



INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION

5, CHEMIN DU POMMIER
CASE POSTALE 330
1218 LE GRAND-SACONNEX / GENÈVE (SUISSE)

TELEPHONE (41.22) 919 41 50 - FAX (41.22)919 41 60 - E-MAIL postbox@mail.ipu.org
TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS : INTERPARLEMENT GENEVE

NY/XXII/2002/SR
28 February 2003

MEETING OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

attending the

57th session of the

UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(New York, 19 November 2002)

SUMMARY RECORD

The meeting was convened by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) and organized in close co-operation with the United Nations Secretariat. It was attended by more than 120 members of Parliament or parliamentary officials from 34 national delegations to the General Assembly and from three regional parliaments. It was chaired by Senator Sergio Pérez (Chile), President of the IPU Governing Council.

Sir Kieran Prendergast, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, delivered a message of welcome to the members of Parliament from Mr. Kofi Annan, Secretary-General. The participants heard addresses from and exchanged views with: Sir Kieran Prendergast; Ms. Noeleen Heyzer, Executive Director, United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM); Ms. Eveline Herfkens, Executive Director, Millennium Development Goals Campaign; Mr. Hans Corell, Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs; Mr. Oscar De Rojas,

Executive Secretary, Financing for Development Secretariat; and Ms. Inge Kaul, Director, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Office of Development Studies.

1. Introduction

The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Senator Sergio Páez, President of the IPU Governing Council. He welcomed Mr. Jan Kavan, President of the 57th Session of the United Nations General Assembly, and the other United Nations officials present.

The meeting would provide an opportunity to debate all aspects of cooperation between the Organization and the Inter-Parliamentary Union. Cooperation had begun in 1947, when the IPU had been granted consultative status (category I). A new and productive stage was about to begin with the milestone granting of observer status to the IPU.

He introduced Mr. Jan Kavan, President of the United Nations General Assembly. The Ambassador was himself a parliamentarian who had worked tirelessly on IPU initiatives and had helped achieve more dynamic cooperation between the IPU and the Parliament of the Czech Republic.

Mr. Jan Kavan said that he was privileged to welcome his many parliamentarian colleagues.

Referring to the deep roots of informal cooperation, he recalled that both the IPU and the United Nations' predecessor, the League of Nations, had been based from the start on the same principles stemming from the pacifist movement at the end of the 19th century. Peaceful settlement of international disputes was their primary objective, but cooperation had gradually extended to other issues and goals.

A much broader level of cooperation had been achieved only in the past decade, especially since 1996 with the signing of a formal agreement, thanks in part to the end of the Cold War, modern means of communication and globalization. Cooperation had received an important impetus from the Conference of Presiding Officers of National Parliaments held at United Nations headquarters in 2000 and was clearly reflected in article 30 of the Millennium Declaration in which signatories expressed their wish to strengthen such cooperation "in various fields, including peace and security, economic and social development, international law and human rights and democracy and gender issues".

Since then, cooperation had been flourishing, as documented in the Secretary-General's report to the 57th General Assembly, which listed nearly 30 fields of activity. The speaker especially appreciated the IPU's contribution to all the recent major United Nations conferences and its invaluable work on human rights and gender issues, including violence against women.

He fully expected that cooperation would reach a new milestone once the 57th General Assembly had granted the IPU observer status. Parliamentarians and the IPU had a crucial role in the global cooperation needed to tackle the important problems facing the world, none of which had a simple solution – poverty, underdevelopment, disease,

environmental degradation, unequal distribution of resources, human rights abuses and, above all, the obstacles to lasting peace. He hoped that fruitful dialogue at the present meeting would bring people everywhere closer to the world of their dreams.

The Chairman then introduced Sir Kieran Prendergast, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, who read out a message of welcome from the Secretary-General of the United Nations, currently traveling in the Balkans.

The Secretary-General congratulated the newly elected President of the IPU Governing Council, Senator Sergio Páez of Chile, and extended his best wishes to the outgoing President, Ms. Najma Heptulla, Deputy Chairperson of India's Rajya Sabha. Their terms of office framed a particularly significant period in the relationship between the IPU and the United Nations.

Enhancing that relationship had been a main priority for him. Parliaments were often the place where the energy of civil society joined the power of social movements to meet the challenge of governing. While the intensity of the cooperative relationship had grown tremendously, so too had the challenges raised by the cross-currents of civil society and governance in the international community. In order to take stock of what was working and what had not worked, he intended to establish a panel of eminent persons broadly representative of civil society and government who would address the parliamentary dimension of the United Nations' relationship with civil society. The panel would be sure to draw on the insights of the IPU: as individuals, members of Parliament represented real constituencies with real needs, while collectively parliamentarians were at the heart of government.

Welcoming the substantive contributions made by the IPU to recent conferences, summits and special sessions, not least by familiarizing parliamentarians with the United Nations' work, he said that the granting of observer status to the IPU would usher in a new and mutually beneficial era in the cooperative relationship between the two organizations. He extended his best wishes for a successful meeting.

2. Post-conflict peacebuilding and other political affairs

The Chairman invited Sir Kieran to address the meeting on his own behalf. Sir Kieran was close to the parliamentary world and his efforts on behalf of the IPU were greatly appreciated.

Sir Kieran Prendergast noted that he was attending the traditional annual meeting for parliamentarians for at least the fifth time. His impression was that the most useful aspect of the meeting was the opportunity for parliamentarians to raise their own concerns and receive responses on them. He would therefore limit his own statement to just a few introductory points.

The Department of Political Affairs was responsible for much of the spectrum of United Nations' action on peace and security, from early warning and conflict prevention to

post-conflict peace-building. Peacekeeping operations proper were under the Department of Peacekeeping, whose resources had recently been increased and which would henceforth plan and manage all large peace operations, even those (such as in Afghanistan) not involving peacekeepers.

In addition to its role in electoral assistance and in providing Secretariat support for the Security Council, the Department of Political Affairs was active in all regions of the world save North America. There were numerous operations in Africa; 70% of the Security Council's work concerned conflicts on that continent. The Department also had a particular interest in Guatemala and in follow-up to the Central American peace process; in Cyprus, the Balkans and the Caucasus; and in Afghanistan and East Timor.

While his Department tried to make Member States more aware of the benefits of preventing conflicts rather than allowing them to erupt, it was also attempting to advance peace-building during the post-conflict phase. Peace-building was a relatively new area of work about which some Member States had concerns, probably because the Organization had not yet managed to explain fully what it meant by that term.

In conflict situations, the signing of a peace agreement did not mean that the root causes of conflict had disappeared. But peacekeeping operations were expensive and there was often donor pressure to withdraw the troops as quickly as possible, perhaps leaving the country in a state of fragile peace and uncertain stability. The idea of post-conflict peace-building was to continue providing assistance in order to underpin the peace and ensure lasting stability.

Drawing a medical analogy, Sir Kieran said that a patient with an infection might be tempted to stop taking antibiotics once he or she started to feel better. Doctors rightly warned that stopping the course of antibiotics prematurely would expose the patient to a recurrence of the infection and, even more dangerous, enable the bacteria to become resistant to the drug and make the infection even more virulent. His Department's view was that the Security Council often supplied "medication" for five days instead of the full course of antibiotics required. Post-conflict peace-keeping aimed to extend the "medication" to the full two weeks and thereby provide a more stable basis for society over the long term. The cost of not doing so was high. Research under the auspices of the World Bank showed that a shockingly high 50% of all conflicts for which peace agreements were concluded recurred within five years, imposing high economic and social costs on the international community -- expensive peacekeeping operations, feeding refugees, dislocation and disturbance in neighbouring countries. Sir Kieran said that his job was to balance operational work in individual conflicts with the task of persuading the Security Council and General Assembly to be proactive in averting conflicts and preventing their recurrence.

The Chairman said that the floor was open for statements from the participants.

Ms. Starrfelt (Norway) endorsed the importance of post-conflict peace-building and asked whether the United Nations found it difficult to secure funding for those projects.

Ms. Kaneva (Bulgaria), speaking as President of the Bulgarian Inter-Parliamentary Group at the National Assembly of her country, welcomed the initiative for strengthened cooperation between the IPU and the United Nations General Assembly and its subsidiary organs. Bulgaria's National Assembly had consistently followed the injunction in the Millennium Declaration to enhance the relationship between the two bodies in fields ranging from peace and security to gender issues. Cooperation was particularly vital at the present time of global menace from terrorism. She expected that the granting of observer status to the IPU would contribute to the solution of global problems and help establish lasting peace and understanding among peoples.

The Chairman welcomed the presence of Bulgarian parliamentarians among the more than 120 parliamentarians from 34 countries and three regional parliaments.

Ms. Rynänen (Finland) agreed that post-war peace-building was of utmost importance, including building up civil society and local administration and establishing the preconditions for cooperation between the conflict partners. She asked whether a plan existed for training peacekeepers for that task, which demanded special skills and human rights education.

Ms. Muñoz de Liendo (Andean Parliament), speaking as a member of the Venezuelan delegation of the Andean Parliament, was grateful for the opportunity to attend the meeting and looked forward to the granting of observer status to the IPU. She wished to recognize the work undertaken by the United Nations and the IPU's close involvement in it through Mr. Santiago Romero, Director of IPU's Liaison Office in New York.

As an Andean parliamentarian, she particularly wished to hear in more detail about the manner in which parliamentarians had been involved in the negotiations for peace in Colombia. That process, involving Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia, was vital for democracy in the sub-region. She would also be grateful for Sir Kieran's opinion on whether trainees could be taught not only how to bring about peace but also how to help promote and enhance democracy.

Mr. Herrera (Mexico) said that his delegation's presence showed the will of the world's parliaments to give a truly parliamentary dimension to the work of the United Nations. He asked for Sir Kieran's opinion on the proposal made by Mexico at the 57th General Assembly to adopt a resolution on combating terrorism and promoting respect for human rights.

Sir Kieran Prendergast said in reply to Ms. Starrfelt that there were several dimensions to the issue of funding for post-conflict peace-building. In peacekeeping operations funded from the regular budget of the United Nations, based on assessed contributions from Member States, the major donors clearly preferred to withdraw the mission as quickly as possible once a peace agreement had been signed. Foreign policy was, after all, made not just by ministries of foreign affairs but by treasuries. As the examples of Sierra Leone and East Timor showed, the major donors preferred that current peacekeeping missions be concluded before any new request emerged for peacekeeping funds. Hence the constant constructive

tension between the proponents of early withdrawal and the opponents of premature cessation of assistance.

For the same reason, there was increasing pressure for “core” United Nations activities such as DDR (disarmament, demobilization and reintegration) to be funded voluntarily, not through the United Nations regular budget.

His opinion was that DDR was too important to be shortchanged. It required no special genius to recognize that having armed individuals roaming around threatened a country's stability, and that even disarmed individuals who failed to be reintegrated into society were likely to turn in desperation to their only skill, that in weaponry – “casual armed labour”, as the Secretary-General called them. Helping to train them, find them jobs or provide them with land and the means to survive until their first harvest were of vital importance. An example was Afghanistan, where thousands had been making their living through weaponry.

