



General Assembly

Seventy-fourth session

50th plenary meeting

Wednesday, 18 December 2019, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

President: Mr. Muhammad-Bande (Nigeria)

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Reports of the Third Committee

The President: The General Assembly will consider the reports of the Third Committee on agenda items 25, 26, 61, 65 to 70, 106 to 108, 121 and 136.

I request the Rapporteur of the Third Committee, Mr. Firas Hassan Jabbar of Iraq, to introduce in one intervention the reports of the Committee.

Mr. Jabbar (Iraq), Rapporteur of the Third Committee (*spoke in Arabic*): It is an honour for me to introduce to the General Assembly the reports of the Third Committee on the agenda items allocated to it by the General Assembly at its seventy-fourth session, namely, items 25, 26, 61, 65 to 70, 106 to 108, 121 and 136.

The reports, contained in documents A/74/391 to A/74/404, include the texts of draft resolutions and decisions recommended to the General Assembly for adoption. For the convenience of delegations, the Secretariat has issued document A/C.3/74/INF.1, in English only, which contains a checklist of actions taken on the draft proposals listed in the reports before the Assembly.

During the main part of the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly, the Third Committee held 52 plenary meetings and adopted a total of 62 draft resolutions, 19 of which were adopted by recorded vote, and one draft decision.

Under agenda item 25, "Social development", including sub-items (a) and (b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 49 of document A/74/391, the adoption of seven draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 26, "Advancement of women", including sub-items (a) and (b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 21 of document A/74/392, the adoption of three draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 61, "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 19 of document A/74/393, the adoption of three draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 65, "Report of the Human Rights Council", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 12 of document A/74/394, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under the agenda item 66, "Promotion and protection of the rights of children", including sub-items (a) and (b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 31 of document A/74/395, the adoption of two draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 67, "Rights of indigenous peoples", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 10 of document A/74/396, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda item 68, "Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance", including sub-items (a) and (b), the Third Committee

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in 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-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).

19-41930 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



recommends, in paragraph 20 of document A/74/397, the adoption of two draft resolutions.

Under agenda items 69, “Right of peoples to self-determination”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 23 of document A/74/398, the adoption of three draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 70, “Promotion and protection of human rights”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 69 of document A/74/399, the adoption of two draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 70 (a), “Implementation of human rights instruments”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 13 of document A/74/399/Add.1, the adoption of two draft resolutions.

Under the agenda item 70 (b), “Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 90 of document A/74/399/Add.2, the adoption of 21 draft resolutions.

Under the agenda item 70 (c), “Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 47 of document A/74/399/Add.3, the adoption of five draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 70 (d), “Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action”, the Third Committee wishes to advise the Assembly that no action was required under the sub-item.

Under agenda item 106, “Crime prevention and criminal justice”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 29 of document A/74/400, the adoption of eight draft resolutions.

In connection with draft resolution VII, “Improving the coordination of efforts against trafficking in persons”, I wish to make the following oral revision to operative paragraph 21. The words “and persons with disabilities” will be added after the words “concerning children” in the fifth line. Operative paragraph 21 will therefore read

“Calls upon Member States to continue their efforts to criminalize trafficking in persons in all its forms, including the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labour or services, slavery

or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs, especially concerning children and persons with disabilities, and to condemn these practices and to investigate, prosecute and penalize traffickers and intermediaries while providing victim-centred protection and assistance to the victims of trafficking with full respect for their human rights, and invites Member States to continue to support those United Nations agencies and international organizations that are actively involved in victim protection.”

Under item 107, “Countering the use of information and communications technologies for criminal purposes”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 13 of document A/74/401, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda item 108, “International drug control”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 11 of document A/74/402, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda item 121, “Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 8 of document A/74/404, the adoption of one draft decision.

Under agenda item 136, entitled “Programme planning”, the Third Committee wishes to advise the Assembly that no action was required under the item.

I would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the commendable leadership of our Chair, His Excellency Christian Braun, Permanent Representative of Luxembourg, and to thank the other Bureau members, namely, the Vice-Chairs, Ms. Gail Farnagalo of Liberia, Mr. Ihor Yaremenko of Ukraine and Ms. Maria Emilia Eyheralde Geymonat of Uruguay.

I would also like to thank, on behalf of the Bureau, the Secretary of the Committee and his able team from the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management for the support and guidance provided to the Bureau and to delegations as well as the other offices in the Secretariat that supported the work of the Committee.

Finally, I am grateful to all Third Committee experts for their friendship and support for the Bureau.

The President: The positions of delegations regarding the recommendations of the Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in

the relevant official records. Therefore, 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 that are before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The President: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote. May I remind members that in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee, and that 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 Third Committee, I should like to advise representatives that we are going to proceed to take decisions in the same manner as was done in the Committee, unless the Secretariat is notified otherwise in advance. That means that where separate or recorded votes were taken, we will do the same. I should also hope that we may proceed to adopt without a vote those recommendations that were adopted without a vote in the Third Committee. The results of the votes will be uploaded and available on the PaperSmart Portal.

I would like to draw the attention of members to a note by the Secretariat, in English only, entitled "List of proposals contained in the reports of the Third Committee for consideration by the General Assembly", which has been circulated as document A/C.3/74/INF/1. This note has been distributed desk to desk in the General Assembly Hall as a reference guide for action on the draft resolutions and decisions recommended by the Third Committee in its reports.

Members will find in column 4 of the note the symbols of the draft resolutions and decisions of the Third Committee, with the corresponding symbols of the reports for action in the plenary in column 2 of the same note. For reports containing multiple recommendations, the draft resolution or decision number is contained in column 3 of the note.

Members are reminded that additional sponsors are no longer accepted now that draft resolutions and decisions have been adopted in the Committee. Any clarification about co-sponsorship in the Committee

reports should be addressed to the Secretary of the Committee.

Furthermore, any corrections to the voting intention of delegations after the voting has concluded on a proposal should be made directly to the Secretariat after the meeting. I would seek members' cooperation in avoiding any interruptions to our proceedings in this regard.

