



General Assembly

Sixty-eighth session

70th plenary meeting
 Wednesday, 18 December 2013, 3 p.m.
 New York

Official Records

President: Mr. Ashe (Antigua and Barbuda)

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

A/68/449, the adoption of four draft resolutions and, in paragraph 22, the adoption of one draft decision.

Reports of the Third Committee

The President: The General Assembly will consider reports of the Third Committee on agenda items 27, 28, 62, 64 to 69, 108, 109, 122 and 135.

I request the Rapporteur of the Third Committee, Ms. Adriana Murillo Ruin of Costa Rica, to introduce the reports of the Committee in one intervention.

Ms. Ruin (Costa Rica), Rapporteur of the Third Committee (*spoke in Spanish*): It is a great honour and privilege for me to introduce to the General Assembly the reports of the Third Committee submitted to it under agenda items 27, 28, 62, 64 to 69, 108, 109, 122 and 135.

The reports contained in documents A/68/448 to A/68/459 and in document A/68/486 include the texts of draft resolutions and draft decisions recommended to the General Assembly for adoption. For the benefit of delegations, the Secretariat has issued document A/C.3/68/INF/1, which contains a checklist of action taken on the draft proposals contained in the reports before the Assembly.

Under agenda item 27, entitled "Social development", including sub-items (a) to (d), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 34 of document A/68/448, the adoption of seven draft resolutions and, in paragraph 35, the adoption of one draft decision.

Under agenda item 28, entitled "Advancement of women", including sub-items (a) and (b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 21 of document

Under agenda item 62, entitled "Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 16 of document A/68/450, the adoption of three draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 64, entitled "Report of the Human Rights Council", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 14 of document A/68/451, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda item 65, entitled "Promotion and protection of the rights of children", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 31 of document A/68/452, the adoption of four draft resolutions, and, in paragraph 32, the adoption of one draft decision.

Under agenda item 66, entitled "Rights of indigenous peoples", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 11 of document A/68/453, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda item 67, entitled "Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 22 of document A/68/454, the adoption of two draft resolutions and, in paragraph 23, the adoption of one draft decision.

Under agenda item 68, entitled "Right of peoples to self-determination", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 20 of document A/68/455, the adoption of three draft resolutions.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

13-62485 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



Under agenda item 69, entitled “Promotion and protection of human rights”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 5 of document A/68/456, the adoption of one draft decision.

Under sub-item (a) of agenda item 69, entitled “Implementation of human rights instruments”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 20 of document A/68/456/Add.1, the adoption of three draft resolutions.

It is my understanding that the Assembly will defer its consideration of draft resolution I, entitled “Human Rights Committee”, until such time as it has before it the pertinent report of the Fifth Committee.

Under sub-item (b) of agenda item 69, entitled “Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 146 of document A/68/456/Add.2, the adoption of 26 draft resolutions.

It is my understanding that the Assembly will defer its consideration of draft resolution XVII, entitled “United Nations Human Rights Training and Documentation Centre for South-West Asia and the Arab Region”, until such time as it has before it the pertinent report of the Fifth Committee.

Under sub-item (c) of agenda item 69, entitled “Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 27 of document A/68/456/Add.3, the adoption of four draft resolutions.

It is my understanding that the Assembly will defer its consideration of draft resolution II, entitled “Situation of human rights in Myanmar”, until such time as it has before it the pertinent report of the Fifth Committee.

Under sub-item (d) of agenda item 69, entitled “Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action”, the Third Committee wishes to advise the Assembly, in document A/68/456/Add.4, that no action was required under the item.

Under agenda item 108, entitled “Crime prevention and criminal justice”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 47 of document A/68/457, the adoption of 11 draft resolutions, and in paragraph 48, the adoption of one draft decision.

Under agenda item 109, entitled “International drug control”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 11 of document A/68/458, the adoption of two draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 122, entitled “Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 5 of document A/68/486, the adoption of one draft decision.

Finally, under agenda item 135, entitled “Programme planning”, the Third Committee wishes to advise the Assembly, in document A/68/459, that no action was required under the item.

I want to thank my fellow Bureau members, in particular the Chair of the Committee, Stephan Tafrov, Permanent Representative of Bulgaria, and Vice-Chairs Mr. Mario von Haff of Angola, Mr. Thorvardur Atli Thórsson of Iceland, and Ms. Maya Dagher of Lebanon. I also wish to thank the Secretary of the Committee and his team for their work and support in making this session efficient and in ensuring its timely conclusion.

I respectfully recommend the reports of the Third Committee to the plenary of the General Assembly for its consideration.

The President: I thank the Rapporteur of the Third Committee for her introduction of the reports of the Third Committee.

If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the reports of the Third Committee which are before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The President: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the recommendations of the Third Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

May I remind members that, under paragraph 7 of decision 34/401, the General Assembly agreed that

“When the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in a plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, i.e., either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation’s vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee.”

May I also remind delegations that, also in accordance with General Assembly 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendations contained in the reports of the Committee, I should like to advise representatives that we will proceed to take decisions in the same manner as was done in the Committee, unless the Secretariat is notified to the contrary in advance. That means that where recorded votes were taken, we will do the same. I should also hope that we will proceed to adopt without a vote those recommendations that were adopted without a vote in the Committee.

Before proceeding further, I would like to draw the attention of members to a note by the Secretariat, entitled "List of proposals contained in the reports of the Third Committee", which has been circulated in English only as document A/C.3/68/INF/1. The note has been distributed desk to desk as a reference guide for action on draft resolutions and decisions recommended by the Committee in its reports.

In that regard, members will find in the fourth column of the note the symbols of the draft resolutions or decisions of the Committee, with the corresponding symbols of the reports for action in the plenary in the second column of the same note. For reports containing multiple recommendations, the draft resolution or decision number is contained in the third column of the note. Furthermore, members are reminded that additional co-sponsors are no longer accepted now that draft resolutions and decisions have been adopted by the Committee. Any clarification about co-sponsorship should be addressed to the Secretary of the Committee.

Agenda item 27

Social development

Report of the Third Committee (A/68/448)

The President: The Assembly has before it seven draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 34 of its report and a draft decision recommended by the Committee in paragraph 35 of the same report. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to VII and on the draft decision, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled "Policies and programmes involving youth". The Third Committee

adopted it. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 68/130).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Promoting social integration through social inclusion". The Third Committee adopted it. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 68/131).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Literacy for life: shaping future agendas". The Third Committee adopted it. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 68/132).

The President: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Cooperatives in social development". The Third Committee adopted it. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 68/133).

The President: Draft resolution V is entitled "Follow-up to the Second World Assembly on Ageing". The Third Committee adopted it. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 68/134).

The President: Draft resolution VI is entitled "Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly". The Third Committee adopted it. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 68/135).

The President: Draft resolution VII is entitled "Preparations for and observance of the twentieth anniversary of the International Year of the Family". The Third Committee adopted it. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 68/136).