Increasing the Secretariat's capacity for post-conflict peace-building would require further dialogue and reassurance that the process would not be intrusive, as some had regarded activities in Kosovo, for example. Even with voluntary funding from the Nordic group and the United Kingdom, the Secretariat could not recruit until it had the approval of membership.

In reply to Ms. Ryyänen, Sir Kieran said that training for peacekeepers in post-conflict peace-building was rising on his Department's agenda, although most peace-building activities would take place after the peacekeepers had left the country.

Replying to Ms. Muñoz de Liendo, he said that the United Nations had been involved in the Colombia peace process in piecemeal fashion, owing to resistance to the idea of needing external assistance and worry by some parties that United States agents might become involved. He acknowledged that the Organization had not been successful in bringing the parties together under President Pastrana, although some confidence had been established in the Secretary-General's potential good offices. President Uribe's presidency could mark the start of a new phase. He personally did not hold out much hope in the short term, since the guerrillas were bound to test the new President's will, but the Secretary-General was maintaining his offer of good offices. The United Nations obviously could not deliver ultimatums, nor could it deal with hostages, a situation in which the International Committee of the Red Cross could help. However, more needed to be done in the way of humanitarian relief. Colombia's was the worst conflict in the Western Hemisphere. The country itself and the international community had to give more attention to the many hundreds of thousands of displaced persons living in miserable conditions. Similarly, all parties – the guerrilla movements, the paramilitaries and Government institutions such as the Army – needed to show much greater respect for human rights, and the United Nations had to do more capacity-building in Colombia, which had a vigorous civil society.

In reply to Mr. Herrera, he said that the Member States were crucial for fruitful cooperation. For example, his Department working with the Autonomous National University in Mexico City had developed a manual for electoral observation and cooperation, including the role of domestic and international observers. The result was an interactive DVD that could not have been produced by the United Nations alone.

In the area of the fight against terrorism, the major focus was the Counter-Terrorism Committee, of which Mexico was a member, set up by the Security Council after 11 September. Resolution 1373 (2001) under which the Committee was established was the Security Council's most ambitious resolution ever because it was binding on all Member States under Chapter 7 of the United Nations Charter. Terrorism had many complex facets and there was no simple or single answer. Winning the battle called for a broad and sustained strategy.

He said that the United Nations was also there to remind countries that the fight against terrorism should not serve as an excuse to suppress freedom of speech, thought or association, or as a spurious justification for pursuing existing grievances against other Member States.

Mr. Graham (Canada) said he felt privileged to be at the United Nations. He viewed peace-building as crucial, partly as a result of his personal experience as an election observer around the world. In one country, after 35 years of a dictatorial regime, the newly elected President was promising his people a new constitution. But the editor of a daily newspaper had pleaded with the outside observers to keep the President's feet to the fire. In his memorable words, "don't love us and leave us". As a result, a centre for democratic education had been set up and the President had delivered on his promises. As far as Mr. Graham was concerned, education was one of the most important aspects of DDR. He asked whether the United Nations had plans to explain to people not only their rights but their responsibilities in a democracy.

Ms. Ionescu (Romania) inquired about measures to make proceedings of the Security Council more transparent and strengthen its relationship with non-member countries. She also asked what measures had been adopted pursuant to Security Council resolution 1325 (2001) so as to integrate a gender equality perspective and the protection of children and of human rights into peacekeeping activities.

Mr. Somparé (Guinea) said that his country had only two months earlier established a National Assembly, of which he was the President. He looked forward to cooperation.

He paid tribute to the United Nations for having helped restore peace in the neighbouring country of Sierra Leone, which was now in the DDR period. He hoped they would be equally successful in Liberia and Côte d'Ivoire; war there would lead to ruinous consequences for Guinea. He appealed to the IPU and the United Nations to take a preventive stance there and to help mitigate the ecological, human and financial suffering already endured in countries such as his, which had sheltered more than a million refugees. More than half a million refugees still remained in Guinea.

Sir Kieran Prendergast said that he attached great importance to the quotation "Don't love us and leave us" cited by Mr. Graham. In the Central African Republic, for example, problems were occurring partly because the peacekeeping operation had been withdrawn too soon; there had simply not been the political will in the Security Council to extend it. He

also agreed that electoral assistance was an important part of United Nations activities; the nature of such assistance had evolved from the observation role a decade earlier.

In reply to Ms. Ionescu, he saw a move toward more candid briefings of the Security Council, both in and out of the formal chambers. There was more transparency and a better understanding of the concerns of troop-contributing countries. Unless they were fully informed of the dangers their troops might run, countries would be increasingly reluctant to provide peacekeeping troops.

While Sir Kieran was not in charge of peacekeeping, he was aware of a serious effort to focus on the protection of children and on gender. Unfortunately, Member States were reluctant to put forward women as credible candidates for senior peacekeeping positions. In his own Department about 45% of professional staff were women – a figure far above the typical percentage of women in national foreign ministries. Progress had been made but far more was needed.

While Mr. Somparé of Guinea had paid tribute to the United Nations, Sir Kieran paid tribute to Guinea, which had borne a heavier refugee burden than any other country in the world and in a hospitable manner that would put Europe to shame. The Secretary-General was fully aware of the interconnected nature of West Africa's problems, with turbulence likely to spill over borders. That was why he had had opened a special office in Dakar and appointed a Special Representative.

The Chairman thanked Sir Kieran for his enlightening statement.

3. Gender, global security and development

The Chairman welcomed Ms. Noeleen Heyzer, Executive Director of UNIFEM. The IPU was in favour of gender equality and parliamentarians had a great deal to contribute towards its advancement.

Ms. Noeleen Heyzer said she would pick up on some of the points just made in connection with global security and view them through a gender lens.

Three events in the year 2000 had helped the international community visualize what the issue of human security had to mean in the 21st century. First was the Millennium Assembly, which had restored development to the agenda and made poverty reduction a goal. It would not be possible to harness the community to the task of halving poverty by 2015 without first looking at the relation between poverty and gender.

The second event had been the special session of the General Assembly on the issue of HIV/AIDS. Human security could not be achieved unless the world took on an epidemic that had no borders and needed a global solution. As UNIFEM had pointed out, as a disease HIV/AIDS was a health issue but as an epidemic it was a gender issue. Tackling it successfully required a hard look at the fatal inequality of power between men and women. That inequality resulted in vastly higher infection rates in African girls as opposed to boys. It also

placed the burden of home care on the shoulders of women and their daughters, diverting them from school and productive activities such as farming.

Thirdly, she was proud of the collaboration between UNIFEM and the Security Council that had led to resolution 1325 (2001) on women, peace and security. For the first time, the Council had said that women's security was actually the best indicator of human security. The nature of warfare had changed. Three-quarters of the casualties in the First World War had been soldiers; today they were civilians. Women's bodies have become a battlefield with violence against women as a weapon of war. The use of systematic rape, deliberate spread of infection, and forced pregnancy was intended to humiliate not just women but men. The impact of war on women and girls included the creation of displaced persons, for whom no single agency was responsible, and refugee women, whose problems were not adequately covered by existing legislation on refugees.

Resolution 1325 (2001) also drew attention to the leadership role of women in crisis and post-crisis situations. Women and their organizations had proven their value for straddling ethnic boundaries and promoting dialogue. UNIFEM had facilitated their participation in the peace process in Burundi and Congo, for example. She was often asked what difference it made to have women at the peace table. The answer was that women raised certain issues, such as the infants born of rape, and the psychological impact of war, that had never before been aired in such a forum. In a post-crisis situation, as resolution 1325 (2001) pointed out, women had an important role to play in reconstructing the country and ensuring that the opportunity was taken to adopt new legislation ensuring their rights to land and education in accordance with the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). In Afghanistan, for example, the focus was on reintegrating widows and replacing women in the educational and health care systems after six years' absence. In East Timor, to take another example, trauma counselling was needed for women and men who had to rebuild their lives. When a country emerged from a crisis, violence did not disappear but often spilled into the home, in part because men had been humiliated by their failure to protect the women in the community.

In short, the resolution had been a major achievement of the Security Council. She hoped that parliamentarians with their energy would pick up the issue of peace, security and women. In the aftermath of 11 September, it was even more important to remember that global security depended on tackling human security, development and human rights as an integrated whole.

Ms. Heyzer said that the acronym ACT – accountability, commitment and transformation – was a useful reminder of how parliaments might galvanize international support for that agenda. Parliamentarians could help hold their governments accountable for the commitments they had made. They could push for resources to be directed in a way that would promote human security, such as into the health sector and skills building.

As for countries' commitment to existing recommendations and conventions, she suggested that investing in Millennium Development Goal number 3 – gender equality and women's empowerment - is the best strategy to achieve all eight goals. For instance, she had already pointed out that overcoming gender inequality would help in the struggle against

HIV/AIDS. Poverty reduction similarly would benefit from improving women's access to markets and working conditions for home-based workers. Globalization had to focus not only on goods and services but on the movement of labour and the links between migrant labour and trafficking in persons.

Coming to transformation, she said that Rwanda was a good example of a country that had used the women's forum of the National Assembly to review and transform national legislation, putting in place brand new rights to land and inheritance.

Parliaments were an important venue for action and transparency, she said. Working together with the United Nations, they could accomplish great things.

The Chairman said that the floor was open for comments.

Ms. Ioannucci (Italy) said that in her country work was being done on laws to expand women's representation in politics and public administration. The need for better representation of women was a felt need especially now that terrorism was threatening families and women, the pivots of society.

She proposed that, in addition to pursuing its work with and on women, the IPU in cooperation with the United Nations should organize a meeting of women parliamentarians to bring their special point of view to bear on the prevention of war and terrorism, and on peace-building.

Ms. Krishna (India) congratulated the Executive Director of UNIFEM for her objective yet passionate statement. She reported that in India consideration was being given to new legislation against domestic violence and rape.

The cruel use of women as weapons in conflict situations was tragic. She had been fortunate enough to take part in the Security Council debate on women, peace and security, and suggested that women should be playing a bigger role in restructuring society and helping mitigate trauma for families and children during the reconstruction phase.

She asked whether UNIFEM had a plan and the necessary funds for bringing more women into peacekeeping and the promotion of human security.

Mr. Mubarak (Egypt) thanked Ms. Heyzer for her statement. Noting that she had focused largely on conflicts in Africa, he said that legislation was the most important means of ensuring women's rights. In his country there was equality in almost every aspect of life but there were very few women in parliament because under the current system it was difficult for them to stand for office. He asked for Ms. Heyzer's comments on that.

Mr. Salles (France) drew attention to the exponential growth of prostitution, including of very young girls, in the West since the fall of the Berlin Wall. The phenomenon was rooted in the great poverty in the East, where minimum wages were a mere 60-70 Euros a month. France and other countries, including the countries of transit, were attempting to coordinate their legislation, but the problem clearly needed to be tackled at the source by

enabling society to protect girls. He asked whether Ms. Heyzer thought that solutions might be found through cooperation between national parliaments, the IPU and the United Nations.

Ms. Starrfelt (Norway) said that she agreed fully with Ms. Heyzer's statement. She asked whether it was proving easy or difficult to ensure that the UNIFEM perspective permeated the United Nations system's work. Secondly, she asked for the speaker's views on how to further improve cooperation between the Organization and parliaments.