Agenda item 25

Social development

(a) Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, persons with disabilities and the family

Report of the Third Committee (A/74/391)

The President: The Assembly has before it seven draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 49 of its report.

I invite delegations wishing to explain their vote before the voting on any or all of the seven draft resolutions to do so now.

Mr. Salovaara (Finland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States.

The European Union and its member States welcomed the outcome of the 2019 session of the Third Committee of the General Assembly. Through the adoption of several key draft resolutions, the Third Committee reaffirmed that all human rights are to be realized worldwide and that there is no hierarchy of human rights. It recalled the centrality of human rights to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals.

The EU and its member States have proudly engaged on all the draft resolutions submitted, and we ourselves have submitted 14 draft resolutions covering a large number of human rights issues ranging from social, economic and cultural rights to civil and political rights and from thematic to country-specific

draft resolutions. We thank all members that supported our priorities and initiatives.

We have worked with all regional groups and organizations, including the Latin American and Caribbean Group, on the rights of the child; the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) on the situation of human rights in Myanmar; the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in support of important draft resolutions on social and economic rights; and the Group of African States on a number of thematic resolutions.

The EU remains committed to engaging with all States in order to promote respect for and the protection and progressive fulfilment of economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to education, the right to food and the rights to safe drinking water and sanitation, as components of the right to an adequate standard of living.

The EU would like to express its deep appreciation to the States Members of the United Nations that have aligned with our statements, in particular the candidate countries to the EU and the Eastern Partnership countries. We welcome the consensual adoption of the EU-led draft resolution on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, as well as the widespread support for the draft resolution on the situation of human rights of the Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar, submitted jointly by the EU and the OIC.

We firmly believe that the international community must continue to send the strong message that all those responsible for crimes involving violations of international human rights law and international humanitarian law are to be held accountable in national, regional or international courts or tribunals, including the International Criminal Court.

We welcome the consensual adoption of the draft resolution on the rights of the child, which the EU submitted jointly with the Latin American and Caribbean Group. In this important year marked by the thirtieth anniversary of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, we collectively reiterated, through the draft resolution, our resolve to promote and protect the rights of all children, particularly those in vulnerable situations.

We welcome the consensual adoption of the EU-led draft resolution on freedom of religion or belief and call on all States to fully implement its provisions

and to guarantee freedom of religion or belief for all, including persons belonging to ethnic and religious minorities. The EU recalls its support for the draft resolutions on the situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic, on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran and on the situation of human rights in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, Ukraine.

The Committee also adopted by consensus several forward-looking draft resolutions on gender equality. Those drafts send a strong signal of the international community's commitment for the human rights of all women and girls, including sexual and reproductive health, and provide a new, ambitious road map for the years to come. We will work with all relevant stakeholders, including member States, civil-society actors and human rights defenders to turn these words into concrete action.

As we mark the fortieth anniversary of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women today, we take this opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to the full and effective implementation of the Convention. The EU will continue to strongly oppose all forms of discrimination, including on the grounds of sex, race, ethnic or social origin, religion or belief, political or any other opinion, disability, age, sexual orientation and gender identity, and will consistently and constructively continue to support United Nations work in this regard.

We welcome the fact that, once again, the Third Committee was able to reach consensus on the promotion and protection of the human rights of migrants, including women migrant workers. The EU will remain steadfast in its commitment to upholding international human rights law in relation to refugees, internally displaced persons and migrants.

The European Union, which, with its new European Green Deal, has committed to becoming the first carbon-neutral region by 2050, salutes the reaffirmation in several resolutions adopted by the Third Committee of the importance of fully implementing the Paris Agreement in consideration of the undeniable impact of climate change on the enjoyment of human rights.

The EU calls upon all Member States to refrain from using the Third Committee to pursue objectives other than the promotion and protection of human rights. In this regard, the EU reiterates its support for an open, free, stable and secure cyberspace, where the rule of

law applies, including in the context of human rights and fundamental freedoms, with a view to achieving societal well-being, economic growth, prosperity and the integrity of free and democratic societies. We recall that, whereas consensus exists on the need to step up our collective efforts to build capacity to fight cybercrime, there is no consensus for the creation of a new international instrument in that regard.

The EU also reiterates that is not for the Third Committee to call into question the decisions of the Human Rights Council, including the Council's authority to appoint mandate holders, and that we do not see any merit in the Third Committee adopting a resolution on the Council's report.

Finally, the EU thanks the Chair of the Third Committee, His Excellency Mr. Christian Braun, the other members of the Bureau and the secretariat of the Committee for their outstanding work.

The President: We shall now take decisions on draft resolutions I to VII, one by one. After all the decisions have been taken, representatives will have an opportunity to explain their vote or position on any or all of the draft resolutions.

Draft resolution I is entitled "Cooperatives in social development". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 74/119).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Promoting social integration through social inclusion". The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 74/120).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Policies and programmes involving youth". A single, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraphs 10, 12 and 13.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo

Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Belarus, Burundi, Cameroon, Egypt, Guatemala, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Libya, Mauritania, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, United States of America, Yemen

Abstaining:

Bahrain, Bangladesh, Comoros, Ethiopia, Haiti, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kuwait, Mauritius, Myanmar, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates

Operative paragraphs 10, 12 and 13 were retained by 138 votes to 15, with 17 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Nicaragua informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against; Algeria had intended to abstain.]

The President: The Third Committee adopted draft resolution III without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 74/121).

The President: Draft resolution IV is entitled “Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly”. 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, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, 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, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, 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, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, 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, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan,

Thailand, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 186 votes to 2, with no abstentions (resolution 74/122).

The President: Draft resolution V is entitled “Persons with albinism”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 74/123).

The President: Draft resolution VI is entitled “Follow-up to the twentieth anniversary of the International Year of the Family and beyond”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 74/124).

The President: Draft resolution VII is entitled “Follow-up to the Second World Assembly on Ageing”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 74/125).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (b) of agenda item 25?

It was so decided.

The President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 25 and its sub-item (a).

