/55 - MEHMET SINÇAR
CASE N° TK/42 - ZÜBEYİR AYDAR	CASE N° TK/57 - MAHMUT KILINÇ
CASE N° TK/43 - MAHMUT ALINAK	CASE N° TK/58 - NAIF GÜNES
CASE N° TK/44 - AHMET TÜRK	CASE N° TK/59 - ALI YIGIT
CASE N° TK/48 - SIRRI SAKIK	CASE N° TK/62 - REMZI KARTAL
CASE N° TK/51 - ORHAN DOGAN	

*Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999)*

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Referring to the outline of the case, as contained in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/164/13(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 163rd session (September 1998) concerning the case of the above-mentioned parliamentarians, former members of the Turkish Grand National Assembly,

Recalling that Ms. Zana, Mr. Dicle, Mr. Dogan and Mr. Sadak, who are currently serving the 15-year prison sentence handed down on them in December 1994, were never accused of any acts of violence or advocacy of violence; that the verdict relied heavily on the deputies' public speeches and writings quoted in the indictment - in which they repeatedly assert the Kurdish minority to be a group with a distinct identity but do not advocate violence - as evidence of their membership of the PKK; that the acts relied on in the judgment as evidence of membership of the PKK include: a press statement in connection with the taking of the parliamentary oath; the « *wearing of yellow, green and red accessories* » while taking the oath; a public statement to the United Nations on 2 April 1992 calling for investigation into the killing of civilians during disturbances at the time of *Newruz*, the Kurdish New Year, of 21 March 1992, and a petition of 20 November 1991 to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe calling for that organisation to appoint a body to monitor human rights in Turkey,

Recalling that contacts which Ms. Zana, Mr. Dicle, Mr. Dogan and Mr. Sadak reportedly had with PKK members and in particular Mr. Abdullah Öcalan were considered by Ankara State Security Court which tried them *inter alia* as proof of their membership of the PKK; *noting* in this connection that some of them had admitted having met Mr. Öcalan in Damascus in early 1993, however, with the blessing of the then Head of State, Mr. Turgut Özal; *recalling further* that, in his letter of 30 June 1998, the President of the Turkish National Group had said he failed to understand why the Committee and indeed the Council had relied on speculations regarding the alleged blessing given by President Özal to a mission to Damascus,

Noting in this connection that, on 18 September 1992, *Hürriyet* published an article under the title « *Özal calls for a ceasefire* » which reports in the following terms about a meeting President Özal had with Mr. Alinak, Mr. Sakik and Mr. Dogan: « *After his meeting with the HEP deputies, the President of the Republic declared that if the arms were to fall silent, certain steps could be envisaged. ... His statement was interpreted as a call for a ceasefire. It is understood that this appeal was to be conveyed by the HEP deputies after their Congress to the leader of the PKK, Mr. Öcalan. The President of the Republic said on the occasion of his meeting with the three HEP deputies that the situation was very dangerous; it might well worsen and hence something had to be done ...* »,

Considering that according to a report that Mr. Dicle issued from prison, the record of the trials pending against him and judgments handed down on him for articles he has published in the press since his imprisonment is as follows:

- (i) Sentenced under Article 312/2 of the Turkish Penal Code to 2 years and 4 months in prison by State Security Court (DGM) N° 3 of Istanbul, decision upheld by the Court of Cassation, for an article entitled « *The Atatürk International Peace Prize* » published on 31 May 1995 by *Yeni Politika*; this case is currently before the European Commission on Human Rights;
- (ii) Sentenced under Article 8/1 of Law N° 3713 to one year in prison by DGM N° 2 of Ankara for an article in a book published by the IHD (Turkish Human Rights Association) entitled « *Human Rights Panorama* »; this decision was overruled by the Court of Cassation, which called for a heavier sentence under Article 312 of the Penal Code; the trial is still under way;
- (iii) Sentenced to 4 months in prison by DGM N° 2 of Ankara, a decision upheld by the Court of Cassation, for an article entitled « *Hear the cry of humanity from the thousands in prison* » published on 26 July 1995 in *Yeni Politika*;
- (iv) Sentenced to 2 years in prison by DGM N° 2 of Istanbul for an article entitled « *The drama of Dersim* » published in *Ülkede Gündem* on 4 August 1997; this case is currently before the Court of Cassation;
- (v) The other trials against him by the Istanbul DGM, which is calling for 1 to 3 years' imprisonment, are as follows:
 - 1 to 3 years' imprisonment for an article entitled « *Coup [d'État] of 2 March* » published in *Demokrasi* on 3 March 1997;
 - 1 to 3 years' imprisonment for an article entitled « *I walk and I think* » published in *Ülkede Gündem* on 27 April 1998;
 - 1 to 3 years' imprisonment for an article entitled « *Living despite the enemy* » published in *Ülkede Gündem* on 25 May 1998;
 - 1 to 3 years' imprisonment for an article entitled « *Operation against the HADEP (People's Democratic Party)* » published in *Ülkede Gündem* on 29 June 1998;
 - 1 to 3 years' imprisonment for an article entitled « *Sentence of the Minister for Culture* » published in *Ülkede Gündem* on 13 July 1998;
 - 1 to 3 years' imprisonment for an article entitled « *European pincers* » published in *Ülkede Gündem* on 1 June 1998;
 - 1 to 3 years' imprisonment for an article entitled « *Lausanne: the death sentence of the Kurds* » published in *Ülkede Gündem* on 20 July 1998,

Considering that the conditions of detention of the former deputies concerned are said to have significantly deteriorated; that, thus, not only are they reportedly no longer authorised to receive visits from foreign delegations (including one from the European Parliament) but also the visits of their families are subject to increasing restrictions; that, henceforth, only direct family members are authorised to one half-hour visit per week in a partitioned visiting room; that « open » visits have reportedly been prohibited for over a year, even on the occasion of traditional holidays when they are granted for ordinary prisoners; that medical visits are likewise said to be increasingly difficult and

accompanied by harassment, insults and ill-treatment; that Ms. Zana, in protest against this treatment, reportedly refuses visits to the military hospital under a military escort; that her state of health has apparently worsened; that the authorities are believed to want to punish her for her refusal to be released on medical grounds without her colleagues being released at the same time,

Recalling finally that the case of Ms. Zana, Mr. Dicle, Mr. Dogan and Mr. Sadak is still pending before the European Court of Human Rights,

Considering the constant affirmation of the Turkish parliamentary authorities that Turkey is making every effort to bring its law and practice into line with European human rights standards, including freedom of speech,

Mindful of the interpretation given to the right to freedom of expression by the European Court of Human Rights, in particular in *Handyside v. UK* (1976), whereby this right is not only applicable to « information » or « ideas » that are favourably received or regarded as inoffensive but also to those that offend, shock or disturb the State or any sector of the population; that such are the demands of that pluralism, tolerance and broadmindedness without which there is no « democratic society »,

1. *Notes* that there is no new element permitting it to alter its conviction that the former MPs in question were sentenced on account of having exercised their freedom of expression in advocating a political solution to the conflict in south-eastern Turkey, for which purpose some of them met Mr. Öcalan;
2. *Calls once again* on the Turkish authorities to release Ms. Zana, Mr. Dicle, Mr. Dogan and Mr. Sadak and thus give substance to their stated pledge to adapt Turkish legislation to European human rights norms;
3. *Is appalled* at the number of trials currently pending against Mr. Dicle in connection with articles he published in different newspapers, and *wonders* how such zeal is compatible with the stated will of the Turkish authorities to bring Turkish law and practice into conformity with European human rights norms; *would be grateful* for information on these proceedings;
4. *Is concerned* at the allegations regarding the restriction of the right of the MPs concerned to receive visits and the reports that Ms. Zana is harassed and insulted when going for medical treatment, and *wishes to ascertain* their present conditions of imprisonment and their state of health;
5. *Reiterates*, moreover, its previous considerations and concerns regarding this case;
6. *Requests* the Secretary General to bring this decision to the attention of the Turkish parliamentary authorities;
7. *Requests* the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians to continue examining the case and report to it at its next session (October 1999).