Ms. Madero (Mexico) joined other participants in congratulating Ms. Heyzer for explaining just why it was important to treat the gender perspective as an integral part of development, social policy and economics, rather than relegating it to an annex.

In matters of democracy and gender, she considered that there should be an observatory of some kind to monitor the commitments that countries had entered into and see how well they were ensuring gender parity, including parity in leadership, through their legislatures and political parties. Political parity would help ensure a better integration of the gender perspective into the many issues that Ms. Heyzer had highlighted. Legislation alone did not suffice; supplementary mechanisms were needed to ensure greater awareness and bring about social and structural changes that would allow laws to be implemented.

Ms. Heyzer said she would comment first on the issue of women in politics, including parliamentary representation. Immediately after the Fourth World Conference on Women (Beijing, 1995), 40 countries had adopted its recommendation for a quota of 30% of women -- a critical mass. Once the women were in place, they could forge a partnership with men and make gains. Mapping progress around the world, UNIFEM had found that countries with a quota system for women in politics had better resource allocations in their gender budget, for example for health and education. Experience also showed that women who managed to use the quota system were especially effective when they had links to civil society and a strong constituency whose issues they could bring to parliament.

On the issue of cooperation, she said it would be helpful to bring recommendations from international conferences back to national parliaments for discussion and action, and to let the United Nations know what obstacles parliamentarians were encountering in implementing those recommendations. The aim was to strengthen intergovernmental dialogue and forge closer bonds so that the international community as a whole could stand behind international commitments, including the Millennium Development Goals.

As for legal reform, she stressed that even the best legal framework could not be implemented unless people had a clear understanding of it and until the practical conditions existed for its application. For example, following the enactment of legislation to combat violence against women in Senegal, she had been contacted by the Minister of Women's Affairs, who had called for an educational campaign to help every village understand that female genital mutilation was dangerous. Merely criminalizing the procedure would not work.

Investing in women and women's organizations for peace-building and human security was very important. So far, however, their role was receiving regrettably little recognition, visibility or support. It was vital to bring women into the entire process, from the peace table to post-conflict reconstruction, including the drafting of new constitutions and laws. In Afghanistan, it was gratifying that the United Nations had managed to bring over 200 women to the Loya Jirga in a tradition-breaking move. It had been a struggle but one well worth it, considering the women's issues that they had brought to the table.

As for trafficking and prostitution, she felt that they were rooted in not just poverty but inequality in the context of globalization and vulnerability caused by economic breakdown, war and corruption. It was important to keep in mind the two distinct flows of labour within globalization. One was an accepted flow of highly skilled workers who were being welcomed into countries' information technology and banking sectors, among others. The other labour flow – unprotected and often illegal -- was that of migrant workers who were taking on ill-paid or dangerous jobs in the health care, service and other sectors that host country nationals were reluctant to fill. She was convinced that as long as illegal migration persisted, so would the smuggling of people, which in turn had links to the criminal trafficking of arms and drugs, as well as women. To promote human security, it was necessary to ensure a safe flow of labour, not only of goods and services.

In short, looking at human security through women's eyes, one could see that it covered a whole range of issues, from combating poverty to empowering women in the fight against AIDS and to promoting women's participation in governance.

Mr. Davis (Council of Europe, United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the IPU branch of the United Kingdom and the delegation to the Assembly of the Council of Europe, wondered whether the need was for more legislation or for the enforcement of existing legislation. Laws against rape, for example, presumably existed in all countries.

Ms. Ryyänen (Finland) thanked Ms. Heyzer for her impressive statement. At the World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg, 2002) she had seen some progress on the agenda that Ms. Heyzer had laid out. However, there had also been some backsliding; gains from previous conferences had been called into question during the negotiations on the final document. She wondered whether Ms. Heyzer had any suggestions for preventing future such confrontations between religious and cultural rights, on the one hand, and fundamental human rights, on the other. In her own opinion, human rights included gender rights and women's so-called reproductive rights, which had close links to health and AIDS prevention in particular.

Ms. Heyzer agreed with Mr. Davis that enacting legislation was only a first step, though it was an important one that typically had not come without a struggle. For example, the subject of domestic violence had hardly been broached before the World Conference on Human Rights (Vienna, 1993). Only 40 countries so far had adopted legislation to combat it. Once legislation on domestic violence was in place, the challenge was to bring on board the criminal justice system by training lawyers, judges and police, and to invest in the necessary services. Prevention was key; it involved changing public opinion and social behaviour through education, the media and parliaments.

She shared the concern of Ms. Ryyänen. A great deal of work had been invested in the major conferences of the 1990s. That work had reaped tremendous benefits for women around the world. To prevent those gains from being eroded, the public had to be made aware of the high costs of backsliding and losing ground.

The human rights standards that the United Nations stood behind had to become the norm for the whole international community, but in the process of moving from rhetoric to reality parliaments had to ensure that there would be no lost opportunities. She hoped that parliamentarians would "ACT" by developing mechanisms for accountability, making and meeting commitments, and using the potential for transformation through the resources and partnerships at their command.

4. The Millennium Development Goals Campaign

The Chairman introduced Ms. Eveline Herfkens, Executive Director of the Millennium Development Goals Campaign, paying tribute to her considerable work in the public arena. The IPU and national parliaments wished to work with the new initiatives and help align their positions with those of the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

Ms. Eveline Herfkens said that having been a parliamentarian for ten years, she felt at home in present company. She attached great importance to meeting with parliamentarians, who in her view were being neglected on the international scene. Even earlier, as Minister of Development Cooperation in the Netherlands, she had felt that the international community was supporting non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in some countries to an extent that undercut parliamentarians. Ultimately, it was parliaments that were accountable, not NGOs.

As an appointee of the Secretary-General, she first wished to explain that the Millennium Development Goals were the combined results of the major international conferences of the 1990s, including the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (Earth Summit, Rio de Janeiro, 1992), the International Conference on Population and Development (Cairo, 1994), the World Summit for Social Development (Copenhagen, 1995), and finally the International Conference on Financing for Development (Monterrey, 2002), which had taken place after the goals had been developed.

Basically, there were eight goals to be reached by 2015: 1) reducing the proportion of poor people in the world by half; 2) ensuring universal primary education for girls and boys; 3) promoting gender equality and the empowerment of women; 4) reducing the current rate of mortality of children under 5 by two-thirds; 5) reducing maternal mortality by three-quarters; 6) halting and reversing the spread of HIV/AIDS, malaria and other major diseases; 7) ensuring environmental sustainability; 8) building the global partnership needed in order to achieve the first seven goals.

Goal 8 had been reinforced by the conclusion of the International Conference at Monterrey that while developing countries had primary responsibility for achieving their development goals, they would find it hard to do so without an enabling international environment. Accordingly, it was up to the countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) to provide adequate development assistance in terms of quantity and quality and, even more important, to work towards debt relief, foster foreign investment, open up their own markets and eliminate product-related agricultural subsidies.

There were many reasons why she was excited at her appointment to campaign for the Millennium Development Goals. During the 25 years that she had been involved in development cooperation and North-South dialogue, she had seen a great deal of time wasted on disagreements between East and West, between North and South, between the United Nations system and the international financial institutions, and between governments and NGOs. The good news was that the Millennium Declaration had not only been signed by 189 heads of state or government but also endorsed by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, and had gained the enthusiasm of the NGO community.

Secondly, whereas the past debate had focused on the means of development, it now focused on the end, namely people-centred development. It built on the consensus that investing in people's health and education made good financial sense.

The third piece of good news was the synergy among the goals. Progress on one goal would bring about progress on the others. For instance, if clean water were more accessible, girls could spend more time at school instead of fetching water. And educated girls would wind up having fewer and better-spaced children who would in turn be healthier and better schooled.

Fourth, all goals had concrete, measurable sub-targets. Countries' progress could be monitored using those benchmarks, and comparisons between countries would spur useful public debate.

The goals were also very balanced. Whereas in earlier debates about world poverty the North and South had typically blamed each other, the Monterrey Consensus embodied a compact between them. Primary responsibility lay with the developing countries, but the developed countries -- which set the international trade and finance rules -- had a responsibility to ensure that globalization benefited all the world's population, as called for in the Millennium Declaration, and not just the rich. That would require creating an equitable and nondiscriminatory multilateral trading system. The system of agricultural subsidies was an example of a rule that needed to be changed. In Europe every cow was subsidized to the tune of \$2 a day, while many Africans had to survive on less than that daily. By including goal 8 of the Millennium Development Goals, a balance was achieved.

The Goals had already galvanized many international corporations. They were helping to spur more unity and joint programming within the United Nations system, which had been criticized for being too compartmentalized, and had brought about greater cooperation between that system and the World Bank and International Monetary Fund.

The Goals were “owned” by the peoples of all countries who had to achieve them, not by the United Nations system or the international financial institutions. The Organization’s role was that of facilitator and scorekeeper. As facilitator at global and local levels, she was reaching out to civil society, media, faith-based organizations, and particularly parliaments. As scorekeeper, the United Nations would help prepare individual country reports on progress towards the Goals and then combine them into a global report with a country-by-country listing. Such lists – for example, the Human Development Index and the Transparency International Index -- were extremely powerful means of stimulating debate in countries where progress had been revealed to be inadequate. She remembered when, a decade earlier, the Human Development Report had first incorporated a gender indicator and the Netherlands had dropped five places on the list of countries. That had led to a very useful public debate about what the country needed to do to recover its prized high place in the ranking.

As Minister of Development Cooperation until July 2002, she had found that the Goals were extremely helpful for combating aid fatigue, which came about because Europeans felt they had just been bailing out elites in the poor countries. Polls taken in many rich countries showed that people were prepared to pay slightly higher taxes in order to combat poverty in the developing world and to educate children.

People sometimes said that the Goals sounded good but wondered whether they were achievable. Her answer was a resounding yes. They were economically and technically achievable, given the political will. Hence the most important force to have was parliaments, who were key to creating political will. They scrutinized government policies, decided on legislation, and through the power of the purse controlled the use of public funds. Parliamentarians were in a position to assess whether proposed government policies would yield the priority action and funding needed for the Goals.

She also suggested that conducting national debates about the Goals might be helpful for parliamentarians themselves. She had been shocked by an international opinion poll, reported in the *Financial Times*, indicating that people trusted parliaments less than any other institution, even big business. Parliamentarians looking for ways to reconnect with their constituencies had a fantastic action agenda in the Goals, which basically summed up human aspirations in a language everyone could understand.

Addressing parliamentarians from the South, Ms. Herfkens said that UNDP country teams were supporting governments in reporting on the status of each goal. It was important for the resulting reports to be monitored by an independent body, and none was better suited to do so than parliament. She urged parliamentarians to frame debates on sectoral issues like health and education in the context of the MDGs; those on parliamentary finance committees should scrutinize the priority being given to spending on poverty reduction. It was vital to make the Government accountable, goal by goal, for its own pledge at the Millennium Summit.

She hoped that parliamentarians from the OECD countries would also subject their governments’ policies to scrutiny, not only on the adequacy of ODA but also on the other

crucial issues for poverty reduction such as debt relief and government positions at the World Trade Organization on the opening of markets.