Agenda item 26

Advancement of women

(a) Advancement of women

(b) Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women and

of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly

Report of the Third Committee (A/74/392)

The President: The General Assembly has before it three draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 21 of its report.

We shall now take decisions on draft resolutions I to III, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled “Improvement of the situation of women and girls in rural areas”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 74/126).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled “Violence against women migrant workers”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 74/127).

The President: Draft resolution III 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 without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 74/128).

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

Mr. Szijjártó (Hungary): First, I would like to confirm that Hungary deems the prevention of violence and the prevention of such violations of the human rights of women workers as sexual violence, trafficking in human beings, exploitation, forced labour and slavery as being highly important. Ensuring safe working conditions, protecting victims, providing adequate information about legal remedies, properly regulating the labour market and empowering women are prerequisites for eliminating violence against women workers. However, we believe that the focus of international discussion on this issue is misplaced. We should put much greater emphasis on prevention, especially with regard to situations that force women to leave their homes.

Ultimately, we have to seriously address root causes. In this regard, the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration unfortunately does not represent the right approach. The Global Compact promotes migration and portrays it as the best thing that ever happened to humankind, which means, in essence, that the Compact supports the smuggler’s business model. Smugglers earn tens or even hundreds of millions of dollars by taking advantage of people, especially defenceless women. The international community should therefore fight smugglers fiercely and thwart their business models. That would truly contribute to protecting vulnerable groups, including migrant women. As long as the Compact is considered the basis for international migratory policy, however, there will be increasing numbers of people taking to the road, and more and more people, including women and working women, finding themselves in defenceless positions.

That is why in December, in this Hall, Hungary voted against the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (see A/73/PV.60), and we do not take part in its implementation. We therefore dissociate ourselves from the paragraphs in resolution 74/127 that mention the Global Compact or the International Migration Review Forum, which serves to further the Compact’s implementation.

Mrs. Bernal Prado (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): Chile does not participate in the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration. It is therefore not appropriate for us to make any objections with regard to its content. Accordingly, Chile dissociates itself from all references to the Compact in the recently adopted resolution 74/127, entitled “Violence against women migrant workers”.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 26 and its sub-items (a) and (b)?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 61

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/74/393)

The President: The Assembly has before it three draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 19 of its report.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position before action is taken on draft resolutions I to III.

Ms. Wegter (Denmark): Draft resolution II, entitled “Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees”, the annual omnibus resolution on the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), is traditionally facilitated by one of the Nordic countries. This year, it has been Denmark’s privilege to facilitate the negotiations on the draft resolution in Geneva and to present it to the Third Committee and General Assembly in New York.

I wish to deliver a statement today on behalf of the five Nordic countries: Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and my own country, Denmark.

The work of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees is of a humanitarian and entirely non-political character. Similarly, the annual draft resolution dealing with the Office’s mandate is a humanitarian, non-political text. It supports UNHCR in continuing to provide international protection and humanitarian assistance and to seek durable solutions for the persons within its mandate. The draft resolution deals with the common ground that enables UNHCR to work in the interests of us all and, most essentially, for the benefit of those forcibly displaced.

This year’s text includes language on the implementation of the global compact on refugees and on the first Global Refugee Forum, which is taking place in Geneva right now. The support for and implementation of the global compact will enable the international community to have a more effective collective response to forced displacement — one of the most central global challenges today.

The text was the outcome of extensive negotiations in Geneva, where the concerns of all Member States were given full and due consideration in order to arrive at a text that could receive the broadest possible support, in the best interests of UNHCR and the people that it serves so well. The draft resolution enjoys strong

and solid support from an overwhelming majority of Member States across all regions, which was made evident in its adoption in the Third Committee last month. With its 79 sponsors, this year’s draft resolution enjoys the largest number yet of sponsors for the UNHCR omnibus resolution.

We therefore deeply regret that one Member State has challenged the draft resolution this year by calling for a vote, thereby challenging the long-standing tradition of consensus. As a facilitator of the draft resolution and on behalf of the Nordic countries, I strongly encourage all States Members of the United Nations to support the draft resolution and to vote in favour of its adoption today by the General Assembly.

Mr. Szijjártó (Hungary): I would like to share with the General Assembly that Hungary is deeply concerned that the number of displaced persons worldwide is at a record high. We fully agree that the international community has the responsibility to assist those displaced, bearing in mind that all displacements shall be temporary in nature.

International law speaks very clearly on this issue: everybody has the right to have a safe and secure life at home. Anyone who needs to escape, can go to the first safe country and has to stay there temporarily until the conditions for return are met. The global compact on refugees, which was affirmed last year in resolution 73/151, represents another approach, promotes migration and encourages people to move further away from home, in clear violation of international law, because nobody has the right to violate the borders between two safe countries.

That is one of the reasons for which Hungary voted against the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (see A/73/PV.60), and we do not accept any reference to that Compact in any United Nations document. That is also why Hungary dissociates itself from this draft resolution as well. We strongly reject its approach, as it suggests that a country’s solidarity should be determined solely on whether it accepts migrants and refugees on its territory. We are certain that there are other ways for a country to show solidarity — for example, humanitarian and development aid provided to countries affected by conflict, assistance to countries located around war-torn areas and the provision of care to large numbers of refugees — which should also be recognized.

Our principles are clear — we have to provide help where it is needed and should not introduce problems where there are none. This is the basis for our policy called “Hungary helps”, through which we have helped 70,000 Christians in the Middle East to stay or to return to their homes by rebuilding their destroyed houses, churches and schools and by covering some of the operational costs of their hospitals.

Our policy is also based on the affected peoples’ request. They ask us not to invite them to leave their homes because that contributes to the elimination of their communities, which only furthers the goals of the terrorist organizations. However, we should not limit ourselves to appeals to the international community to help countries in war-torn areas; we should also take more concrete action, as we are doing, for example, in Uganda, where we are providing €16 million of support in the framework of a development programme to ensure the supply of water for refugees staying in the territory of their country.