CASE N° TK/63 - HASAN MEZARCI - TURKEY***Resolution adopted without a vote by the Inter-Parliamentary Council at its 164th session
(Brussels, 16 April 1999)***

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Referring to the outline of the case, as contained in the report of the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians (CL/164/13(b)-R.1), and to the resolution adopted at its 163rd session (September 1998) concerning the case of Mr. Hasan Mezarci, a former member of the Turkish Grand National Assembly,

Taking account of information conveyed by one of the sources in March 1999,

Recalling that, contrary to information supplied to it by the parliamentary authorities in March/April 1995, Mr. Mezarci was sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment on 29 January 1996 by Bandirma Penal Court, having been found guilty of violating Articles 1 and 2 of Law 5816 by insulting the memory of Atatürk: he had called for an investigation into the alleged extrajudicial killing of Ali Sükrü, a member of Parliament for Trabzond in the 1920s who, Mr. Mezarci claimed, had been murdered on Atatürk's orders,

Recalling also that, in his letter of 5 January 1998, the President of the Turkish National Group stated that various judicial proceedings on charges of insulting the memory of Atatürk were under way against Mr. Mezarci, namely case N° 1996/588 before Ankara 8th Criminal Court, case N° 1996/575 before Ankara 20th Criminal Court and case N° 1996/570 before Ankara 5th Criminal Court; *recalling further* that he has been charged with insulting the Republic and the Armed Forces by stating in an interview, published on 15 January 1997, that «*the heads of the gangs are the Prime Ministers, the Chiefs of Staffs and Presidents*» and that the relevant trial is still under way before Istanbul Criminal Court N° 2,

Recalling further that Mr. Mezarci was found guilty of insulting and defaming the Turkish Parliament and sentenced to ten months' imprisonment under Article 159 (1) and (2) of the Penal Code; that, according to the indictment, he stated the following: «*This Constitution and this Assembly will not resolve any of the country's problems and it will lead to another military coup. The solution is the Sharia system. I cannot sit in this Assembly. I am disgusted with it*»; that at the court hearing on 19 March 1997, Mr. Mezarci reportedly said «*I described Sharia as a belief, not as a State form. (...) It is my constitutional right to inform people of my Assembly activities. I have spoken more openly in the Assembly than in newspaper reports where I have been quoted*»; *recalling also* that an appeal is pending,

Considering that, according to one of the sources, a new trial was opened at Trabzond Penal Court against Mr. Mezarci under Article 159 of the Penal Code for «*insulting the army*» during a speech he delivered on a local TV channel in Trabzond on 11 November 1997,

Mindful of the stated will of the Turkish authorities to make every effort to bring Turkish legislation into line with European human rights standards, particularly with respect to freedom of expression; and *noting in this connection* the interpretation given by the European Court of Human Rights to freedom of expression, namely that «*freedom of expression constitutes one of the essential foundations of (such) democratic society, one of the basic conditions for its progress and for the development of every man. Subject to Article 10(2), it is applicable not only to 'information' or 'ideas' that are favourably received or regarded as inoffensive or as a matter of indifference, but also to those that offend, shock or disturb the State or any sector of the population. Such are the demands of that pluralism, tolerance and broadmindedness without which there is no democratic society*» (Handyside v. UK, September 1976),

Noting finally the recommendation made by the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the right to freedom of opinion and expression in the report on his mission to Turkey in 1997 (E/CN.4/1997/31/Add.1), namely that «*persons sentenced to a fine or a term of imprisonment solely for the peaceful expression of their opinions, including opinions that run counter to the philosophy of the State or might otherwise be considered as ill-conceived, should ... have their convictions annulled*»,

1. *Reaffirms* that in making the statement which, on 29 January 1996, led to his sentencing to 18 months' imprisonment, Mr. Mezarci was simply exercising his right to freedom of expression, guaranteed under Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights, to which Turkey is a party;
2. *Reiterates its wish* to receive detailed information on the other judicial proceedings apparently still under way against him, in particular a copy of the relevant judgments;
3. *Urges* the authorities to follow the recommendation made by the United Nations Special Rapporteur on freedom of expression and annul the sentences handed down on Mr. Mezarci on account of peaceful expression of an opinion;
4. *Requests* the Secretary General to seek the requested information from the President of the Turkish National Group;
5. *Requests* the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians to continue examining the case and report to it at its next session (October 1999).