The IPU might also take on some of those challenges through its technical cooperation programme, which was supported by UNDP and by a few donor countries that were deeply committed to the Goals.

She concluded by saying that only parliaments could fill the democracy deficit in global governance. As the Secretary-General had stated, parliamentarians' unique powers of the purse could make a real difference.

The Chairman thanked the speaker for her most interesting statement and opened the floor for comment.

Mr. Anam (Indonesia) congratulated Ms. Herfkens on her comprehensive presentation of the Goals. He asked what the main obstacle was thus far to achieving them on time, and whether terrorism was affecting their achievement.

Mr. Versnick (Belgium) congratulated Ms. Herfkens on her energetic and enthusiastic presentation. She had kindly stressed the importance and power of parliaments, and had even suggested means for parliamentarians to reconnect with public opinion. However, a more provocative statement including both praise and criticism might spur more action by politicians.

Mr. Malofeev (Belarus) asked whether there was any realistic prospect of reaching agreement on innovative sources of financing for development, as had been discussed at the Conference in Monterrey.

Mr. Saporito (Italy) said that he had been disappointed in the speaker's presentation, which had been moralistic rather than methodological. He pointed out that parliamentarians were already playing a role in monitoring their governments.

From the meeting's programme he had been expecting Sir Kieran Prendergast to talk about the fight against terrorism. He asked the Chairman whether some time could be devoted to the issue during the afternoon session.

Mr. Herrera (Mexico) said that Ms. Herfkens had expressed the aspirations of all humankind. He was particularly interested in her reference to the fact that people in the less-developed countries were clamouring not so much for assistance as for proper terms of trade. Although fair trade agreements had been signed, they were not being respected by the signatories. Implementation should be built into national legislation, as it was in Mexico and other countries, and complemented by an international free trade framework.

Mexico would be hosting the Fifth Ministerial Meeting in Cancun to be organized by the World Trade Organization (WTO) in April 2003, at which the main issue would again be the demand for fair trade. He therefore invited the IPU to undertake the same kind of effort as it had carried out for the International Conference on Financing for Development

(Monterrey, 2002) and the World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg, 2002).

Globalization should be complemented by national legislation. Without erecting trade barriers, developing countries might consider establishing some compensatory principles of justice vis-à-vis the more developed countries, whose high subsidies produced harmful economic distortions. He requested Ms. Herfkens to provide more details on how those distortions hurt especially the primary sectors of the developing countries – cattle-raising, fishing and minerals, as in case of Mexico.

Ms. Ionescu (Romania) recalled that, according to Ms. Herfkens, the Millennium Development Goals could not be achieved without parliaments. She agreed and also considered that the IPU could play an important role by mobilizing efforts, encouraging an exchange of experience, and even creating a follow-up mechanism for monitoring parliamentary action on promoting the Goals. Now especially that the IPU was to benefit from observer status, she asked whether Ms. Herfkens was contemplating involving national parliaments and their international organization in the Campaign.

The Chairman invited Ms. Herfkens to reply to the comments made and assured his Italian colleagues that the issue of terrorism would be taken up in the afternoon by Mr. Hans Corell.

Ms. Herfkens said in reply to Mr. Anam that the main obstacle to achieving the Goals was that political will was lacking, to various degrees, in country after country. The problem was partly that of national governments and partly that of inadequate global governance. Indonesia, for example, was affected by problems of governance as well as by the financial crisis. The parliament could help tackle the factors that were responsible for a slowdown in poverty reduction, which had been more rapid in previous years.

A real impact of terrorism on the Goals was in diverting attention and resources away from poverty reduction. At the same time, however, terrorism was teaching more people that the world's population was all in the same boat, as it were. The demonstration that events in one place inevitably affected other parts of the world helped engender a feeling of greater international solidarity which might even foster progress towards the Goals. So while some countries were focusing on terrorism and little else, others were become more aware of cross-national linkages and doing more to fight poverty.

She was prepared to take up the suggestion of Mr. Versnick to be more critical in her assessment of how countries were doing, although the situation differed greatly from one country to the next. Belgium was one of the few countries to have committed itself to increasing its aid budget to reach the 0.7% level of GNP for its official development assistance (ODA). But unlike Ireland, Belgium's commitment was not part of an across-the-board stance in parliament and hence was vulnerable to a change in government. A stronger cross-Parliament agreement would improve the Belgian record. Also in Belgium, there was room for improvement in the Government's positions on eliminating the more objectionable aspects of the common agricultural policy of the European Union and opening up its markets to products from the poor farmers of the world.

In reply to Mr. Malofeev, she said that there had indeed been debate about the Tobin Tax, but speaking as a political realist she had seen no one with the power to commit to it. Some candidates and sitting parliamentarians in France and Germany had spoken about it – partly, she suspected, to divert attention from the issue of the genuine need to increase ODA in those countries – but once elections had taken place all such talk had stopped.

A more realistic approach was for individual countries to commit unilaterally to the 0.7% figure as Belgium, Finland, Luxembourg and Ireland had recently done – some as part of the Monterrey process -- and as the Nordic countries and the Netherlands had been doing for 25 years. After utter silence on the subject for two decades, not only had a larger group of countries now adopted the 0.7% commitment, but in Barcelona in March 2002 the leaders of all the European Union countries had adopted a time-frame for reaching 0.39%, or more than halfway. She wished to remind Mr. Saporito of that pledge. The Italian delegation, if a member of the IPU, had a commitment to international cooperation. According to rumours that were now circulating, the draft of the forthcoming Italian budget did not make the necessary allowance for the Government of Italy's pledge to reach 0.39% by 2007. Moralizing aside, international cooperation would fail if countries continued to make but not live up to their pledges.

She fully agreed with Mr. Herrera that for most developing countries fair trade was far more important than aid. It was impossible to halve poverty without addressing jobs, income and, thus, trade issues. It would be wonderful if the IPU became involved in monitoring that agenda and she would be happy to address any such gathering organized by the IPU.

In reply to Ms. Ionescu, she agreed that the Campaign would get nowhere without national parliaments. Again, she would be delighted for the IPU to take up a role. With its unique network the IPU was in a position to help parliamentarians compare notes and exchange best practices on how to launch debates, for example on forthcoming issues on the agendas of the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization. Parliamentarians had the potential to become a tremendously powerful force to cut poverty in half by 2015; indeed, it was hard to think of a better theme for their next election campaign.

The Chairman expressed his thanks to Ms. Herfkens for her most interesting statement.

Mr. Anders B. Johnsson, Secretary General of the IPU, said that he had just received good news from the United Nations General Assembly. They had formally decided to grant the IPU observer status.

He said, however, that the story was not over. Over the next two days there would be a debate in the General Assembly on cooperation between the United Nations and a total of 23 regional and other organizations, including the IPU. He encouraged participants to read the report on the relationships of those organizations with the United Nations. As part of the debate, there would be a vote on a resolution that would *inter alia* authorize the IPU

to distribute its official documents to the General Assembly. Thus far, 50 countries had decided to co-sponsor the resolution. In view of what was at stake, he hoped to see all 140 Member countries of the IPU as co-sponsors by the time the resolution was adopted.

6. The International Criminal Court and other legal matters

The Chairman introduced Mr. Hans Corell, Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs, who would speak about the International Criminal Court, one of the most important initiatives for protecting the inalienable rights of humankind. Mr. Corell was responsible for organizing the Conference that adopted the ICC Statute.

Mr. Hans Corell said that it was always a pleasure for him to meet with parliamentarians, who made their countries' laws and appropriations and often made up the government itself.

He predicted that in a few decades, people would look back on the creation of the International Criminal Court (ICC) as one of the most important events in the history of international law and indeed humankind. The ICC was intended to address the impunity of individuals who had for centuries violated the weak, by making them stand trial for their acts.

Updating the meeting on progress thus far, he said that the Statute of Rome had entered into force on 1 July 2002. Over 80 ratifications had been received. The Assembly of the Court, made up of the States Parties, had met for the first time in September 2002 and had taken largely administrative decisions, including on rules of procedure and a budget for the first year. Next on the agenda was the election of judges and the appointment of a prosecutor. Candidates for judges were soon to be presented to the Secretary-General and the elections would take place at the Assembly in February 2003. Consultations concerning the prosecutor were under way and it was his hope that a person could be found around whom everyone could unite. A registrar would be appointed once the judges had been elected. An advance team in The Hague was helping to set up the Court in advance of its inauguration, scheduled for March 2003, and to receive for safekeeping any communications addressed to the ICC.

He would be happy to go into further detail on any aspect of the ICC that participants wished.

Another court that the United Nations had been involved in setting up was the Special Court for Sierra Leone, a country in which enormous atrocities had been committed. Unlike the Rwanda and Yugoslav Tribunals, which the Security Council had set up as subsidiary organs under Chapter 7 of the United Nations Charter, making their actions binding on the States Parties, the Special Court for Sierra Leone was a leaner model based on a negotiated agreement between the Government and the Secretary-General. The Special Court would focus on those who bore the greatest responsibilities for the atrocities. A prosecutor and an acting registrar were already in Freetown, to be followed soon by the judges.

A similar court had been envisaged to deal with one of the world's greatest tragedies, that of Cambodia, where 1.7 million people – 20% of the population – had been killed between 1975 and 1979. Initially, in the long negotiations between the United Nations and the Government of Cambodia, the focus had been on setting up an international court. However, the Government had then changed its position and requested extraordinary chambers under the national legal system. The Secretary-General had unfortunately been compelled to withdraw from the negotiations in February 2002 for lack of confidence that such a court would uphold international standards of fairness, justice and independence. A draft resolution on the subject was circulating among Member States that might soon lead to further developments.

A total of 13 conventions had been adopted to deal with terrorism. They were based on two principles – *aut dedere, aut judicare*, as the ancient Romans said; i.e. either deliver the suspects to be prosecuted in another country, or bring them to justice in your own country. Some of the conventions had been adopted under the aegis of the United Nations and others under that of international organizations such as the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). What all of them had in common was that they came into action once the damage had already been done. The Secretary-General had initiated a report, now before the General Assembly, on the question of why terrorist acts were committed in the first place, and it was for Member States to take that issue further.

Parliamentarians would also be aware of Security Council resolution 1373 (2001) requiring national parliaments to enact legislation on terrorism, primarily to combat financing for terrorist acts. The resolution had also set up a Counter-Terrorism Committee, chaired by Sir Jeremy Greenstock, Ambassador of the United Kingdom to the United Nations, which had been very active in working with governments and parliaments with regard to the reports on measures countries had taken to implement the resolution.

The Sixth Committee of the General Assembly, for which Mr. Corell's Department was responsible, was also attempting to draft two conventions on the fight against terrorism. One was a comprehensive convention -- an umbrella document covering all terrorist acts -- and the other was a convention on nuclear terrorism. Major advances had been made on the two draft conventions but, as the political climate had soured, States had been hesitant to take the final steps, including finding common language for a definition of terrorism. He nevertheless saw grounds for hope that both conventions would be finalized and adopted.

Parliamentarians would know that the United Nations had basically governed the province of Kosovo as well as that of East Timor until the latter had become an independent State. Acting under the binding Chapter 7 of the United Nations Charter, the Security Council had also called on the Organization to exercise a legislative function there -- a function which in democratic States was normally the preserve of an elected assembly. The Department of Legal Affairs had therefore added to its workload the task of screening every legislative proposal for its conformity with constitutional and human rights principles.