I would like to make a further remark on a specific part of the document on Africa. We know that population having been rising in African countries, but we do not think that the solution to the phenomenon is to invite these people to come to Europe. Instead, we think that assistance should be brought to Africa. We should improve the ability of these countries to keep the growing number of young people at home by creating the necessary circumstances for them to choose to stay. That is the solution. If young and talented people all leave the countries of Africa, then the question becomes who will modernize these countries, whose future could easily be compromised.

Accordingly, Hungary is ready to assist international efforts to create the necessary conditions for people to stay at home under safe and secure circumstances and, for those who have to leave, to give them the right and possibility to return home as soon as possible.

The President: We will now take decisions on draft resolutions I to III, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled “Enlargement of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 74/129).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled “Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees”. 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, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, 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, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu,

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

Eritrea, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Libya, Poland

Draft resolution II was adopted by 179 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions (resolution 74/130).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 74/131).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 61?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 65 (continued)

Report of the Human Rights Council

Report of the Third Committee (A/74/394)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 12 of its report.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before action is taken on the draft resolution.

Mr. Poveda Brito (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): With regard to the draft resolution on the report of the Human Rights Council for the 2019 period, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela will vote in favour. This is a principled position based on the importance of this subsidiary organ as the privileged venue to address this critical subject within the framework of cooperation and dialogue among States. Venezuela renews its commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights without distinction and based on the principles of universality, objectivity, non-politicization and non-selectivity. My country reaffirms its responsibility to work

constructively with the Council during the 2020-2022 triennium, for which it was elected in October.

Nevertheless, Venezuela also condemns the adoption of special resolutions and procedures or any other mechanism on the situation of human rights in specific countries and rejects selective treatment of this topic for political ends, as it constitutes a violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Accordingly, Venezuela does not recognize and dissociates itself from document A/HRC/42/25.

Mrs. Ndayishimiye (Burundi) (*spoke in French*): I would like to make a statement before the voting on the draft resolution entitled "Report of the Human Rights Council", which my delegation supports as a whole.

The delegation of Burundi wishes to reiterate its principled position reaffirming the importance of this organ for addressing the issues related to human rights and rejects to its use to promote hidden interests. I would also like to express Burundi's concerns with specific parts of the report, particularly those on resolutions that specifically target certain countries, including Burundi.

My country is convinced that all progress on human rights requires dialogue and cooperation in the framework of the universal periodic review, as well as national assistance and capacity-building of all stakeholders in this area. We cannot stress enough that politicization, selectivity and double standards are real obstacles to the process of promoting human rights, and the international community must break with this counterproductive attitude and address the suffering of the people of this world with the same level of attention, without other geopolitical motivations.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to dissociate itself from the section of the report that targets Burundi, namely, the parts referring to the Commission of Inquiry on Burundi, established by the Human Rights Council following its politically motivated resolution contained in document A/HRC/33/24 of 30 September 2016 and without taking into consideration the position of the Government of Burundi. My country will therefore pay no heed to the written or oral reports already produced by the Commission..

The President: We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. 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, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, 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, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Belarus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Israel, Myanmar

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of

Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan

The draft resolution was adopted by 120 votes to 4, with 59 abstentions (resolution 74/132).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Ireland informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Philippines to speak in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mrs. Fangco (Philippines): I am taking the floor on behalf of the Philippines to explain our abstention in the voting on resolution 74/132, on the report of the Human Rights Council, which contains a reference to Human Rights Council resolution 41/2 and the human rights situation in the Philippines. As a member of the Council, Philippines fully supports it and always voted in favour of its report in previous years. This year, however, the report refers to Council resolution 41/2, on the human rights situation in the Philippines. We want to emphasize that this resolution was not adopted unanimously but only by a minority, a total of 18 members, which is not even half of the Council's membership. Moreover, almost as many members either voted against the resolution or abstained. Given those figures, the resolution's validity is highly questionable and clearly does not represent the will of the Council's entire membership, much less that of the developing countries that are always a target of such resolutions and bear the brunt of them.

The Philippines would like to stress that respect for States' sovereignty and non-interference in their internal affairs, objectivity, non-selectivity, impartiality, transparency, cooperation and dialogue are important principles that the United Nations and the Human Rights Council should uphold. We support the centrality of the Universal Periodic Review as the sole mechanism for addressing situations regarding human rights in States.

Given the current budgetary issues that the United Nations is dealing with, we are concerned about the proliferation of country-specific resolutions within it. We urge Member States to evaluate the costs of unilateral, country-specific resolutions versus their impact on the ground in terms of improving the capacities of the States concerned. Will they really be constructive and helpful, or will they only further the politicization of human rights? The resolution on the

Philippines, for example, is expected to cost \$331,000, or more than ₱16.8 million. That is a huge amount for us, and it will only cover the salaries, consultancy fees and travel expenses of the researchers who will be hired to prepare a so-called comprehensive report on the human rights situation in the Philippines. That over-broad scope clearly has no intention of generating an objective assessment of the real situation on the ground but speaks to the real motive of the resolution's authors, which is to name and shame, for which no amount of money will ever be enough.

The Assembly should consider carefully whether it should allow itself to advance the political agenda of a few. We further urge it to assess the effectiveness of unilateral, country-specific resolutions in having a positive impact on the ground and on people's lives.

The President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote on the resolution just adopted.

May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 65?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 66

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/74/395)

The President: The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 31 of its report.

We shall now take a decision draft resolutions I and II, one by one.

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "Rights of the child".

A separate recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 13 of draft resolution I.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia

(Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

Belarus, Burundi, Egypt, Libya, Mauritania, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Comoros, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Mauritius, Pakistan, Rwanda, Samoa, Sudan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates

Operative paragraph 13 was retained by 138 votes to 10, with 20 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Ethiopia informed the Secretariat that it had intended abstain.]

The President: The Third Committee adopted draft resolution I, entitled “Rights of the child”, without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I, as a whole, was adopted (resolution 74/133).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled “The girl child”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 74/134).

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation, who wishes to speak in explanation of position on the resolution just adopted.