The President: We shall now turn to paragraph 35 of the report to take action on the draft decision, entitled "Reports considered by the General Assembly in connection with the question of social development". May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to

adopt the draft decision recommended by the Third Committee?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 68/531).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 27 and its sub-items (a) to (d)?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 28

Advancement of women

Report of the Third Committee (A/68/449)

The President: The Assembly has before it four draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 21 of its report and a draft decision recommended by the Committee in paragraph 22 of the same report. We will now take decisions on draft resolutions I to IV and on the draft decision, one by one.

We first turn to draft resolution I, entitled "Violence against women migrant workers". The Third Committee adopted it. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 68/137).

Draft resolution II is entitled "Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women". The Third Committee adopted it. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 68/138).

Draft resolution III is entitled "Improvement of the situation of women in rural areas". The Third Committee adopted it. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 68/139).

Draft resolution IV is entitled "Follow-up to the Fourth World Conference on Women and full implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the outcome of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly". The Third Committee adopted it. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 68/140).

The President: We now turn to the draft decision entitled "Reports considered by the General Assembly in connection with the advancement of women". May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to adopt the draft decision as recommended by the Third Committee?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 68/532).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 28 and its sub-items (a) and (b)?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 62

Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions

Report of the Third Committee (A/68/450)

The President: The Assembly has before it three draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 16 of its report. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I, II and III.

Draft resolution I is entitled "Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees". The Third Committee adopted it. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 68/141).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Enlargement of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees". The Third Committee adopted it. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 68/142).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa". The Third Committee adopted it. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 68/143).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 62?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 64 (continued)**Report of the Human Rights Council****Report of the Third Committee (A/68/451)****Amendment (A/68/L.33)**

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 14 of its report and an amendment to the draft resolution contained in document A/68/L.33.

I give the floor to the representative of Switzerland to introduce the amendment contained in document A/68/L.33.

Mr. Seger (Switzerland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the sponsors of A/68/L.33, which relates to the draft resolution on the report of the Human Rights Council contained in the report of the Third Committee (A/68/451).

Throughout the Third Committee's consideration, we expressed our concern about additions made to the draft resolution on the report of the Human Rights Council in paragraphs 2 and 3 as compared with 2012, when the text was adopted by consensus. In our view, those paragraphs were contrary to the established institutional relationship between the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly, including the Third Committee, which had been reaffirmed by the General Assembly in resolution 65/281 after being reviewed by the Human Rights Council. If the General Assembly was to confirm the retention of these paragraphs in the draft resolution contained in the report of the Third Committee, it could have unforeseen consequences for over 100 resolutions adopted by the Human Rights Council each year.

We firmly believe that a solution should be found to the concerns expressed by many delegations on that issue, in a manner that respects the institutional architecture of the human rights system, as agreed by all Member States. We have continued over the past weeks to call on the main sponsors of the draft resolution to engage in a constructive dialogue so as to discuss solutions to those concerns, including by working on concrete proposals. We were convinced that a consensual and balanced solution that would address delegations' concerns by promoting a coherent and well-functioning United Nations human rights system would benefit all Member States. However, we were not able to achieve that in the Third Committee or in the run-up to this plenary meeting. We are disappointed

therefore that the promising discussions we held yesterday evening were not continued today and that the request for another meeting was refused.

As no consensual solution could be found, the sponsors have submitted amendment A/68/L.33, pursuant to which paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft resolution would be deleted. We respectfully call on all Member States to support the proposed amendment so as to adopt a text that respects and strengthens the human rights system.

The President: I call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote before the voting on the amendment contained in document A/68/L.33.

Mrs. Mørch Smith (Norway): Norway would like to explain why we will vote in favour of the proposed amendment (A/68/L.33).

Norway is of the view that a compromise solution that addressed the concerns of interested parties could have been possible. Unfortunately, such a compromise was not reached. We are therefore left with no choice but to vote in favour of the amendment, deleting paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft resolution contained in the report of the Third Committee (A/68/451). Norway will vote in favour in order to protect the institutional architecture of the United Nations human rights system, which has been agreed on by all States Members of the United Nations in both resolution 60/251, which established the Human Rights Council, and resolution 65/281, which reviewed the Council.

It is unwarranted to single out any Human Rights Council resolution that does not contain recommendations to the General Assembly and is not of a norm-setting character. By reopening one of the agreed resolutions of the Human Rights Council, we would risk setting a dangerous precedent that could undermine the United Nations human rights architecture. By allowing for the reopening of Human Rights Council resolutions by the General Assembly, we would challenge the clearly defined divisions of labour and responsibilities among the United Nations human rights mechanisms.

All States are permitted to participate on equal terms in the negotiation of all Human Rights Council resolutions, regardless of their status as members or observers. The role of the Human Rights Council as the main body for dealing with human rights issues within the United Nations has been emphasized by universal support for the Council among the entire United

Nations membership since its establishment in 2006. We believe that it is in our common interest to protect its integrity and effectiveness. By voting in favour, we hope to maintain and protect the universally agreed United Nations human rights architecture.

Ms. Cousens (United States of America): On behalf of the United States, I am taking the floor first to inform colleagues that we are withdrawing our sponsorship of amendment A/68/L.33 in order to make an explanation of vote before the voting to urge Member States to support this amendment.

The amendment is crucial to preserving the integrity of the Human Rights Council and the established and well-understood balance between the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly. The amendment is vital in order to ensure that we do not today set a precedent with far-reaching implications that could have negative consequences for each and every Member State.

The United States has listened seriously to the concerns that some colleagues have raised about one particular resolution adopted by the Human Rights Council this year. We have also been very clear that we are open to any number of ways to give voice to those concerns and find ways to address them. It is in that spirit of mutual respect that we have been working diligently with colleagues to explore any scope for common ground up until this very moment. We are disappointed that those efforts have not borne fruit, and our grave reservations about the draft resolution remain.

It is without precedent and entirely inappropriate for the annual resolution on the report of the Human Rights Council to single out one item of the Council's work that is fully within the mandate of the Human Rights Council — in this instance resolution 24/24, which deals with the important issue of reprisals against human rights defenders — for reconsideration by the General Assembly. Resolution 24/24 does not include any recommendations from the Council to the General Assembly that would require the Assembly to consider the resolution or take any further action.

We are also troubled that no informal negotiations were held on the draft text. This year's draft differs significantly from last year's and every prior year's texts, which have been adopted by consensus. This departure from precedent should not have moved ahead without broad consultations and negotiations that

included Member States from all regions. Moreover, the Human Rights Council adopted resolution 24/24 with broad support. Sixty-seven States, including States from every regional group, including the Group of African States, sponsored the resolution. Not one Member State voted against the resolution.

Most concerning is the fact that, independent of the specific concerns about this specific resolution, the annual resolution taking note of the report of the Human Rights Council is not the appropriate way to address a new substantive concern, and it upsets the long-standing balance carefully wrought between the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly. Deferring action or reconsidering a Human Rights Council resolution in the General Assembly creates a dangerous precedent that could undermine the Council's work by opening the door to the General Assembly's revisiting any of the Council's decisions that are clearly and fully within the mandate we have all entrusted to the Council.