There were many legal aspects to the situation in Iraq. In 1996 he had negotiated the agreement on the oil-for-food programme. Parliamentarians would naturally be focusing on the aspect of disarmament and on resolution 1441 (2002), in which the Security Council had

taken a final step to give Iraq the option of disarming in accordance with that resolution and earlier ones. It was also important to remember that the United Nations had been involved for more than six years in humanitarian action to alleviate the burden on the Iraqi population, whose situation now appeared to be better.

He drew the meeting's attention to the fact that the General Assembly would soon be celebrating the 20th anniversary of the adoption of the Convention on the Law of the Sea. The so-called "constitution of the oceans" represented a major concept in regulating the uses of the oceans and the rights of States to use those parts of the oceans and seabeds outside the national jurisdiction of any State. In addition to the Deep Seabed Authority in Kingston, Jamaica, and the Law of the Sea Tribunal in Hamburg, Germany, parliamentarians would soon be hearing about the Continental Shelf Commission. Serviced by Mr. Corell's Department, the Commission dealt with how far beyond the 200 nautical mile zone (the exclusive economic zone) States were allowed to go with their continental shelf. Very complex equations were needed to determine where the slope became so steep that it became deep sea and hence the common heritage of humankind. As originally foreseen, a few other conventions anchored in the Law of Sea had been drafted in order to have an all-encompassing regime for the oceans, under the authority of the General Assembly, to whom his Department reported annually.

Human cloning was the most recent addition to his Department's agenda. That very sensitive and complex issue was being discussed in the Sixth Committee, which had been charged with drafting terms of reference for further work. Discussions would resume in 2003. While the issue was partly a legal one, as in many other such cases there were also extremely difficult political and ethical dimensions that had to be tackled before any convention could be drafted.

He looked forward to questions from the participants.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Corell for his statement and opened the floor for comments.

Mr. Günter (Switzerland) congratulated the IPU on organizing the meeting. The United Nations needed a parliamentary dimension; indeed, in the distant future, it might become a true world parliament.

It was central to Switzerland's policy that war criminals should be charged and brought before an international tribunal. A peaceful world needed a judicial body to deal with criminals who threatened world peace and the fate of innocent human beings. Now that the ICC was in its final phase of implementation, the Court had to be provided with the necessary conditions under which to function. The proliferation of clauses providing for immunity and exceptions was dangerous and could weaken the Court.

He asked Mr. Corell for his view on how parliamentarians could help achieve the two main tasks at hand: encouraging States to sign and ratify the Statute of Rome, and ensuring that governments did not conclude special arrangements with non-Party States that would weaken the Court's international jurisdiction.

Mr. Atkinson (Council of Europe, United Kingdom) recalled that in the aftermath of 11 September the Council of Europe had passed a comprehensive resolution urging that the remit of the Statute of Rome should be widened to cover those leaders responsible for acts of international terrorism. His understanding was that the Court's judges once elected would decide on their remit.

Mr. Melakhessou (Algeria) asked whether the United Nations had the necessary information for a definition of terrorism and wished to know by what means the Organization proposed to combat that scourge.

Mr. Graham (Canada) congratulated Mr. Corell on a very comprehensive outline of what his exceptionally busy Department was doing. His question, like that of his Algerian colleague, was on the definition of terrorism. He wished to know how and why nuclear terrorism was to be distinguished from the comprehensive convention against terrorism, which presumably included all other kinds of terrorist acts.

Mr. Stubrin (Argentina) joined previous speakers in expressing thanks to Mr. Corell for his excellent statement.

First, he asked for Mr. Corell's views, at what was a delicate juncture, on the recent debate in the Security Council on the Council's own powers to use force. Desert Storm in Iraq in early 1990s had been authorized by the Council; unfortunately, the intervention in Kosovo had not, which had posed problems.

Secondly, he was disturbed that the use of the Internet to fight terrorism had been authorized in the United States of America without any details of the basis for such action. He wondered how much freedom people were prepared to give up in the fight against terrorism and asked Mr. Corell to expound on the issue with reference to the earlier comments from his Algerian and Canadian colleagues.

Mr. Carvajal (Mexico) stressed the potential importance of the IPU in combating terrorism. Recommendations adopted by the IPU usually went on to become laws in countries, as had happened with legislation on HIV/AIDS and against antipersonnel mines. Given the role of the IPU and national parliaments in supporting the fight against terrorism, it should be possible for them to have direct contacts with the United Nations.

Mr. Davis (Council of Europe, United Kingdom) thanked Mr. Corell and congratulated him on his efforts to establish the ICC.

He asked Mr. Corell for his views on whether Security Council resolution 1441 (2002) gave the United Nations the authority for military action against Iraq by one or more Member States without a further resolution by the Council.

Mr. Mubarak (Egypt) joined other speakers in thanking Mr. Corell for his informative talk. Many asylum seekers were terrorists, from whom Egypt had suffered greatly, and yet

they were often given asylum in Western countries. He asked whether that pattern was to continue or whether the United Nations could offer another approach.

Mr. Saporito (Italy) recalled the efforts by the G8 and the IPU to help define terrorism; at the IPU's 107th Conference held in Marrakech in March 2002, for example, parliamentarians from around 100 countries had tackled the definition of terrorism on the basis of United Nations documentation and country experiences. Such efforts were aimed at helping to solve some of the problems being encountered by the Counter-Terrorism Committee chaired by Sir Jeremy Greenstock.

Italy believed that the threat of terrorism could be overcome through universal cooperation on the basis of Security Council resolutions. In response to resolution 1373 (2001), his country had reported on planned and past measures to combat terrorism, based on resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1390 (2002). Most important, in his view, was maintaining a united front: if even one country had a different interpretation of terrorism, it could become the channel for terrorist penetration, in particular for the financing of terrorism.

He had commented earlier on the report of Ms. Herfkens, which he had found somewhat generic. He had since been told that in her reply she had mentioned a reduction of aid funding in Italy's budget. He could not imagine how she could know that; the budget had not yet been approved. In any event, decisions on Italy's development cooperation were for the Government and Parliament to make.

Mr. Corell, Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs, in answer to Mr. Günter, said that parliamentarians were better placed than most to help in supporting the ICC. They were the ones who represented their people and who took the final decisions in parliament. Most important, parliamentarians were in a position to educate people about why the Court was needed. People at grassroots level understood better than was sometimes assumed just why they and their fellow human beings around the world needed the protection of the Court, which was there for purposes of both prevention and punishment. Punishment served a preventive function, by signalling to potential violators that they would ultimately be brought to justice. He urged participants to speak with their constituents, work in their national parliaments, and reach across borders to help fellow parliamentarians who were encountering difficulty in convincing their constituencies of the importance of the ICC. The initiative lay with them.

In reply to Mr. Atkinson, he said that certain terrorist acts that were of a magnitude to be classed as crimes against humanity would already be punishable; the 11 September attacks, for example, were considered by some to have exceeded that threshold. If confronted with a crime of that magnitude, the Court's judges could therefore deal with it. However, introducing terrorism as a separate crime under the Rome Statute would require amending the Statute, which could not be done at the present juncture. The idea of including terrorism had been entertained by those drawing up the Statute but they had wisely decided not to pursue it. It was already enough of a challenge to gain acceptance for a court whose task by definition involved intervening in situations where an individual country was either unwilling or unable to pursue crimes against humanity.

In reply to Mr. Melakhessou, he said that the definition of terrorism was a contentious issue because in certain circumstances some saw the terrorist as a freedom fighter and others did not. The United Nations had to be careful in bridging the gap. Mr. Corell said that during discussions in 2001, consensus had very nearly been reached on Articles 2 and 18 of the draft Convention, which set out the parameters of the crime in much the same language as used by the Secretary-General and others: i.e., that no act of a terrorist nature could be defended, no matter how important or noble the cause invoked. Of course, the acts themselves – murder, assault, arson, rape -- were already criminalized under national legislation. The only element to be added was the indiscriminate nature of terrorist acts.

As for Mr. Melakhessou's second question, he said that while the Organization could combat terrorism by drafting conventions and helping to bring suspects across national borders, there was a limit to what it could do in the highly sensitive matters of investigation and intelligence-sharing. Interpol faced similar challenges. Member States were concerned to protect their intelligence sources and prevent information from falling into the wrong hands, and they preferred interacting in small groups to tackle specific problems.

In reply to Mr. Graham, he said that the Convention against Nuclear Terrorism was intended to be a sectoral convention, one that tackled specific factors that had been sources or means of terrorism, such as the hijacking or destruction of aircraft. The Comprehensive Convention would be an umbrella covering all the sectoral conventions. As such, it could readily be adopted as a simple legislative act by a developing country parliament, which might not have all the resources needed to make the various sectoral conventions part of national legislation.

Replying to Mr. Stubrin's first question, he said that it was for the Security Council to construe its own resolutions, including any violations of them. Operation Desert Storm had indeed been authorized by the Council, whereas a regional group of States had intervened in Kosovo, regrettably without the Council's authorization.

As for what should be done in future, he maintained his view that what was at stake was the credibility of the Security Council. If a well-informed general public somewhere in the world was aware of terrible crimes and people fleeing across the border, they might well expect action, and even authorization for the use of force, from the Council. While the use of force by the United Nations came as a surprise to some, it should not. The Charter had been conceived to ensure collective security, if necessary through authorization of the use of force by a State or coalition of States, under Article 53. However, those were sensitive issues. He would only say that countries needed to be careful not to destroy the delicate system set up in the Charter. They should join together if they intended to use force. As for the exception of a single country acting in self-defence under Article 51, that State was responsible for bringing the situation to the Security Council for assessment.

Mr. Stubrin had also raised the issue of the delicate balance between combating terrorism and preserving human rights. It was all too easy to keep expanding the population under suspicion. Parliamentarians had a role in making sure that the fight against criminality did not cross the fine line that maintained the foundation of a democratic society, namely the international and regional human rights instruments that had been painstakingly drawn up

starting in 1948. Crossing that line would result in just the kind of suspicion-ridden society that the terrorists wanted.

Welcoming the IPU's new relationship with the United Nations, which Mr. Carvajal had referred to, Mr. Corell recalled that the United Nations was fundamentally an intergovernmental organization. Under those circumstances, he suggested that it would be up to national parliaments and governments to discuss how the IPU could best enhance interaction with the Organization.

Mr. Davis had put a very difficult question to him concerning Security Council resolution 1441 (2002) on Iraq which he, as Legal Counsel, feared he could not answer without giving offence to the Council. He would refer participants to the very delicate balance among the provisions in the resolution, in particular in operative paragraphs 11 and 12. The understanding was that, if an issue should arise, it would be brought back to and discussed by the Security Council, which would consider consequences and conclusions. It was to be hoped that Iraq realized that the resolution might be the last chance for them to comply with the many resolutions adopted and to cooperate with the inspectors so that the country could be disarmed with respect to weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Mubarak had mentioned the increasing number of asylum-seekers. Mr. Corell stressed that receiving countries did not make blanket decisions on the granting of asylum but decided on a case-by-case basis that took the applicant's specific situation into account. Even when the country of origin had a functioning democracy with a parliament, asylum seekers might have cause to flee. Mr. Corell's view was that the best way to stem the flow of asylum seekers was to tackle the root causes of the fear and insecurity that forced people to leave their home and country, usually with great reluctance.