Mr. Kashaev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): My delegation cannot support the language of operative paragraph 20 of resolution 74/133, entitled “Rights of the child”, concerning the International Criminal Court, and dissociates itself from that paragraph.

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

Rights of indigenous peoples

(a) Rights of indigenous peoples

(b) Follow-up to the outcome document of the high-level plenary meeting of the General Assembly known as the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples

Report of the Third Committee (A/74/396)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution, entitled “Rights of indigenous peoples”, recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 10 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 74/135).

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Chile, who wishes to speak in explanation of position on the resolution just adopted.

Mrs. Bernal Prado (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): Chile is not a participant in the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, and is therefore not responsible for its content in any way. We therefore dissociate ourselves from all the references to the Compact in resolution 74/135, entitled “Rights of indigenous peoples”.

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

It was so decided.

Agenda item 68

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/74/397)

The President: The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 20 of its report. The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolutions I and II, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled “Combating glorification of Nazism, neo-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:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, 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, Central African Republic, 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, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, 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, Republic of Moldova, 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, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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:

Ukraine, United States of America

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tonga, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution I was adopted by 133 votes to 2, with 52 abstentions (resolution 74/136).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "A global call for concrete action for the 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, Central African Republic, 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, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, 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, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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:

Canada, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Israel, Marshall Islands, Nauru, 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, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine

Draft resolution II was adopted by 135 votes to 9, with 43 abstentions (resolution 74/137).

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

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-items (a) and (b) of agenda item 68?

It was so decided.

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 68.

Agenda item 69

Right of peoples to self-determination

Report of the Third Committee (A/74/398)

The President: The Assembly has before it three draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 23 of its report. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to III, one by one.

We first turn to draft resolution I, 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, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, 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, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, 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, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Brazil, Colombia, Fiji, Mexico, Palau, Switzerland, Tonga

Draft resolution I was adopted by 130 votes to 52, with 7 abstentions (resolution 74/138).

The President: Draft resolution II is 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, 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, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, 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:

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

Abstaining:

Australia, Cameroon, Guatemala, Honduras, Kiribati, Lesotho, Palau, Rwanda, Togo, Tonga, Vanuatu

Draft resolution II was adopted by 167 votes to 5, with 11 abstentions (resolution 74/139).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Latvia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: We now turn to draft resolution III, entitled "Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 74/140).

The President: I call on the representative of Canada, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote.

Mr. Hinton (Canada): I have requested the floor this morning to explain Canada's vote on resolution 74/139, on the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination.

Canada is a strong ally and close friend of Israel, continuing a partnership that has advanced the shared values and interests of our two democracies for 70 years. Canada is strongly committed to the goal of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East, including the creation of a Palestinian State, living side by side in peace and security with Israel. Canada's vote today is a reflection of this long-standing commitment.

Canada voted in support of this resolution, as it addresses one of the core issues of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Canada strongly supports the international consensus on a two-State solution so that both peoples can have a secure and prosperous future. This is particularly important at a time when the prospects for two States for two peoples is increasingly under threat.

Today, Canada strongly reiterates our long-stated concern that there are too many resolutions related to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, a situation that unfairly singles out Israel for criticism. These resolutions do not speak to the complexities of the issues or seek to address the actions and responsibilities of all parties, including the destructive role in the conflict of such terrorist organizations as Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad. Canada continues to vote no on these

one-sided resolutions. We would prefer to see the international community channel its efforts towards helping both sides resume direct negotiations and work towards achieving a lasting peace for both peoples.

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

It was so decided.

Agenda item 70

Promotion and protection of human rights

Report of the Third Committee (A/74/399)

The President: I would like to inform members that we will take action on sub-items (a) to (d) of agenda item 70 immediately after taking action on the main agenda item.

The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 69 of its report.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Szijjártó (Hungary): We consider it of the utmost importance to come to a common understanding of and universal respect for international law. If we seriously considered international law, we would find that the right to migrate is not among the fundamental human rights but that, in contrast, the right to a safe and secure life at home is clearly a fundamental human right for all peoples.

Indeed, it is not a fundamental human right to wake up in the morning, pick a country where one would like to live and, in order to get there, violate a series of borders between safe countries. Furthermore, the international community should respect that migration policy is an exclusively national prerogative and all countries have the right to decide on their own who will and will not be allowed to enter their territory. All nations have their own sovereign right to decide whom they would and would not like to live with in their own territory.

The Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration does not show respect for those national prerogatives. Nor does it say anything about the people who simply want to have a safe and secure life in their homeland. Furthermore, the Compact considers, as a

matter of definition, that every country on the globe must fall into one of three categories from the point of view of migration — source country, transit country or destination country. On the contrary, our position is that all countries have the sovereign right to decide that they do not fall into any of those three categories. Moreover, any interpretation of migration that does not consider its security aspects is a false interpretation.

We have had sad and regrettable experiences in Europe in that regard. Our experience proves that massive, illegal and uncontrolled migratory flows give an opportunity to terrorist organizations to send their fighters, activists and proponents of extreme ideologies all around the world. An additional risky outcome of massive illegal migratory flows is that dangerous societies can be created.

I would also like to draw the Assembly's attention to the importance of the protection of borders. The protection of borders is not only a national competence but also a State obligation in terms of protecting the security and citizens of that country. The violation of a border is a crime against the sovereignty of that country and should not be considered as a human rights issues. Furthermore, border violations should not be promoted.

With regard to draft resolution IV contained in document A/74/399/Add.2, entitled "Protection of migrants", we believe that the best way to protect migrants is to create circumstances such that people do not become migrants. If they need to escape from their homes, we should make it possible for them to return to their homes as soon as possible. Let me underline, once again, that the international community must recognize that all persons have the right to live in peace and security in their homeland. That is why it would be a good thing if the United Nations intended to reaffirm that right in a migration-related resolution.

For all those reasons, Hungary voted against the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (see A/73/PV.60) and we dissociate ourselves from the paragraphs of the draft resolution that contain any reference to the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration or the International Migration Review Forum.