The decision we take here today is therefore not one that delegations should make lightly. The success of the amendment before the Assembly is critical to ensuring that the integrity of the Human Rights Council is preserved, in line with the mandate all the States members of the General Assembly have given it. The amendment needs to succeed in order to prevent a damaging precedent for any future Human Rights Council resolutions.

If delegations have concerns about Council action, there are many ways to deal with them in both Geneva and New York. Using this Third Committee technical draft resolution as a vehicle, however, is the one way in which it should not be used. Delegations' support for the amendment before us is vital and will ensure that the General Assembly safeguards the Human Rights Council from having its legitimacy eroded. We urge all Member States committed to fundamental human rights, to the appropriate and legitimate exercise of the Human Rights Council's mandate and to the established institutional relationships between the Council and the General Assembly to therefore vote in favour of the amendment.

Ms. Ruin (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation will vote in favour of the amendment (A/68/L.33) introduced by the delegation of Switzerland on behalf of the main sponsors.

Costa Rica has always had difficulties with this text presented in the Third Committee, on which,

unfortunately, open consultations were not held. In the past, we have abstained in the voting on this text, and we have also explained our position. Given that my country's traditional position is that the report of the Human Rights Council, a key human rights body of the Organization, must be considered in the plenary of the General Assembly and not in the Third Committee. This position, based on paragraph 5 (j) of resolution 60/251, was reaffirmed with the agreements reached during the review process of the Council at the sixty-fifth session, in accordance with paragraph 6 of resolution 65/281. The report must thus be considered by the plenary of the General Assembly. Only the recommendations must be considered by the Third Committee. More important still, the paragraphs that were added this year are unacceptable to my delegation.

Besides the fact that Human Rights Council resolution 24/24 contains no formal recommendation, paragraph 2 of the draft resolution contained in the report of the Third Committee (A/68/451) refers to deferring consideration of the entire resolution, and not just the paragraph concerning the relevant issue. My delegation regrets that an agreement was not reached, as we believe that it would have been possible to respond to the concerns expressed by the sponsoring delegations of the draft resolution on the report of the Human Rights Council. We deplore the fact that such an agreement was not achieved. We believe that the practical consequences of not adopting the amendment for the entire work of the Human Rights Council will be most unfortunate. The resolutions of the Human Rights Council, the principal relevant body of the Organization, have value in themselves and should not be reviewed or questioned by the General Assembly.

My delegation wishes to express its full support for the work of the Human Rights Council, its resolutions and recommendations. As a member of the Human Rights Council and as a country committed to the cause of human rights, we believe that it is essential to safeguard the work and decisions of the Council, and we will therefore vote in favour of the amendment.

Mr. Tangara (Gambia): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 54 States members of the Group of African States.

At the outset, the African Group wishes to reaffirm the Human Rights Council mandate, as contained in resolution 60/251, to promote universal respect for the protection of all human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction of any kind and in a fair

and equitable manner, and to make recommendations thereon. It is on that basis that the Group has been consistently supportive of the Council's work. The Group views the principles underpinning the Council's mandate as important, particularly with respect to the principle of cooperation and genuine dialogue aimed at strengthening the capacity of Member States to comply with their human rights obligations.

The Group would like to recall that we submitted the draft resolution contained in the report of the Third Committee (A/68/451) under agenda item 64, entitled "Report of the Human Rights Council", in order to address a procedural element regarding the adoption of Human Rights Council resolution 24/24, entitled "Cooperation with the United Nations, its representatives and mechanisms in the field of human rights".

The Group would like to stress that the draft resolution has serious potential ramifications for the mandate of the Human Rights Council vis-à-vis the General Assembly, the Third Committee and other United Nations entities and bodies in addressing this critical procedural issue with respect to the Council's mandate in relation to taking binding decisions on behalf of other United Nations entities. Paragraphs 2 and 3 were introduced into the draft resolution to defer action in order to allow time for the consultation process.

At this stage, the African Group would like to bring to the attention of the Assembly the fact that Human Rights Council resolution 5/1 clearly defines the mechanisms, mandates, roles, responsibilities and principles of reviews and the rationalization and improvement of mandates. In particular, paragraph 58 (g) stipulates that new mandates should be as clear and specific as possible, so as to avoid ambiguity.

While recognizing that the consultations still have to be undertaken and that no prejudging of that discussion should take place, the African Group is of the view that the following issues need to be part of the consultation process: first, the feasibility of a designation of a United Nations-wide senior focal point to promote the prevention of protection against accountability for reprisals and intimidation related to cooperation with the United Nations, its representatives and mechanisms among others; secondly, the existence of mechanisms, in other United Nations bodies that deal with matters of this nature and their experiences, challenges and good practices ahead of the designation of the United

Nations-wide senior focal point; thirdly, the mandate of the Human Rights Council's 47 members to designate or create a focal point that binds other United Nations entities; and fourthly, the serious ramifications for the institution-building package adopted by the General Assembly, particularly with respect to its carefully crafted agenda and mandates mechanism.

The African Group believes in the principle of constructive and genuine dialogue and cooperation. In that regard, we have undertaken intensive consultations with Member States and regional groups in order to determine the way forward on this issue. But the consultations failed to elaborate a compromise proposal addressing the concerns of the African Group and a slim majority of the Assembly.

On 27 November, the Third Committee rejected the amendments contained in draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.77, introduced by the United States of America and Lithuania, on behalf of the European Union, which sought the deletion of paragraphs 2 and 3 of draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.75, presented by the African Group. The same amendments contained in document A/68/L.33 are presented today for action. The only change of the so-called new proposal is the reference of the document itself. There is nothing new in the substance of the text. Therefore, the African Group requests all Member States that voted against the amendments presented in the Third Committee to continue to do so in the Assembly.

For those delegations that abstained or did not participate in the vote, the African Group urges them to follow the voice of reason and democracy in the Assembly and to vote against A/68/L.33.

Mr. Tommo Monthe (Cameroon) (*spoke in French*): I take the floor after the Chair of the Group of African States simply because, as all are aware, Cameroon was responsible for coordinating the negotiations in the Third Committee of the viewpoints of the group of experts of the African Group on this issue. I am therefore taking the floor in full awareness of the matter.

First, I would like to strongly and powerfully express our support for the views expressed on behalf of the Group of African States by the Permanent Representative of the Gambia.

Secondly, I recall that, the contrary to what has been said, the report of the Human Rights Council (A/68/451) containing these analyses and proposals

was already opened for certain points in the past. Some of those points concerned recommendations that had been made, while others did not. Some had to do with recommendations made by consensus, while others did not. In any case, everybody in the Assembly can recall the points in the Human Rights Council's report that touched on the marriage of young girls. Although the Council had already made a recommendation and even reached a decision on that issue, some delegations presented new draft resolutions to the Assembly on the same issue without its raising any major issues.

Let us also recall the issue of indigenous peoples. Clearly, the Human Rights Council had made a recommendation and reached a decision on that issue, and when it reached the Assembly an entire year passed before the declaration was adopted. It was reopened because we believed that this was quite a routine thing to do, and some delegations, including those that spoke today, had no objection to it. The issue of drinking water and sanitation was also the subject of discussion in the Human Rights Council. It was taken up again in the Assembly and there were no problems as a result. In conclusion, I wish to state that the African Group is not breaking any new ground. We are simply following what has been done in the past.