The Chairman thanked the speaker for the extraordinary amount of information he had provided and his relevant answers. He apologized to the Italian delegation, whose further questions could not be put for lack of time.

6. Financing for development

The Chairman introduced Mr. Oscar De Rojas, Executive Coordinator of the United Nations Financing for Development Secretariat. He would be speaking about how to institutionalize the agreements reached at the International Conference on Financing for Development (Monterrey, March 2002) and about preparations for the Fifth Ministerial Meeting to be held in April 2003 in Cancun, Mexico, under the auspices of the World Trade Organization (WTO).

Mr. Oscar De Rojas thanked the IPU for its invitation to attend the meeting. His Secretariat had been in close contact with the IPU in preparing for and holding the International Conference on Financing for Development and wished to continue involving national parliaments and their international organization in the follow-up. Implementing the agreements reached at Monterrey would require action by governments, in many cases through or with the support of parliaments.

The International Conference at Monterrey was the only one of the major United Nations conferences since the 1990s to have come about at the initiative of the developing countries. It had originated in the South, as was evident from the controversial and sensitive issues on its agenda: the functioning of the international monetary and trade system, foreign debt, and the flow of capital which in net terms sometimes benefited the North rather than the South.

For over two decades, developed nations had maintained that hard-core macroeconomic issues of that kind should be discussed not in the United Nations but in the international financial institutions – the Bretton Woods institutions, namely the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, and the World Trade Organization (WTO). It had taken several years of discussion to reach agreement that those issues would be included for the first time in the broad agenda for the International Conference at Monterrey. The quid pro quo was that, also for the first time, the developing countries had accepted that the agenda would include sensitive domestic issues such as governance, preferred economic models, regulation versus deregulation, and privatization versus the role of the State. Chapter 1 of the agenda thus dealt with domestic issues, including improving governance and banking systems so as to mobilize domestic resources and attract foreign investment. At the other end of the spectrum, Chapter 6 covered the systemic issues of greatest interest to the developing world, namely how the international monetary and trade system worked, whether it helped or hindered development, and to what extent developing countries had a voice in how it operated.

The document that had emerged from the International Conference, the Monterrey Consensus, might not look very revolutionary. Nevertheless, the fact that discussion had taken place on hitherto taboo issues had opened some doors through which there could now be movement in the follow-up phase. Little headway had been made at Monterrey on a number of issues, for example, on innovative sources of financing or how to deal with global public goods in the 21st century (which the meeting would hear more about from Ms. Inge Kaul, an expert on the subject). However, he took hope from the agreement to continue studying and discussing those issues. In short, the International Conference was not an end but a beginning. Even the Bretton Woods institutions, initially reluctant to take part, were now actively involved in the Monterrey process.

Another distinguishing feature of the International Conference was the participation of civil society, including the private business sector, which had an important role to play in private capital flows. While this was not the first time that civil society groups had taken part in United Nations events, their input in the preparatory phase and at the Conference itself had been a hallmark of Monterrey. Mexico had organized a meeting for parliamentarians, who had been able to deliver a message to the International Conference that had been well received.

Mr. De Rojas announced that copies were available of a CD-ROM containing extensive information on and from the Conference, including the speeches of heads of delegation.

Looking to the future, he saw a special challenge for parliamentarians. The parliamentarians he had met with over the years, including in connection with the International Conference, had typically been open to the idea of greater international cooperation for development and sympathetic to developing country needs such as lowering trade barriers and finding solutions to the debt problem. However, the delegations of the very same countries had expressed far more conservative views at the International Conference. Unless the Governments of developed countries took more favourable positions on global economic governance and similar issues, the views of the people's elected representatives would carry no weight.

The Chairman thanked Mr. De Rojas for his statement and opened the floor for comments.

Mr. Brutti (Italy) thanked Mr. De Rojas for his report.

He wished to highlight the uniquely useful role that could be played by parliaments, particularly in relationship with the United Nations, in the follow-up to the International Conference. The Conference had created a close relationship – which in his view ought to become even closer -- between the United Nations, with its universal membership, and the Bretton Woods institutions and the WTO, which were not representative bodies but rather technocratic organizations that worked under economic imperatives and lacked a legislative basis. After the years of attention paid to the Bretton Woods institutions and WTO during the surge of globalization, it was high time for a greater focus on the United Nations and the democratic institutions, the parliaments.

Mr. Stubrin (Argentina) said that he was somewhat disappointed at the outcome of the Conference on the crucial issue of trade.

The United Nations had declared itself in favour of setting percentage targets for development cooperation in terms of gross domestic product (GDP) for goods and services. He asked if Mr. De Rojas thought the International Conference had brought the world any closer to establishing ways of measuring countries' capacity for ODA.

Mr. Correa (Latin American Parliament, Venezuela), speaking on behalf of the Latin American Parliament, in which 22 countries were represented, welcomed the analysis of the International Conference, which emphasized the necessity to involve people through their parliaments in decisions affecting them and in meeting their needs, such as poverty reduction.

Prior to the Conference at Monterrey, the Latin American parliamentarians had attempted to achieve hemispheric consistency in their positions, but they had not been successful. Perhaps if they had acted well in advance of the Conference they might have succeeded in incorporating certain important points into the conclusions. More broadly, he felt that there was a need for action not only by individual parliaments but by parliamentary blocs linked by similar interests and objectives. There might be some opportunities to do so in the follow-up to the Conference.

The Latin American Parliament supported the draft resolution prepared by the IPU. It was a step in the right direction and would help fill the democratic deficit in global governance mentioned by Ms. Herfkens.

Mr. De Rojas welcomed the interesting comments just made. As Mr. Brutti had said, involving the Bretton Woods institutions and, to a lesser degree, the World Trade Organization in the International Conference was an achievement that would have appeared utopian just a few years earlier. So was the discussion of macroeconomic issues under the auspices of the United Nations. The top officials of the financial institutions had indeed participated with enthusiasm at Monterrey, addressing sessions and participating in round-tables with heads of state and government. The intention was to maintain that relationship in the follow-up process by ensuring cooperation between the Secretariats and in intergovernmental deliberations, under the auspices and rules of procedure of the United Nations.

He agreed with Mr. Stubrin that the issue of trade was crucial. It had been one of the pillars of the International Conference and the subject of one of the six chapters of the Monterrey agenda. Just as for financial matters, many countries had considered that trade issues should be left to the WTO and had refused to pre-negotiate at the United Nations issues that they would be negotiating at the next multilateral round. However, it had finally been accepted that those issues should be dealt with under the auspices of the United Nations as the global political organization *par excellence*. The Monterrey Consensus did not go very far beyond the Doha Declaration adopted at WTO's Fourth Ministerial Conference (Doha, Qatar, November 2001) but it carried an important political message.

With regard to the allocation of 0.7% of GNP for ODA, a target set by the United Nations almost 30 years earlier, the picture was extremely mixed. Some developed nations had accepted the target immediately and a handful of countries, mainly in northern Europe, had since achieved or even surpassed the 0.7% figure. Most had not. On the other hand, a few countries, including the world's main industrialized country, did not even accept that ODA should be measured as a percentage of GNP. The tangible outcome of the International Conference at Monterrey was that pledges had been made for increased ODA – an annual increase of 5% by the USA and slightly higher by the European Union. It was important to remember, however, that by World Bank calculations even a doubling of current ODA, to US\$100 billion a year, would not suffice for achieving the Millennium Development Goals. Reaching the goals would require revising the terms of trade, the opening up of markets, and so on.

There was an emerging consensus that the developing countries should have a greater voice in international economic decisions, and yet it was always difficult to get that consensus translated into specific decisions. He was therefore pleased that Mr. Correa considered that the issue of the democratic deficit in global governance should be high on the agenda of parliamentarians. Unless parliaments provided political and moral support and pressured Governments to act, he failed to see who would.

Mr. Novales (Mexico) said that his country had been pleased to host the International Conference as a developing country initiative and one that covered issues of relevance to the

whole world. He recalled that the South had provided much of the raw material that had enriched the North and was now supplying human vitality to the aging populations of the North.

He asked when and to what extent the strong commitments made at Monterrey would be implemented through mechanisms for mandatory compliance.

Mr. Günter (Switzerland), looking to the future, asked for Mr. De Rojas' expert opinion on what might emerge from the so-called high-level segment to be held at United Nations Headquarters.

Mr. Gogoi (Romania) said that information and communication technology had to be considered as socioeconomic development tools for poverty reduction. He asked how the forthcoming World Summit on the Information Society (Geneva, December 2003) could be linked to the follow-up of the International Conference at Monterrey.

Ms. Madero (Mexico) observed that the International Conference had illustrated the importance of communication between the IPU and governments. At Monterrey, the Mexican Senate had read out a message from the IPU, and the IPU in turn at its 107th Conference in Marrakech (March 2002) had read out a text of the agreements reached at Monterrey. She hoped that would be the start of greater communication involving the IPU and aimed at ensuring that participants at future meetings were fully aware of past commitments made by States. The IPU also had a role in monitoring implementation of their commitments.

Development had many facets and it was vital to keep in mind the multiple complex links between social and economic issues. Failing that, it would be impossible to assess whether the 0.7% figure was an appropriate index. Development had to be looked at not just in terms of the relationships between individual countries, developed and developing, but on a regional basis, as well as in terms of the relationship between States and parliaments.

Mr. De Rojas said that he would first reply to the questions on the next steps to be taken to ensure the implementation of the agreements reached at Monterrey.

The General Assembly offered two kinds of follow-up machinery. One mechanism, under the umbrella of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations (ECOSOC), was the one-day meeting held every April between ECOSOC and the Bretton Woods institutions. It had been decided at Monterrey that those meetings would henceforth be devoted exclusively to analysing the progress made on one or more decisions contained in the Monterrey Consensus.

However, the principal follow-up mechanism was the so-called high-level segment. This was a special meeting held in the United Nations General Assembly every two years and officially called the high-level dialogue on enhancing international cooperation for development. At Monterrey it had been decided to revitalize that meeting and make it the very heart of the follow-up process. Starting in 2003, the three-day meeting would undertake a complete review of follow-up to the International Conference.

Mr. De Rojas hoped that in addition to ministerial participation, the high-level segment would be attended by parliamentarians. He urged any parliamentarians who would be part of a delegation to the General Assembly in 2003 to plan on staying on until late September for that important three-day meeting.

In 2005 a decision would be needed on whether and when to organize a formal follow-up Conference, as was often done at the five-year or ten-year mark following major United Nations conferences.

In reply to Mr. Gogoi, he said that the Secretariat had already been contacted by the organizers of the World Summit on the Information Society to share information on organizing such meetings and explore possible common ground. There were certainly links and a need for proper feedback between the two processes. He hoped to continue working along those lines in coming months.