Mr. Mack (United States of America): In recognition of other statements made today, the United States takes this opportunity to make important points of clarification on some of the language we see reflected across multiple draft resolutions. We understand that

these texts and resolutions adopted in the General Assembly are non-binding documents that do not create rights or obligations under international law.

The United States understands that General Assembly resolutions do not change the current state of conventional or customary international law. We do not read resolutions to imply that States must join or implement obligations under international instruments to which they are not a party, and any reaffirmation of such convention applies only to those States that are party to it.

For the United States, that understanding includes references to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Convention on the Rights of the Child, to which we are not party. Moreover, United States co-sponsorship of, or consensus on, resolutions does not imply endorsement of the views of Special Rapporteurs or other Special Procedures mandate holders as to the contents of international law.

We note that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights does not create binding obligations on States. With regard to universal access to health care, the United States aspires to help increase access to high-quality health care, but we understand that each country should develop its own approach to achieving access to health care within its own context.

The United States also recognizes the important role of partnerships with the private sector, non-governmental organizations, including faith-based organizations, and other stakeholders. As we said (see A/74/PV.14) at the time of the adoption of resolution 74/4, entitled “Political declaration of the high-level meeting on universal health coverage”, patient control and access to high-quality people-centred care are key.

With regard to women’s equality and empowerment, the United States is committed to promoting women’s equality and empowering women and girls. Accordingly, when the subject of resolution texts is women or, in some cases, women and girls, our preference is to use those terms rather than gender for greater precision.

Further, the United States recalls the unequivocal objections of two delegations to the adoption of the so-called agreed conclusions of the sixty-third meeting of the Commission on the Status of Women, which

included substantive concerns that the United States shared. Many of those same problems are endemic among Third Committee resolutions, including problematic references to abortion, the proliferation of ill-defined gender jargon and the inclusion of language that undermines the role of the family. The United States does not consider the outcome documents from this year’s meeting of the Commission on the Status of Women to be the product of consensus.

With regard to the International Criminal Court (ICC), the United States does not and cannot support references to the ICC and the Rome Statute that do not distinguish sufficiently between parties and non-parties or are otherwise inconsistent with the United States position on the ICC, particularly our continuing and long-standing objection to any assertion of ICC jurisdiction over nationals of States that are not parties to the Rome Statute absent a referral from the Security Council or consent of such a State. Our position on the ICC in no way diminishes our commitment to supporting accountability for atrocities.

Additionally, the United States notes that any references to certain acts as crimes against humanity or war crimes under the Rome Statute should be understood in the context of how those terms are defined in the Statute itself, including that crimes against humanity must include a widespread or systematic attack against a civilian population and/or must be committed pursuant to a State or organizational policy.

With regard to sexual and reproductive health, the United States defends human dignity and supports access to high-quality health care for women and girls across the lifespan. We do not accept references to sexual and reproductive health, sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights, safe termination of pregnancy or other language that suggest or explicitly states that access to legal abortion is necessarily included in the more general terms “health services” or “health-care services” in particular contexts concerning women. Each nation has the sovereign right to implement related programmes and activities, consistent with their laws and policies. There is no international right to abortion.

Further, consistent with the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development Programme of Action and the 1995 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and their reports, we do not recognize abortion as a method of family planning, nor do we support abortion in our global health assistance.

With regard to migration, the United States maintains the sovereign right to facilitate or restrict access to its territory in accordance with its national laws and policies, subject to our existing international obligations. The United States did not participate in the negotiation of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, objected to its adoption and is not bound by any of the commitments or outcomes deriving from the Global Compact process or contained in the Compact itself.

The Global Compact and the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants contain goals and objectives that are inconsistent and incompatible with United States law and policy and the interests of the American people. We refer interested parties to consult the national statement of the United States of America on the adoption of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, as delivered on 19 December 2018 (see A/73/PV.60).

With regard to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, we underscore that it is non-binding and does not create or affect rights or obligations under international law, nor does it create any new financial commitments.

Further, the United States understands references to internationally agreed development goals to be referring to the non-binding 2030 Agenda. The United States recognizes the 2030 Agenda as a global framework for sustainable development that can help countries work towards global peace and prosperity. We applaud the call for shared responsibility, including national responsibility, in the 2030 Agenda, and emphasize that all countries have a role to play in achieving its vision. The 2030 Agenda recognizes that each country must work towards implementation in accordance with its own national policies and priorities. The United States also underscores that paragraph 18 of the 2030 Agenda calls for countries to implement the Agenda in a manner that is consistent with the rights and obligations of States under international law. We also want to highlight our mutual recognition, in paragraph 58, that implementation of the 2030 Agenda must respect and be without prejudice to the independent mandates of other processes and institutions, including negotiations, and does not prejudice or serve as a precedent for decisions or actions under way in other forums. For example, the 2030 Agenda does not represent a commitment to providing new market access for goods or services. Nor does it interpret or alter any World Trade Organization

agreements or decisions, including the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights.

With regard to climate change, on 4 November 2019 the United States submitted a formal notification to the United Nations of its withdrawal from the Paris Agreement on Climate Change. The withdrawal will take effect one year from the delivery of the notification. References to the Paris Agreement or to climate change are therefore without prejudice to United States positions. With regard to references to special reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the United States has indicated at the IPCC that the IPCC's acceptance of such reports and approval of their respective summaries for policymakers does not imply United States endorsement of the specific findings contained in the reports. References to the IPCC's special reports are also without prejudice to United States positions.

Regarding trade, as President Trump stated in his address to the General Assembly on 25 September 2018 (see A/73/PV.6), the United States will act in its sovereign interests, including on trade matters. This means that we do not take our trade policy direction from the United Nations. It is our view that the United Nations should respect the independent mandates of other processes and institutions, including trade negotiations, and should not involve itself in decisions and actions in other forums, including the World Trade Organization. The United Nations is not an appropriate venue for such discussions, and there should be no expectation or misconception that the United States would heed decisions made by the Economic and Social Council or the General Assembly on such issues. That includes calls that undermine incentives to innovation, such as technology transfer that is not voluntary or on mutually agreed terms.