My third point concerns document A/68/L.33, which is before us today. As the Chair of the African Group said, it is the same document A/C.3/68/L.77 that was submitted to the Third Committee.

I respect the President's honour, and I did not want to get into a discussion as to whether an identical proposal adopted or rejected in the Third Committee should be presented once again. That is not the issue. The proposal is being submitted now as A/68/L.33, but the content is exactly the same. When it was considered in the Third Committee, I said that the situation was clear.

With regard to the draft resolution contained in the report of the Third Committee (A/68/451), which is before the Assembly today, the African Group had believed that when it comes to the creation of a focal point, the ramifications of which are so broad, it was not possible to avoid discussing it in depth, since only the 47 members of the Human Rights Council had reached a decision and since it was routine for the other members of the General Assembly to be fully informed of the issue before they took a decision. The African Group even made it a point of honour that the discussions would not last indefinitely and that they

would come to an end before the end of the sixty-eighth session.

For those wise reasons, the African Group decided to adopt a “slow and steady wins the race” approach. There is no point in sprinting, but we do have to take things step by step. A/C.3/68/L.77, which appears before the Assembly today as A/68/L.33, was presented in its current format in order to eliminate the two paragraphs contained in the African Group’s draft, thereby forcing everyone to accept it immediately and creating a focal point. We believe that it would be wise to have a discussion before creating a focal point. We said at the time that A/C.3/68/L.75 represented the voice of wisdom, the voice of balance, and that we had to leave the door open in order to avoid unintended consequences. That is why we state today that A/68/L.33 is aimed at destroying the draft resolution contained in the report of the Third Committee.

For all the reasons raised by the Chair of the African Group, and for the reasons that I myself have just listed, which support this wise compromise, we cannot support or accept A/68/L.33. We will vote against it, and we hope that all those who have tried to protect the African calabash will come to see that the stone contained in A/68/L.33 will end up breaking it, and thus deprive everyone of the opportunity to discuss this issue in full cognizance of the facts before accepting the creation of a focal point.

Mr. Chipaziwa (Zimbabwe): I just wish to say very briefly that it must be possible — it is possible — for the General Assembly to correct the Human Rights Council when it has acted in a spirit that is contrary to the spirit of the majority of this more representative body, the General Assembly, with its 193 members. The Human Rights Council is a subsidiary body of the Assembly. We can correct the Human Rights Council without damaging its status in any way. Moreover, as has already been said, A/68/L.33 is just the defeated A/C.3/68/L.77 in a new guise. We urge members to vote against A/68/L.33. In so doing, they will not damage the Human Rights Council; they will merely be exercising their responsibility.

Mr. Reyes Rodríguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I have refrained from participating in this discussion up to this point, but certain questions of principle have been raised on which my delegation believes it indispensable to provide some clarification.

The General Assembly created the Human Rights Council. It has the full authority and mandate to review the work of the Human Rights Council. I myself was Cuba’s representative in Geneva and a Vice-Chair of the Human Rights Council. I have no reason to discredit or to detract from the authority of the Council, but at the same time the General Assembly has all the power and mandate necessary to study, analyse and reach conclusions about any decision of the Human Rights Council. As a matter of fact, the Human Rights Council was not established by consensus.

I am surprised to hear certain delegations allude to and defend the decisions of the Human Rights Council today, when for years they did not even take part in the Council’s work. Not all members of the General Assembly are represented in Geneva. Others have missions that are so small that they are unable to attend all the meetings. There are missions from Caribbean countries, my own region, that have so few representatives that they have to focus their efforts on the World Trade Organization, because trade and the economy are what their States are dependent on to meet their peoples’ right to food and development.

On the issue of reprisals, I believe that the Human Rights Council and the entire machinery of the United Nations must work to prevent reprisals against human rights defenders and those cooperating with the Council.

I wonder why we are stressing the issue of the focal point when the High Commissioner, her Office, the Secretary-General and the entire Secretariat already have a mandate. I very much fear that there is some kind of hidden motive behind this draft resolution. If not, why is so much stress being placed on an intergovernmental mandate? Why is an intergovernmental mandate needed when there are no programme budget implications? What staff members from the Office of the High Commissioner are going to work in the focal point? If the Office does not have money or enough staff, how is it going to create a new focal point? Where is the money coming from? What personnel are going to work on that? Are they going to transfer the staff who are working on the right to development? Are they going to move the people working on the universal periodic review? I see here issues that are not fully clarified.

I therefore believe that the proposal of the Group of African States is a very wise one. It is not calling for the elimination or dismissal of the proposal that the Human Rights Council considered. It is simply asking for time for clarification so that all of us can be convinced of the

importance of the decision we are about to take. I think there is a certain extremism in the positions of those who wish to push this process forward at any cost. We have time, both in the Human Rights Council and in the General Assembly. We have months before us, and we have all the time in the world to discuss and reach a consensus on the issue of how to put an end to reprisals and the best way in which the United Nations can work so that reprisals do not take place.

I believe it would be extremely dangerous for the amendment contained in document A/68/L.33 to be adopted here, and for the position of focal point established pursuant to the draft resolution to be imposed when a large number of delegations still have questions, when there is no clarity about what is going to be done, and when its very legitimacy as an institution is in question. Therefore, in these circumstances, I think we must vote against the amendments and for the African draft resolution, which will give us time to analyse, study and build a true consensus.

The President: The Assembly will first take a decision on the amendment contained in document A/68/L.33.

I give the floor to the representative of the Secretariat.

Mr. Botnaru (Department for General Assembly and Conference Management): I should like to announce that, since the submission of the amendment, and in addition to those delegations listed in A/68/L.33, the following countries have become sponsors: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The President: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy,

Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu

Against:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Brunei Darussalam, Haiti, Iraq, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Malaysia, Nepal, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Trinidad and Tobago, Viet Nam, Yemen

The amendment was rejected by 83 votes to 80, with 18 abstentions.

The President: We shall now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Report of the Human Rights Council", contained in paragraph 14 of the report of the Third Committee (A/68/451).

I now call on those delegations wishing to speak in explanations of vote before the voting.

Mr. Wenaweser (Liechtenstein): I have the honour to make this explanation of vote on behalf of Switzerland, New Zealand, Iceland, Norway and my own country, Liechtenstein.

The institutional relationship between the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly has developed over the years towards a stable arrangement that was last confirmed in resolution 65/281 on the review of the Human Rights Council. The arrangement is expressed in the understanding that

“the Third Committee would consider and act on all recommendations of the Human Rights Council to the Assembly, including those that deal with the development of international law in the field of human rights, without prejudice to the right of Member States to present resolutions and decisions on all issues considered in the report of the Council. Taking this recommendation into account, the Assembly, in plenary meeting, would consider the report of the Council on its activities for the year” (A/63/250/Add.1, para. 3).