He agreed with Ms. Madero on the crucial linkages between the economic and social spheres. The results of the World Summit for Social Development (Social Summit, Copenhagen, 1995) certainly had to feed into the Monterrey process. An even broader initiative was circulating in the General Assembly to organize what was being called an Integrated Follow-up to the Conferences, which would make it possible to build on those and many other connections, such as the links with sustainable development, women and population.

The Chairman thanked Mr. De Rojas for his important statement and extremely helpful replies.

7. Global public goods

The Chairman introduced Ms. Inge Kaul, Director of the Office of Development Studies of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The IPU had close and productive links with UNDP which he hoped would continue.

Ms. Inge Kaul observed that many participants, like herself, wore spectacles and knew that their vision of the world changed depending on which lens they wore. The lens through which she wanted participants to look was that of global public goods. Through that lens, one could visualize globalization, understand it better, and identify ways of making globalization work for all.

In order to define what was meant by global public goods, she invited participants to think about all the things that mattered to their own well-being and to that of their constituents and nations. They would immediately see that those things broke down into two categories. On the one hand, there were private goods – bread, milk, shoes – which individuals would typically spend their own money to acquire. On the other, there were public goods – traffic lights, a functioning judicial system, freedom from crime and terror – which needed to be produced jointly and, once in existence, were generally available to all.

The next realization was that many public goods of importance to parliamentarians and their constituencies had acquired a cross-border dimension. Pension funds were invested internationally, which meant that a person's security in old age would depend on financial markets abroad. Other examples were health, with communicable diseases spilling across borders; food security; and even clean air. Increasingly, the public goods desired by local constituencies could no longer be produced through domestic action alone but required international cooperation of one kind or another. Those were what was meant by global public goods.

Just as preferences for private goods varied, some individuals preferring tea and others coffee, so did preferences for public goods. A New York investor might prize financial market stability over all, whereas an African with HIV/AIDS or malaria might place greater value on a helpful international regime of intellectual property rights. Some goods in the public domain might be actually objectionable in certain parts of the world. For example, following the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations, whose cost implications for Africa were around US\$1 billion a year, policy-makers on that continent might question whether the trade regime was a public good at all. It was important not to confuse the consumption of public goods with their utility.

The variable utility of public goods had an important link to a point that participants had repeatedly raised during their meeting, namely the question of who decided which goods were to be placed in the public domain. Ms. Kaul referred participants to the executive summary of a UNDP publication entitled "*Providing Global Goods – Managing Globalization*" and pointed to the triangle of "publicness" on the cover. A slimmer or fatter triangle was used to show to what extent a given global public good affected everyone, whether it was providing utility or disutility around the world, and to what extent all stakeholders – those actually affected by the good – had been consulted.

Obviously, many issues on the international policy agenda met the definition of global public goods, although some were better described as global public "bads", such as the threat of climate change, financial crises and emerging global health challenges. The intention was to move from the management of bads to the production of goods.

Though the world was emerging from an era marked by the importance of national borders and the emergence of new States, Ms. Kaul observed that the growing globalization of public goods was blurring the line between domestic and foreign. She invited participants to give some thought to the policy implications of that trend for the executive branch of government. Perhaps governments needed to focus less on the foreign/domestic divide and start thinking in a more integrated way about health, financial stability and environmental sustainability. Security and peace were traditionally dealt with by ministries of foreign affairs, whereas the issues that now dominated the political agenda such as environment, finance, trade and health were handled by technical departments or ministries. Should technical ministries take over some responsibility for foreign affairs? Or should some of their experts be assigned to the foreign affairs ministry?

Traditionally, diplomats and ambassadors were appointed to individual countries. Today, given the concern with issues such as health and finance, the question was whether

countries should appoint "issue ambassadors" to deal with the HIV/AIDS epidemic, or with sustainable energy. Some countries had started to move in that direction by appointing human rights ambassadors and disarmament ambassadors.

Thirdly, the growing importance of global public goods had implications for financing. Addressing the parliamentarians from the industrialized world, Ms. Kaul pointed out that 30% of ODA was flowing not to poor countries for combating poverty, but to restoring the ozone layer, mopping up after financial crises, and so on. Given the number of poor people on the planet, it seemed unjustified to allow any of the limited ODA available to be diverted from poverty reduction. Instead, the Environment Ministry, for example, might help finance global activities aimed at climatic stability while the Health Ministry could contribute to global public health. There was some justification for taking the money from domestic budgets. For one thing, the well-being of the country's own nationals was at stake. For another, national ministries generally had enough funding at their disposal; after all, they always managed to find the money to deal with flooding or terrorism or other crises. Besides, working proactively to increase global public goods instead of after-the-fact efforts against global public "bads" made financial sense.

Addressing the parliamentarians from developing countries, Ms. Kaul similarly wondered whether their countries might be more proactive when it came to cooperation, instead of focusing solely on domestic affairs. For example, more use might be made of the Global Health Fund. Though set up by donors, the Fund was meant to be a cooperative effort with developing countries, e.g., for pharmaceutical research and development.

Ms. Kaul then turned to the implications for parliamentarians and legislatures. If the handling of foreign affairs by the executive branch of government required rethinking, the corresponding question would be whether the parliamentary committee structure also needed to change. She would welcome the participants' views and comments. Did their foreign affairs committee still have the traditional remit of peace and security? Was international cooperation being dealt with adequately by their environment committee? Did they think that somehow combining the foreign affairs and technical/sectoral committees might be useful?

Another question was whether existing budgetary rules would allow an Environment Minister, for example, to request extra resources for combating climate change through international cooperation, or whether the latter would have to be financed from the ODA budget.

The question was how to ensure parliamentarians' involvement in international cooperation, now that it was no longer focused only on defence, or competition for market shares. Policy-making increasingly took place at the international level, after which parliamentarians were bombarded with draft legislation. She asked them as parliamentarians whether they felt fully accountable to their constituencies, for example for shaping the international trade system or ensuring old-age security in the light of constant financial crisis.

It was often said that globalization was eroding policy-making sovereignty. She was convinced that a great deal of that sovereignty could be regained if parliamentarians were to take a real role in international negotiations on cooperation.

The Chairman thanked the speaker and opened the floor for comments.

Mr. Siniscalchi (Italy) was sensitive to the problems raised by Ms. Kaul in her interesting report. However, he wanted to make a few distinctions. On the one hand, one could reform the bureaucratic structure of government, altering ministries and parliamentary committee structure. At the present time, he felt that could cause delay. The other aspect of reform, which he considered ripe for debate and broad dialogue, was to introduce a system of rules for globalization that would bring order to certain elements of the market economy and embody solidarity both with developing countries and with the weaker socioeconomic strata of the developed countries. His parliament was keen to conduct research and take initiatives along those lines.

He renewed the appeal to the IPU to gather as much support as possible for global institutions such as the International Criminal Court. Unless parliamentarians helped globalize the defence of human rights, they would see the same conflicts in their own countries. He asked the United States delegation to bear in mind the horizontal nature of global institutions and to participate in solving political and economic problems.

Ms. Starrfelt (Norway) had listened to Ms. Kaul with interest. Clearly, the work of all parliamentary committees had global dimensions. In Ms. Kaul's view, was it best for the foreign affairs committee to incorporate the sectoral issues, or for the standing committees to incorporate the global dimensions? Or perhaps she favoured a combination of the two?

Ms. Inge Kaul, replying to the comment by Mr. Siniscalchi, noted that in the economic sphere globalization was proceeding quickly, partly because business was a driving force and had the ear of government. In the human rights sphere, where many groups and populations were involved, there was slower progress towards globalization, although some rights such as freedom from slavery had won virtually universal acceptance. It would take more prodding to establish full support for the ICC.

Countries were still experimenting to see how best to locate governmental responsibility for international cooperation. Studies by UNDP showed that some countries were taking the first tack mentioned by Ms. Starrfelt, others the second. Both the executive and legislative branches seemed to be making increasing use of matrix management. Further experiments would require study before any specific organizational formulas could be recommended.

Mr. Günter (Switzerland) agreed that problems of global warming, for example, should not be tackled at the expense of development. However, given the current economic stagnation, unemployment, lower tax revenues, and demands from influential people for tax cuts for the rich to spur the economy, it would be an uphill fight to keep ODA from becoming the prime victim of budget cuts. As a parliamentarian he would do his best but he

was pessimistic in the present political and economic climate, with people clamouring that the country's money should be spent on its own poor and jobless.

Mr. O'Keefe (Council of Europe, Ireland) said that Ms. Kaul's stimulating presentation had opened new horizons for him and other participants. However, her views on financing might be considered simplistic by hard-nosed politicians. In particular, he questioned whether the real problem of 30% of ODA being diverted from the poor to global public goods could be solved by squeezing out equivalent monies from domestic budgets. If one looked at the typical health minister, faced with a choice between keeping a hospital open and contributing resources to international health challenges, it was easy to see which would win. He would encourage research to find more realistic solutions.

Replying to Mr. Günter and Mr. O'Keefe, Ms. Kaul said that the solution she had proposed had a sound economic foundation, based on calculations summarized in the UNDP publication on global public goods and available *in extenso* on the UNDP website. Redirecting the entire 30% of ODA to the developing countries would require coming up with some US\$15-16 billion for the industrialized world. The reality was that the world's failure to act on public "bads" such as global health challenges, global warming and financial volatility had a colossal annual cost. In times of resource scarcity, tremendous savings could be made by moving from the financing of crisis management to the financing of global public goods. According to their calculations, the cost of inaction on the global public "bads" was as much as 100 times higher than the cost of corrective action. She hoped that the topic could be the subject of a new debate once the parliamentarians had had the opportunity to examine those calculations. A period of modest budgetary adjustment might seem more acceptable.

Mr. Herrera (Mexico) congratulated Ms. Kaul warmly on her presentation. The approaches embodied in her publication were important contributions to the fight to ensure acceptable levels of well-being for all, and were already being reflected in discussions of socioeconomic development, including those at Monterrey.

He asked her to comment on the commitment by developed countries to allocate part of their GNP to combating poverty. He would also appreciate her views on the new ideas coming from Europe, for example, the suggestion from the President of the French Republic that a global tax might be placed on businesses, which had not only ecological but also social and political responsibilities.

Ms. Starrfelt (Norway), by way of follow-up to her first question, asked whether UNDP had found any connection between the manner in which countries dealt organizationally with international concerns and their willingness to support international cooperation.

Ms. Kaul said in answer to Mr. Herrera that UNDP was modest in its ambitions. The publication proposed little budgetary restructuring. In addition, it suggested that there was room for restructuring with respect to the estimated \$900 billion being spent annually on perverse subsidies, i.e. subsidies that actually contributed to producing global public bads. For example, a country might be subsidizing coal production while searching for funds to

combat global warning. The publication on global public goods also recalled that money always seemed to be readily available whenever a crisis occurred. As for the Tobin Tax, which would for example bring US\$29 billion into the United States budget and US\$26 billion into the budget of the United Kingdom, the challenge would then be extricating the money from the national budget and channeling it into the domain of global public goods.

In the light of all those factors, UNDP was reluctant to call for an increase in public expenditure. Rather, they were saying that the financing of global public goods should be viewed as an allocation issue rather than as a resource mobilization issue. There was enough money to do things right, and doing things right was less expensive than inaction.