Furthermore, the United States is disappointed to see references to the world financial and economic crisis. We note that the effects of the financial crisis are no longer of any real relevance, and that continued references to it detract from efforts to focus both on today's challenges and on the steady global economic growth we are experiencing. We would like to take this opportunity to make important clarification points regarding the reaffirmation of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. We want to note specifically that much of the trade-related language in the Addis Ababa outcome document (resolution 69/313) has been overtaken by events since July 2015. It is therefore immaterial,

and our reaffirmation of the outcome document has no standing for ongoing work and negotiations that involve trade.

The right to development, which is not recognized in any of the United Nations human rights conventions, does not have an agreed international meaning. Furthermore, work is needed to make it consistent with human rights, which the international community recognizes as universal rights held and enjoyed by individuals and which every individual may demand from his or her own Government. We also continue to be concerned about the possibility that the right to development referenced in resolutions this year protects States rather than individuals. States must implement their human rights obligations, regardless of external factors, including the availability of development and other assistance.

The President: It is time to wrap up.

Mr. Mack (United States of America): We therefore continue to oppose references to the right to development in draft resolutions presented to the General Assembly during this session.

Finally, we reiterate statements we have made during Third Committee discussions, and it is our intention that this statement applies to all agenda items addressed by the Third Committee.

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

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled “The human rights to safe drinking water and sanitation”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 74/141).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled “International Equal Pay Day”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 74/142).

The President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 70.

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments

Report of the Third Committee (A/74/399/Add.1)

The President: The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 13 of its report. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I and II, one by one.

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled “Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 74/143).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Optional Protocol thereto: accessibility”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 74/144).

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation, who wishes to speak in explanation of position after adoption.

Mr. Kashaev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We would like to reiterate our position on a number of paragraphs in resolution 74/143, entitled “Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment”. Our delegation cannot support the language in the seventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4 that refers to the International Criminal Court and its Rome Statute, and dissociates itself from the consensus on those paragraphs.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (a) of agenda item 70?

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/74/399/Add.2)

The President: The Assembly has before it 21 draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 90 of its report.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to XXI, one by one. After all the decisions have been made, representatives will again have an opportunity to explain their vote or position.

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled “Freedom of religion and belief”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 74/145).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled “Implementing 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 through providing a safe and enabling environment for human rights defenders and ensuring their protection”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 74/146).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled “Terrorism and human rights”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 74/147).

The President: Draft resolution IV is entitled “Protection of migrants”. The Third Committee adopted draft resolution IV without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 74/148).

The President: Draft resolution V is entitled “The right to food”. 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, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, 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, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, 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, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, 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, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Draft resolution V was adopted by 188 votes to 2 (resolution 74/149).

The President: Draft resolution VI 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, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Eswatini, 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, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, 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, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Liberia, Mexico, Peru

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 128 votes to 53, with 8 abstentions (resolution 74/150).

The President: Draft resolution VII 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 draft resolution VII without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 74/151).

The President: Draft resolution VIII is entitled “The right to development”. 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), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, 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, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, 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, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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:

Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Georgia, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovenia

Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 138 votes to 23, with 26 abstentions (resolution 74/152).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Albania informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

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

Draft resolution IX was adopted (resolution 74/153).

The President: Draft resolution X is 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, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, 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, Palau, 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, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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, Brazil, 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, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland,

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

Draft resolution X was adopted by 135 votes to 55 (resolution 74/154).

The President: Draft resolution XI is 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, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, 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, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, 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, Palau, 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, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Brazil

Draft resolution XI was adopted by 134 votes to 52, with 1 abstention (resolution 74/155).

The President: Draft resolution XII is entitled “National human rights institutions”. The Third Committee adopted draft resolution XII without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XII was adopted (resolution 74/156).

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

Draft resolution XIII was adopted (resolution 74/157).

The President: Draft resolution XIV is entitled “Strengthening the role of the United Nations in enhancing periodic and genuine elections and the promotion of democratization”. The Third Committee adopted draft resolution XIV without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XIV was adopted (resolution 74/158).

The President: Draft resolution XV is 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, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso,

Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, 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, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, 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, Palau, 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, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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, Brazil, 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, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution XV was adopted by 136 votes to 55 (resolution 74/159).

The President: Draft resolution XVI is entitled "Protection of and assistance to internally displaced persons". The Third Committee adopted draft resolution XVI without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XVI was adopted (resolution 74/160).

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

Draft resolution XVII was adopted (resolution 74/161).

The President: Draft resolution XVIII is entitled "Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa". The Third Committee adopted draft resolution XVIII without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XVIII was adopted (resolution 74/162).

The President: Draft resolution XIX is entitled "United Nations Human Rights Training and Documentation Centre for South-West Asia and the Arab Region". 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, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau,

Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, 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, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, 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, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

Iran (Islamic Republic of), Palau

Draft resolution XIX was adopted by 187 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions (resolution 74/163).

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

Draft resolution XX was adopted (resolution 74/164).

The President: Draft resolution XXI 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 it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XXI was adopted (resolution 74/165).

The President: I now give the floor to representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position after voting or adoption.

Mr. Kashaev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We would like to once again reiterate our position on a number of paragraphs in some of the resolutions just adopted.

With regard to resolution 74/160, "Protection of and assistance to internally displaced persons", our delegation cannot support the language in the twenty-sixth preambular paragraph regarding the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and dissociates itself from the consensus on that paragraph.

Regarding resolution 74/158, "Strengthening the role of the United Nations in enhancing periodic and genuine elections and the promotion of democratization," we want to again dissociate ourselves from the consensus on operative paragraph 14.