By singling out in the Third Committee a specific resolution of the Human Rights Council that does not contain a recommendation, the main sponsors of the draft text before us have violated that understanding. Our delegations therefore supported the amendment to the draft resolution presented to the Third Committee and today in plenary. We would also like to express our disappointment that the main sponsors have not consulted the membership on the draft resolution which, for the first time, is of a substantive nature and raises issues of institutional importance. All States should have had an opportunity to consider and discuss the draft text. It is disappointment that there was no response to constructive attempts to find a consensual agreement on the matter in the framework of the Third Committee.

For the foregoing substantive and procedural reasons, our delegations will, at this point, oppose the draft resolution before us.

Ms. Murmokaitė (Lithuania): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union and its member States. Our concern with additional elements in the draft resolution are well known and shared by a broad range of colleagues across regions. We have continued to work tirelessly and sincerely to reach out to the main

sponsors of the draft resolution to find a balanced solution to the concerns on the issue in a manner that respects the institutional architecture of the United Nations human rights system, as agreed by all Member States. We believe that is our shared, long-term goal. We therefore regret that our efforts to find a balanced solution could not be achieved and left us with no other opportunity than to resort to submitting amendments to address our continuing strong concerns.

It is based on our continuing view that the additional elements in the draft resolution as it stands disrupt the established relationship between the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly, including its Third Committee. It is a view based on principled support for the agreement and our intent to ensure a consistent and well-functioning United Nations human rights system. As the amendments, which would have restored the text to the format that was adopted without a vote in 2012, were not accepted, we encourage all delegations to vote against the draft resolution.

Mr. Patriota (Brazil): Brazil remains fully committed to the protection of all individuals against violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms wherever they may be perpetrated. That attitude is consistently reflected today in national policies and programmes dealing with the protection of human rights defenders, threatened victims and witnesses and endangered children and adolescents. The same principles we defend at the national level guide us internationally. Brazil voted in favour of Human Rights Council resolution 24/24 on reprisals against human rights defenders and thus reaffirmed its position at the General Assembly by voting in favour of the amendment contained in document A/68/L.33.

Our abstention in the Third Committee represented an expression of the expectation that a consensus might be reached. That, unfortunately, did not occur. At the same time, it is of paramount importance that the process of the creation of the post of a United Nations-wide senior focal point be carried out in a transparent manner and through a comprehensive dialogue with a view to strengthening the international legitimacy associated with that new position. Of particular relevance will be the establishment of a clear mandate and adequate procedures for accountability.

Brazil acknowledges the systemic implications of the mandate for a United Nations-wide focal point. For that reason, we are of the view that it is legitimate for any Member State to bring the issue to the attention of

the General Assembly for its consideration. That should not be construed as disregard for the institutional architecture of the United Nations human rights system nor as an expression of an inferior level of commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights. On the contrary, by recognizing the existence of systemic implications in the case at hand, we will be contributing to a more balanced and democratic approach to this specific situation. It is in that spirit that we will abstain on the draft resolution before us.

Ms. King (Australia): Australia is a strong supporter of the work of the United Nations to promote and protect human rights. We consider the Human Rights Council to be a fundamental part of the United Nations human rights architecture, and we strongly believe that preserving its autonomy and expertise is critical to ensuring its effectiveness. We have been pleased that over recent years we have been able to reach consensus on the General Assembly resolution on the Human Rights Council report. We regret deeply that has not been the case this year. We particularly regret that the lack of consensus is due to efforts to defer implementation of Human Rights Council resolution 24/24 on cooperation with the United Nations, its representatives and mechanisms in the field of human rights.

Human Rights Council resolution 24/24 addresses the critical issue of countering reprisals against those who cooperate with United Nations mechanisms. We regard that as a fundamental issue that requires urgent United Nations attention. It is at the heart of the human rights functions of the United Nations, namely, to do what it can to help and protect those individuals who seek to support its work. Australia believes that the Human Rights Council's adoption of resolution 24/24 was within its mandate, and General Assembly resolution 60/251 establishing the Human Rights Council makes clear that the Council should promote the effective coordination and mainstreaming of human rights within the United Nations system.

Australia has been committed to working with other States towards a compromise solution to address the concerns of some States with regard to Human Rights Council resolution 24/24 in a way that does not risk eroding the United Nations international human rights framework. We regret deeply that a compromise solution was not found. We now look forward to working with others within the General Assembly to address issues of concern with resolution 24/24 so

that the provisions of that important resolution can be implemented.

The President: A recorded vote has been requested on the draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 14 of its report.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Tuvalu,

Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Brazil, Dominica, Grenada, Haiti, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Samoa, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Vanuatu

The draft resolution was adopted by 94 votes to 71, with 23 abstentions (resolution 68/144).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Chad informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against.]

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Qatar, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote after the voting.

Ms. Al-Mulla (Qatar): I would like to make an explanation of vote following the adoption of resolution 68/144, on the report of the Human Rights Council (A/68/451). Let it be noted that the State of Qatar made the same remarks during its consideration in the Third Committee. We take this opportunity to reiterate our position because of the concerning precedent that this resolution creates.

At the outset of my remarks, allow me to recall that the State of Qatar supported the African Group's stance during the consideration of Human Rights Council resolution 24/24, at the Council's twenty-fourth session. Our support is grounded in the belief that, through channels consistent with established United Nations rules of procedure, Member States have the right to further discuss subjects of concern to them. The consideration of resolution 24/24, contained in the present resolution before us, reopens negotiation on a resolution already adopted at the Human Rights Council. Such a practice can consequently undermine the role of the Human Rights Council. To that end and as a matter of principle, we chose to abstain on the adoption of the resolution of the report of the Human Rights Council.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 64?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 65

Promotion and protection of the rights of children

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children

(b) Follow-up to the outcome of the special session on children

Report of the Third Committee (A/68/452)

The President: The Assembly has before it four draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 31 of its report, and a draft decision recommended by the Committee in paragraph 32 of the same report. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I, II, III and IV and on the draft decision, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled "Strengthening collaboration on child protection within the United Nations system". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 68/145).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "The girl child". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 68/146).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Rights of the child". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 68/147).

The President: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Child, early and forced marriage". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 68/148).

The President: We shall now turn to paragraph 32 of the report to take action on the draft decision entitled "Reports considered by the General Assembly in connection with the question of the promotion and protection of the rights of children". May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to adopt the draft decision recommended by the Third Committee?

The draft decision was adopted (draft decision 68/533).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 65 and its sub-items (a) and (b)?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 66

Rights of indigenous peoples

(a) Rights of indigenous peoples

(b) Second International Decade of the World's Indigenous People

Report of the Third Committee (A/68/453)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 11 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 68/149).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 66 and its sub-items (a) and (b)?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 67

Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

(a) Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

(b) Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action

Report of the Third Committee (A/68/454)

The President: The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 22 of its report, and one draft decision recommended by the Committee in paragraph 23 of the same report. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I and II and on the draft decision, one by one.

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "Combating glorification of Nazism and other practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Canada, Kiribati, Palau, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, El Salvador,

Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tonga, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution I was adopted by 135 votes to 4, with 51 abstentions (resolution 68/150).