In reply to Ms. Starrfelt, Ms. Kaul said that it could be shown that public awareness about global issues was linked to preparedness for international cooperation. In many countries the public at large was quite concerned about global issues but, owing to breakdowns in the political process, that concern was not necessarily translated into policy action. Parliamentarians might want to ensure that they had enough support to help them deal with the global issues now coming to parliaments.

Ms. Madero (Mexico) observed that many public goods and services failed to reach women. With aging populations, women found themselves providing care for the elderly that had previously been supplied as a public service. They themselves needed assistance because they no longer worked in the productive sector.

In reply to Ms. Kaul's question on governmental organization, she said that current structures in Mexico enabled individuals to acquire and use experience in specific areas. Nevertheless, she could envisage some combining of structures, especially to deal with novel issues such as gender and the Internet, which called for specific expertise.

Ms. Kaul agreed with Ms. Madero that it might be best to start with novel issues.

Responding to Ms. Madero's first point, she said that history showed that the private/public balance kept shifting over time and across cultures. For example, television had come into many households as a public service, only to be followed later on by cable television, making it more private. Nothing was inherently public or private; it was a policy choice for society what to make public and what to make private. The whole globalization debate was sometimes cast in terms of the balance between markets and States, although either one could be used for producing public or private goods. What really mattered was the balance between private goods and public goods.

In conclusion, Ms. Kaul said that the world faced a basic choice. People today were bound to be exposed to externalities and public "bads" that could spill into their country. In a world of globalization and open borders, international cooperation was no longer optional but had become a mandatory part of policy-making. Basically, if people did not want to suffer from global public bads such as ill health or climate change, they had to provide a win-win cooperation strategy with new incentives for those who would need to make the corresponding changes within their borders.

8. Close

The Chairman considered that the participants in the meeting had undertaken a very important journey. They had heard and debated with speakers of tremendous calibre and dealt with the major issues of the current and future agenda, including the challenges for parliamentarians. The international community's commitment to fair trade, the International Criminal Court, post-conflict peace-building, financing for development in the wake of the International Conference at Monterrey, the challenges of global public goods, the promotion of women and human rights – all those were highly relevant issues that could not possibly be exhausted in one meeting. Parliamentarians and the IPU would pursue them further.

In conclusion, he thanked the participants and welcomed the granting of observer status to the IPU at the United Nations.

Mr. Anders B. Johnsson, Secretary General of the IPU, observed that Ms. Kaul's last statement echoed what the IPU had been saying for years. The world had changed too much for parliaments to continue working in the traditional way. The fact that issues were no longer only local and national but international led to the simple but important conclusion that parliaments had to become much more active on the international scene. It was up to parliamentarians and the IPU to decide how to do so.

In a few months' time, by way of follow-up to the meeting, participants would receive a summary of the debates and statements which they could use in their work. More immediately, on 20 November there would be a debate in the General Assembly on cooperation between the United Nations, regional organizations and other organizations; the IPU would be one of the 23 organizations under discussion. He urged them to remind their country delegations to include the parliamentary dimension in their statements and to cosponsor the draft resolution mentioned earlier. The most immediate follow-up to the meeting was a reception in 10 minutes' time to which all participants were cordially invited.

The Chairman thanked the Secretary General of the IPU and declared the meeting closed.

PARTICIPATION

Members of Parliament

ALGERIA

MELAKHESSOU, Tahar (Mr.)

REDJIMI, Mourad (Mr.)

SMATI, Khelifa (Mr.)

ARGENTINA

STUBRIN, Marcelo (Mr.)

BELARUS

MALOFEEV, Anatoly (Mr.)

BELGIUM

LEFEVRE, Jacques (Mr.)

VERSNICK, Geert (Mr.)

BRAZIL

EFRAIM, Morais (Mr.)

HENRIQUE, Alves E. (Mr.)

HERÁCLITO, Fortes (Mr.)

LOMANTO, Leur (Mr.)

MELLO, Geraldo (Mr.)

NONÔ, José Thomas (Mr.)

ROBSON, Tuma (Mr.)

BULGARIA

KANEVA, Margarita (Mrs.)

PETROVA, Christina (Mrs.)

CANADA

DUBÉ, Antoine (Mr.)

GRAHAM, Alasdair (Mr.)

TORSNEY, Paddy (Mrs.)

COTE D'IVOIRE

BAKAYOKO, Youssef (Mr.)

CZECH REPUBLIC

EKERT, Milan (Mr.)

SEITLOVA, Jitka (Ms.)

TLUSTY, Vlastimil (Mr.)

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

ALEGRIA, Pedro José (Mr.)

DURAN GORDEN, Tomas (Mr.)

EGYPT

MUBARAK, Amin (Mr.)

ESTONIA

FJUK, Ignar (Mr.)

FINLAND

HELLE, Esko (Mr.)

IHAMÄKI, Timo (Mr.)

LUHTANEN, Leena (Mrs.)

RYYNÄNEN, Mirja (Mrs.)

FRANCE

SALLES, Rudy (Mr.)

GABON

MBOUROU, André (Mr.)

MBINA, Rey (Mr.)

MBA NZOGHE (Mrs.)

GERMANY

RAIDEL, Hans (Mr.)

GUATEMALA

RIOS-MONTT, Zury (Mrs.)

GUINEA

SOMPARÉ, Aboubacar (Mr.)

DIALLO, Tierno Aliou Banire (Mr.)

BAH, Ousmane (Mr.)

GUINEA BISSAU

DJALO, Serifo (M.)

HUNGARY

BALSÁI, István (Mr.)

INDIA

GUPTA, Shri Prem Chand (Mr.)

KRISHNA, Bose (Mrs.)

INDONESIA

ANAM, Soebagio (Mr.)

MURTI, Iris Indira (Ms.)

RATNA MIRAH, Gunarijah (Ms.)

RATNAWATI, Sylvia (Ms.)

SIRAIT, Sabam (Mr.)

ITALY

SAPORITO, Learco (Dr.)

ANGIUS, Gavino (Mr.)

BRUTTI, Massimo (Mr.)

IOANNUCCI, Maria Claudia (Mrs.)

SCHIFANI, Stefano (Mr.)

TAROLLI, Ivo (Mr.)

CASTAGNETTI, Pierluigi (Mr.)
NAPOLI, Angela (Mrs.)
SINISCALCHI, Vincenzo (Mr.)

MEXICO

CARVAJAL, Gustavo (Mr.)
CALDERON, Felipe (Mr.)
NOVALES, Jose Luis (Mr.)
ESPADAS, Uuc-Kib (Mr.)
HERRERA, Fidel (Mr.)
MADERO, Lidia (Ms.)
GONZALEZ, Emilio (Mr.)

MOROCCO

TAHIRI, Haj (Mr.)

NAMIBIA

DINYANDO, Raphael (Mr.)
SHIHWAMENI, Herbert (Mr.)
YA KASITA, Henock (Mr.)

NORWAY

STARRFELT, Oddbjorg Ausdal (Ms.)

POLAND

JARZEMBOWSKI, Ryszard (Mr.)
LEWICKI, Marian (Mr.)
PATURALSKA, Grazyna (Mrs.)

PORTUGAL

DUARTE, Pacheco (Mr.)
ROSA MARIA, Albernaz (Mrs.)

ROMANIA

GOGOI, Ion (Mr.)
IONESCU, Smaranda (Mrs.)

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

YARYGUINA, Tatiana (Ms.)

RWANDA

MITALI KABANDA, Protais (Mr.)

SWITZERLAND

GÜNTER, Paul (Mr.)

VIET NAM

NGO, Anh Dzung (Mr.)
VU, Hai Ha (Mr.)

Andean Parliament

MADRIZ SOTILLO, Jhannett (Ms.)

DIAZ LAPLACE, Luis (Mr.)

ARIAS, Mario (Mr.)

MUÑOZ DE LIENDO, Adela (Ms.)

Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe

ATKINSON, David (Mr.) (United Kingdom)

BERGOVIST, Jan (Mr.) (Sweden)

BERNOTAS, Rokas (Mr.) (Lithuania)

BINET, Gérard (Mr.) (Canada)

CLERFAYT, Georges (Mr.) (Belgium)

DAVIS, Terry (Mr.) (United Kingdom)

DOMINGUES, Maria Elisa (Ms.) (Portugal)

DURRIEU, Josette (Ms.) (France)

GROSS, Andreas (Mr.) (Switzerland)

IWINSKI, Tadeusz (Mr.) (Poland)

KILCLOONEY OF ARMAGH (Lord) (United Kingdom)

LA PIERRE, Laurier (Mr.) (Canada)

MEDEIROS FERREIRA, José (Mr.) (Portugal)

O'KEEFE, Jim (Mr.) (Ireland)

OUZKY, Miroslav (Mr.) (Czech Republic)

POURGOURIDES, Christos (Mr.) (Cyprus)

SEVERINSEN, Hanne (Ms.) (Denmark)

Latin American Parliament

CORREA, Rafael (Mr.) (Venezuela)

Secretariats of national delegations at the 57th session of the General Assembly

Ms. Karla SCHAEFER (Brazil), Secretary of the Brazilian Group

Mr. Serge PELLETIER (Canada), Secretary of the Canadian Group

Ms. Eva BARTONOVA (Czech Republic), Advisor

Ms. Michaela PETRICKOVA (Czech Republic), Secretary of the Czech Group

Ms. Marja HUTTUNEN (Finland), Secretary of the Finnish Group

Mr. Olivier DELAMARE-DEBOUTTEVILLE (France), Counsellor at the Senate

Mr. Everhard VOSS (Germany), Director, Parliamentary Relations Directorate, Deutscher Bundestag

Ms. Bettina GIESECKE (Germany), Deputy Head, Inter-Parliamentary Affairs Division, Deutscher Bundestag

Mr. Emmanuel Derrick LÉNAUD (Guinea), Director of the Private Office of the President of the National Assembly

Mr. Laye KEIRA (Guinea), Chief of Protocol

Mr. László KOVACS (Hungary), Chief Counsellor of the National Assembly, Secretary of the Hungarian Group

Mr. Guelfo FIORE (Italy), Press officer

Mr. Giampaolo GRAZIAN (Italy), Protocol

Ms. Daniela DELFINO (Italy), Secretary of the Italian Group

Ms. Guiseppina NUCCI (Italy), Secretary of the Italian Group

Ms. Elizabeth DE WEE (Namibia), Senior parliamentary clerk

Mr. Bjorn HOLTER ERIKSEN (Norway), Adviser

Ms. Cristina DUMITRESCU (Romania), Secretary of the Romanian Group

Mr. Serguei VYDRINE (Russian Federation), Deputy Chief of the State Duma
Ms. Michèle CARLIEZ (Council of Europe), Secretary of the Parliamentary Assembly
Mr. Johannes DE JONGE (Council of Europe), Secretary of the Parliamentary Assembly
Mr. Rüdiger DOSSOW (Council of Europe), Secretary of the Parliamentary Assembly
Ms. Marja RUOTANEN (Council of Europe), Secretary of the Parliamentary Assembly

* * * *

Secretariat of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

Mr. Anders B. Johnsson
IPU Secretary General

Mr. Alessandro Motter
Adviser, Office of the Permanent Observer of the IPU to the United Nations