The President: We now turn to draft resolution II, entitled “Global efforts for the total elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and the comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action”. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad

and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Australia, Canada, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Israel, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Palau, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Ukraine

Draft resolution II was adopted by 134 votes to 11, with 46 abstentions (resolution 68/151).

The President: We turn now to the draft decision, entitled “Documents considered by the General Assembly in connection with the elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance”. May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to adopt the draft decision, as recommended by the Third Committee?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 68/534).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (a) of agenda item 67?

It was so decided.

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of sub-item (b) of agenda item 67.

Agenda item 68

Right of peoples to self-determination

Report of the Third Committee (A/68/455)

The President: The Assembly has before it three draft resolutions recommended by the Third

Committee in paragraph 20 of its report. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to III, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled “Use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination”. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia

(Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Colombia, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Switzerland, Tonga

Draft resolution I was adopted by 128 votes to 55, with 8 abstentions (resolution 68/152).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled “Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination”. The Third Committee adopted draft resolution II. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 68/153).

The President: We now turn to draft resolution III, entitled “The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination”. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg,

Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Palau, United States of America

Abstaining:

Cameroon, Paraguay, Tonga, Vanuatu

Draft resolution III was adopted by 178 votes to 7, with 4 abstentions (resolution 68/154).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 68?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 69

Promotion and protection of human rights

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments

Report of the Third Committee (A/68/456/Add.1)

The President: The Assembly has before it three draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 20 of its report. Before proceeding further, I should like to inform members that action on draft resolution I, entitled “Human Rights Committee”, is postponed to a later date to allow time for the review

of its programme budget implications by the Fifth Committee. The Assembly will take action on draft resolution I as soon as the report of the Fifth Committee on its programme budget implications is available.

We will now take a decision on draft resolutions II and III, one by one.

Draft resolution II is entitled “International covenants on human rights”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 68/155).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled “Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 68/156).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (a) of agenda item 69?

It was so decided.

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms

Report of the Third Committee (A/68/456/Add.2)

The President: The Assembly has before it 26 draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 146 of its report. Before proceeding further, I should like to inform members that action on draft resolution XVII, entitled “United Nations Human Rights Training and Documentation Centre for South-West Asia and the Arab Region” is postponed until a later date to allow time for the review of its programme budget implications by the Fifth Committee. The Assembly will take action on draft resolution XVII as soon as the report of the Fifth Committee on its programme budget implications is available.

We will now take decisions on draft resolutions I to XVI and XVIII to XXVI, one by one. After all the decisions have been taken, representatives will again have an opportunity to explain their votes or positions.

We now turn first to draft resolution I, entitled “The human right to safe drinking water and sanitation”. The

Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 68/157).

The President: We now turn to draft resolution II, entitled “The right to development”. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Canada, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, Slovakia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine

Draft resolution II was adopted by 158 votes to 4, with 28 abstentions (resolution 68/158).

The President: We now turn to draft resolution III, entitled “Human rights and cultural diversity”. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo,

Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

None

Draft resolution III was adopted by 136 votes to 54 (resolution 68/159).

The President: Draft resolution IV is entitled “Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 68/160).

The President: We now turn to draft resolution V, entitled “Promotion of equitable geographical distribution in the membership of the human rights treaty bodies”. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic,

Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Chile

Draft resolution V was adopted by 135 votes to 54 votes, with 1 abstention (resolution 68/161).

The President: We now turn to draft resolution VI entitled “Human rights and unilateral coercive measures”. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia,

Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

None

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 135 votes to 55, with 0 abstentions (resolution 68/162).

The President: Draft resolution VII is entitled "The safety of journalists and the issue of impunity". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 68/163).

The President: Draft resolution VIII is entitled "Strengthening the role of the United Nations in enhancing periodic and genuine elections and the promotion of democratization". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VIII was adopted (resolution 68/164).

The President: Draft resolution IX is entitled "Right to the truth". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IX was adopted (resolution 68/165).

The President: Draft resolution X is entitled "International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution X was adopted (resolution 68/166).

The President: Draft resolution XI is entitled "The right to privacy in the digital age". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XI was adopted (resolution 68/167).

The President: We now turn to draft resolution XII, entitled "Globalization and its impact on the full

enjoyment of all human rights". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland,

Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

None

Draft resolution XII was adopted by 136 votes to 55 (resolution 68/168).

The President: Draft resolution XIII is entitled "Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping, stigmatization, discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against persons, based on religion or belief." The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XIII was adopted (resolution 68/169).

The President: Draft resolution XIV is entitled "Freedom of religion or belief". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XIV was adopted (resolution 68/170).

The President: Draft resolution XV is entitled "National institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XV was adopted (resolution 68/171).

The President: Draft resolution XVI is entitled "Effective promotion of the Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XVI was adopted (resolution 68/172).

The President: Draft resolution XVIII is entitled "Follow-up to the International Year of Human Rights Learning". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XVIII was adopted (resolution 68/173).

The President: Draft resolution XIX is entitled “Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XIX was adopted (resolution 68/174).

The President: Draft resolution XX is entitled “Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order”. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Chile, Costa Rica, Mexico, Palau, Peru, Samoa

Draft resolution XX was adopted by 132 votes to 52, with 6 abstentions (resolution 68/175).

The President: Draft resolution XXI is entitled “Strengthening United Nations action in the field of human rights through the promotion of international cooperation and the importance of non-selectivity, impartiality and objectivity”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XXI was adopted (resolution 68/176).

The President: Draft resolution XXII is entitled “The right to food”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XXII was adopted (resolution 68/177).

The President: Draft resolution XXIII is entitled “Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XXIII was adopted (resolution 68/178).

The President: Draft resolution XXIV is entitled “Protection of migrants”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XXIV was adopted (resolution 68/179).

The President: Draft resolution XXV is entitled “Protection of and assistance to internally displaced persons”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XXV was adopted (resolution 68/180).

The President: Draft resolution XXVI is entitled “Promotion of the Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms: protecting women human rights defenders”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XXVI was adopted (resolution 68/181).

The President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of sub-item (b) of agenda item 69.

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives

Report of the Third Committee (A/68/456/Add.3)

The President: The Assembly has before it four draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 27 of its report.

Before proceeding further, I should like to inform members that action on draft resolution II, entitled “Situation of human rights in Myanmar”, is postponed to a later date to allow time for the review of its programme budget implications by the Fifth Committee. The Assembly will take action on draft resolution II as soon as the report of the Fifth Committee on its programme budget implications is available.

I shall now give the floor to representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position before we take action on the draft resolutions.

Mr. Ja’afari (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to make the following statement in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution I, entitled “Situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic”, which was introduced in the context of sub-item (c) of agenda item 69 and the

report of the Third Committee contained in document A/68/456/Add.3.

Permit me on this occasion to remind members that the international legal framework within which Member States operate is based on the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States under any pretext. That principle has been consecrated in many international instruments and resolutions, in particular the Charter of the United Nations. Accordingly, the introduction of such politicized draft resolutions targeting specific States violates the provisions of the Charter in general and impedes a peaceful political resolution to the Syrian crisis. That is all the more so given the fact that such a solution hinges on a comprehensive national dialogue among Syrians, in accordance with their will and free from any external interference. Such a draft resolution would encourage the continuation of armed violence, killing and the shedding of Syrian blood, thereby serving the agendas of specific States that are trying hard to bring about the failure of the “Geneva II” conference.

The reality of events in Syria is no secret; nor is the outrageousness and enormity of the crimes perpetrated against the Syrian people by armed terrorist groups connected with Al-Qaida. Those groups were brought in by the Saudi regime with the assistance of Governments representing more than 83 States — most of them Islamic, Arab or Western countries that are sponsors of this outrageously hostile, politicized and politically driven draft resolution. That has been clear from the fact that a number of States are hastening to review their policies vis-à-vis the Syrian crisis with a view to rectifying the egregious mistakes they perpetrated against our people and to clean up their international profile for fear of being held accountable to their people and to history for their misdirected policies with regard to the Syrian crisis.

It is the height of cynicism and frivolity that the Saudi regime, which epitomizes the violation of human rights of its people, Arabs and Muslims, is sponsoring the draft resolution before us. The Saudi regime is a principal source of fundamentalist and Takfiri terrorism in States across the world, beginning with Afghanistan in the 1980s. It is also linked to the 11 September event in New York and with attacks in London, Madrid, Paris, various Arab capitals and the African Sahel.

Saudi Arabia is presenting a draft resolution calling for protection of the human rights of the Syrians at a time when its regime is interfering overtly and

with impunity in the internal affairs of my country, fanning the flames of hatred and preventing Syrians from finding a peaceful political solution to the crisis themselves. In that regard, I would like to quote the statement made yesterday by the Saudi Ambassador to the United Kingdom, which appeared in *The New York Times*.

(spoke in English)

“We continue to show our determination through our support for the Free Syrian Army and the Syrian opposition. It is too easy for some in the West to use the threat of Al Qaeda’s terrorist operations in Syria as an excuse for hesitation and inaction.

“The way to prevent the rise of extremism in Syria — and elsewhere — is to support the champions of moderation: financially, materially and yes, militarily, if necessary.” (*The New York Times*, 17 December 2013)

(spoke in Arabic)

The Saudi Ambassador and his regime are of the view that extending financial and training support to terrorists — those who destroy churches, abduct monks and nuns and kill Syrians — should continue. That is what the Saudi Ambassador to the United Kingdom said in his statement in *The New York Times*.

The Saudi regime finances and backs every sort of sanctuary for terrorism throughout the world. The Saudi financing of, and complicity with, terrorism is better documented by the international and Western media than by Syria’s media. Rather than apologizing to our people and Government for its support for terrorism, for killing innocent people and for committing abuses that threaten international peace and security, the Saudi regime persists in dispatching Al-Qaida terrorist operatives to my country. The Saudi position will only lead to the proliferation of terrorism and its evils inside Saudi Arabia itself. It will also lead to continuous violations of human rights in Syria by the armed Takfiri terrorist groups that are financed and supported by the foolhardy Saudi regime, causing harm to Syrian villages and citizens.

As I address the General Assembly right now, Takfiri groups are invading the workers’ city of Adra, which is inhabited by 70,000 simple workers employed in 600 laboratories and factories. The most horrendous crimes are being committed against them — they are

being slaughtered, burned alive in furnaces and subject to decapitation in the countryside, with promises of similar treatment for those who support the victims. This sectarian rebellion is being fuelled by ignorant messages being spread by the religious leaders.

Why is there so much reticence with respect to the Saudi-Qatari terrorist hysteria? Why is there this unwarranted silence by the international community with regard to the Turkish, Saudi and Qatari regimes’ sponsorship of terrorism in my country? I wonder whether, for members of NATO such as Turkey, the smell of oil and gas attracting interests to Saudi Arabia and Qatar will justify turning a blind eye to the crimes committed by those regimes in Syria.

The Assembly has heard about the killing of more than 100,000 in Syria; yet the Saudis, Turks and Qataris do not talk about the reason for that painful number of deaths. The Assembly will not hear about who killed them and how they were killed. The Assembly will not hear about the number of those who were killed with cold steel as the result of abominable sectarian strife, or about the number of victims killed by suicide explosions and car bombs. Nobody will explain to the Assembly where the Takfiri mercenary training camps are located and who is in charge of them.

In conclusion, my delegation has requested a recorded vote on draft resolution I. We urge Member States to reconsider their votes and call on them to vote against the draft resolution in order to avoid being drawn into the web of illusions that the sponsor countries seek to falsely plant in the global consciousness, in a bid to divert attention from their inhuman, immoral and illegal practices.

Mr. Kim Song (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea): My delegation firmly believes that all human rights issues should be addressed through the Universal Periodic Review mechanism, rather than in plenary meeting, especially given that country-specific draft resolutions clearly run counter to the principles of impartiality and non-selectivity with respect to human rights.

Draft resolution I, contained in document A/68/456/Add.3, can have no impact on the human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic, since the alleged human rights violations are the consequence of political considerations. My delegation believes that human rights cannot be imposed from outside. Accordingly, my delegation will vote against the draft resolution.

Mr. Dehghani (Islamic Republic of Iran): I take the floor to once more enumerate the reasons for which we believe that delegations should vote against draft resolution IV, contained in document A/68/456/Add.3, entitled “Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran”. The reasons are as follows.

First, the draft resolution does not correspond to the actual situation on the ground, as it does not take into consideration the development of human rights in Iran and ignores all the cooperation that Iran has extended.

Secondly, it is imbalanced, as it either exaggerates or distorts the real course of events in my country. As a result, it will fail to be effective or bring about any outcome.

Thirdly, it is based on a misguided and erroneous approach that is selective, discriminatory and punitive. Experience shows that such an approach has led nowhere. It is damaging because it undermines and discredits the United Nations human rights mechanisms.

Fourthly, does not seek to encourage cooperation in the field of human rights and is thereby counterproductive and fails to encourage meaningful engagement with the United Nations human rights mechanisms and bilateral human rights dialogue based on mutual respect and understanding.

Fifthly and finally, since political objectives are paramount among the main sponsors of the draft resolution, it does not add any value to the lofty goals that human rights seek to advance.

Taking that into consideration, we hope that delegations will vote against draft resolution IV.

Mr. Reyes Rodríguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to express Cuba’s position regarding the various draft resolutions.

With regard to Syria, we will vote against draft resolution I. We believe that we are not really promoting dialogue and reconciliation, which are necessary in the quest for a peaceful and inclusive way out of the situation in the Syrian Arab Republic, by continuing this exercise — one that involves a draft text that does not genuinely respond to the situation on the ground. I believe that dialogue and compromise are the only solutions that will enable us to find a peaceful, negotiated solution to the situation that has been imposed upon the Syrian Arab Republic.

I am aware that the consideration of draft resolution II has been postponed, but I wonder when we are going to finish our consideration of the situation in Myanmar. This is another example of initiating a politically motivated draft resolution that never comes to an end, irrespective of changes in the situation on the ground.

Turning the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, we distanced ourselves from the consensus in the Third Committee, and I should like to reiterate Cuba’s position with regard to draft resolution III.

The same is true with regard to the Islamic Republic of Iran. We are going to vote against draft resolution IV. Again, we believe that the draft text does not help to meet the needs of any of the various countries in terms of human rights. Iran, like the other two countries under consideration, cooperates with the Human Rights Council via the Universal Periodic Review. A number of important developments have taken place in the Islamic Republic of Iran that the draft text does not take into account. Cuba will therefore vote against the draft resolution.

The President: We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I, III and IV, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled “Situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic.” A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway,

Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen

Against:

Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cabo Verde, Chad, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guyana, India, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Togo, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zambia

Draft resolution I was adopted by 127 votes to 13, with 47 abstentions (resolution 68/182).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 68/183).

The President: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran." A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Sudan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu

Against:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Armenia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo,

Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 86 votes to 36, with 61 abstentions (resolution 68/184).

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against.]

The President: I shall now give the floor to the representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position on the resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Kim Song (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): My delegation takes the floor to clarify its position in total rejection of resolution 68/183, entitled "Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea," and to disassociate itself from its adoption.

There are no human rights violations in my country as mentioned in the resolution. My delegation firmly believes that all human rights issues must be treated under the Universal Periodic Review mechanism, which is fully operational, rather than in plenary meeting of the General Assembly. The adoption of the resolution against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will result in the further deterioration of the political situation in the already deadlocked dialogue between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the European Union. It will also escalate the dangerous situation on the Korean peninsula, since the resolution is only the product of the hostile policy of the United Nations against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to overthrow our political and social system.

The main sponsors of the resolution are those countries that committed human rights violations by invading sovereign States and undertook the mass killing of innocent people in Iraq and Afghanistan, doing so by disguising their actions as a war on terror and humanitarian intervention. Before criticizing the human rights situations of other countries, they should reflect on the human rights records in their own countries.

Moreover, the information contained in the resolution is a full fabrication, cooked up by hostile forces through so-called defectors from the North. We cannot overlook the fact that the South Korean authorities mean to use defectors as a tool of human rights against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The South Korean authorities must immediately stop luring and

abducting citizens of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. If South Korea is really interested in human rights, as a sponsor of the resolution they must abolish the anti-human-rights national security law that defines compatriots of the same blood as an enemies to be eliminated by any means. Under that law, any person having contact and communication with the North will be the subject of a crackdown, and persons who demand the democratization of their society and talk about national reunification are sent to prison. Such is the real human rights situation in South Korea.

Finally, my delegation once again fully rejects this resolution and disassociates itself from its adoption.

Mr. Yao Shaojun (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China maintains its consistent position on country-specific resolutions on human rights. We oppose the adoption of such resolutions. We believe that human rights can be promoted and protected only through constructive dialogue and cooperation. On the basis of that principled position, we voted against the country-specific resolutions concerning Syria and Iran.

I reiterate our position, as stated in the Third Committee, on resolution 68/183, on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. We did not participate in the consensus.

Ms. Belskaya (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): Belarus would like to reiterate its position with regard to the unacceptability of country-specific resolutions as a means of exerting political pressure against sovereign States. For that reason, we voted against resolutions 68/182 and 68/184, on the human rights situations in the Syrian Arab Republic and the Islamic Republic of Iran, respectively. For the same reason, we would like to disassociate ourselves from the consensus on resolution 68/183, on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (c) of agenda item 69?

It was so decided.

(d) Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

Report of the Third Committee (A/68/456/Add.4)

The President: May I take it that the Assembly wishes to take note of the report of the Third Committee?

It was so decided.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (d) of agenda item 69?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 69 (continued)

Promotion and protection of human rights

Report of the Third Committee (A/68/456)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 5 of its report. We will now take action on the draft decision, entitled “Documents considered by the General Assembly in connection with the question of the promotion and protection of human rights”. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt the draft decision as recommended by the Third Committee?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 68/536).

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 69.

Agenda item 108

Crime prevention and criminal justice

Report of the Third Committee (A/68/457)

The President: The Assembly has before it 11 draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 47 of its report, and one draft decision recommended by the Committee in paragraph 48 of the same report. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to XI and on the draft decision, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled “Follow-up to the Twelfth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and preparations for the Thirteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 68/185).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled “Strengthening crime prevention and criminal justice responses to protect cultural property, especially with regard to its trafficking”. The Third Committee adopted

the draft resolution. May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 68/186).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled “Technical assistance for implementing the international conventions and protocols related to counter-terrorism”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 68/187).

The President: Draft resolution IV is entitled “The rule of law, crime prevention and criminal justice in the United Nations development agenda beyond 2015”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 68/188).

The President: Draft resolution V is entitled “Model strategies and practical measures on the elimination of violence against children in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to do the same?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 68/189).

The President: Draft resolution VI is entitled “Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 68/190).

The President: Draft resolution VII is entitled “Taking action against gender-related killing of women and girls”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 68/191).

The President: Draft resolution VIII is entitled “Improving the coordination of efforts against trafficking in persons”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution VIII was adopted (resolution 68/192).

The President: Draft resolution IX is entitled “Strengthening the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme, in particular its technical cooperation capacity”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IX was adopted (resolution 68/193).

The President: Draft resolution X is entitled “United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution X was adopted (resolution 68/194).

The President: Draft resolution XI is entitled “Preventing and combating corrupt practices and the transfer of proceeds of corruption, facilitating asset recovery and returning such assets to legitimate owners, in particular to countries of origin, in accordance with the United Nations Convention against Corruption”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XI was adopted (resolution 68/195).

The President: We will now take action on the draft decision, entitled “Reports considered by the General Assembly in connection with the question of crime prevention and criminal justice”. May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to adopt the draft decision, as recommended by the Third Committee?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 68/537).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 108?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 109

International drug control

Report of the Third Committee (A/68/458)

The President: The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 11 of its report. We will now take a decision on draft decisions I and II, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled “United Nations Guiding Principles on Alternative Development”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 68/196).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled “International cooperation against the world drug problem”. The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 68/197).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 109?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 122 (continued)

Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

Report of the Third Committee (A/68/486)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 5 of its report. We will now take action on the draft decision, entitled “Programme of work of the Third Committee for the sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly.” May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt the draft decision, as recommended by the Third Committee?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 68/538).

The President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 122.

Agenda item 135 (continued)

Programme planning

Report of the Third Committee (A/68/459)

The President: May I take it that the Assembly wishes to take note of the report of the Third Committee?

It was so decided.

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 135.

On behalf of the General Assembly, I would like to thank the Permanent Representative of Bulgaria,

Ambassador Tafrov, and Chair of the Third Committee, the members of the Bureau, the Secretary of the Committee, as well as all representatives for a job well done.

The General Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of all the reports of the Third Committee before it today, with the exception of documents

A/68/456/Add.1, A/68/456/Add.2 and A/68/456/Add.3, concerning draft resolutions I, XVII and II, respectively. As noted earlier, the Assembly will take action on those draft resolutions as soon as the reports of the Fifth Committee on their programme budget implications are available.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.