Lastly, we feel compelled to dissociate ourselves from the consensus on operative paragraph 3 of resolution 74/148, on "Protection of migrants". We do not agree with the reference to the activities and recommendations regarding natural disasters of the Agenda for the Protection of Cross-Border Displaced Persons in the Context of Disasters and Climate Change, and the Platform on Disaster Displacement. There is so far no reliable and universally recognized scientific evidence that enables us to talk about a direct dependence between climate change and the movements of people or of environmental issues as dominant factors in forcing such movement. In addition, the activity of the Platform on Disaster Displacement does not have the support of every country, and its conclusions have not been endorsed by the specialized platform of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. We have already expressed our position regarding this language during the adoption of the Global Compact on Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, and we justifiably assumed that repeating it would be unnecessary. However, for some reason some delegations, whether mistakenly or in bad faith, have interpreted the absence of a repetition of our statement on this subject in the Third Committee as agreement

with the paragraph and recognition of the consensus on the language. We believe this repetition of it will clarify our true position for those delegations.

Mr. Skoknic Tapia (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): Chile is not a participant in the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, which is why its content does not apply to us in any way. Chile therefore dissociates itself from all references to the Global Compact in resolution 74/148, on “Protection of migrants”.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (b) of agenda item 70?

It was so decided.

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

Report of the Third Committee (A/74/399/Add.3)

The President: The Assembly has before it five draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 47 of its report.

Before proceeding further, I should like to inform members that action on draft resolution IV, entitled “Situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities 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 IV as soon as the report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications is available.

I now give the floor to delegations wishing to deliver explanations of vote or position before voting or adoption.

Mr. Kuzmin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We are now about to vote on so-called country-specific draft resolutions, whose defining feature is an egregious politicization that has nothing to do with the protection of human rights. There is basically no dialogue at all on this group of resolutions in the Third Committee, and the confrontation keeps building every year. We have not just come to a halt, we are sliding backwards. We get the feeling that the authors of these resolutions are purposely trying to undermine constructive, mutually respectful cooperation on a broad range of issues regarding the agenda on the

protection of human rights, and we do not accept that kind of approach on principle.

We will vote against the draft resolutions on the human rights situations in Iran, Myanmar and Syria, and we dissociate ourselves from the consensus on the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. The draft resolution on Crimea deserves separate comment. I will not repeat my statement in the Third Committee but simply touch on the main points.

In 2014 the people of Crimea freely and consciously realized their right to self-determination. Today Crimea is part of the territory of the Russian Federation and fully integrated into Russia, politically, legally and economically. The Russian Federation guarantees the protection of human rights and freedoms throughout its territory, including Crimea. No one is firing on residential neighbourhoods in Crimea with large-calibre weapons and mortars or burning people alive, as happened in Odessa on 2 May. No one is killing journalists or holding neo-Nazi marches or forbidding people to speak their native language. Life in Crimea is calm and peaceful, and anyone who wants to can see that for themselves. We welcome them to the peninsula and to Russia. Incidentally, in addition to air, sea and road links, a passenger railway link will soon be opening across the Crimean bridge.

Do not believe the militaristic rhetoric we hear from various representatives of Ukraine or the horror stories in the draft resolution. Friendliness and understanding are what are desperately needed now for a dialogue with the good people of Ukraine who have become victims of a cynical geopolitical experiment. A vote for this draft resolution is a vote against the Russian Federation and against the interests of the Ukrainians, Russians, Crimean Tatars and members of other nationalities living in Crimea. It is a vote against the interests of Ukraine itself. I would therefore like to thank all 126 States that refused to vote in favour of this odious draft resolution in the Third Committee.

Mr. Kim Song (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea): My delegation totally rejects the draft resolution entitled “Situation of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea”, sponsored by the European Union. It has nothing to do with the genuine promotion and protection of human rights and is an impure product of a political plot by hostile forces that seek to tarnish the identity and image of the Democratic People’s

Republic of Korea and overthrow its social system. As we have already made clear on several occasions, the entire contents of the draft resolution are nothing but completely false and fabricated sophism. The human rights issues mentioned in the draft resolution have never existed and could not be allowed to exist in my country, where the dignity and independent rights of human beings are fully recognized.

The reality is clearly that hostile forces obsessed with inveterate hatred against us are becoming more hell-bent on human rights rhetoric against our country and seeking to destroy our social system. Even if hostile forces may criticize so-called human rights issues, they cannot conceal the truth about the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, where all people are provided with appropriate rights as masters of their State and society, nor can they justify the perverse human rights record of their own despicable entities.

The United Nations should discern the sinister political motivation behind the so-called human rights racket and should no longer allow any infringement upon sovereignty or misuse of the good name of the United Nations.

The European Union, the main sponsor of the draft resolution against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, should reflect on and correct its own serious human rights situations, including such crimes against humanity as Islamophobia, xenophobia, mistreatment of minorities, racial discrimination and the refugee crisis, which are widespread throughout its own territories, and should bring criminals to justice rather than inquiring into non-existent human rights issues in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea will actively contribute to the dialogue on cooperation for the promotion and protection of human rights, but we will respond strongly to such provocative or hostile acts as the adoption of human rights resolutions against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea that aim to overthrow our social system.

My delegation condemns in the strongest terms the adoption of the draft resolution, which is a typical manifestation of hostile intent against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea that infringes upon the sovereignty and dignity of our State and represents a grave political provocation. As such, we consider that there is no need or justification to put it to the vote.

In conclusion, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea opposes and rejects all country-specific human rights resolutions — against the Russian Federation, the Islamic Republic of Iran or the Syrian Arab Republic — based on our principled position against politicization, selectivity and double standards relating to human rights.

Mr. Poveda Brito (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): With regard to the draft resolutions under agenda item 70(c), the Bolivian Republic of Venezuela reaffirms its principled position on the adoption of resolutions and special procedures or any other mechanism relating to the human rights situation in a specific country, noting that we reject the selective approach to addressing such topics based on political motivations as a violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

Cooperation and dialogue are the appropriate tools for the effective promotion and protection of human rights. In that regard, we support the repeated calls by the Non-Aligned Movement in this matter, with the understanding that human rights issues must be dealt with under the principles of universality, non-selectivity and non-politicization. Based on this principled position, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela will dissociate itself from any consensus that may be reached on the draft resolution on the human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Mr. Hassani Nejad Pirkouhi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am delivering this statement in relation to draft resolution II as contained in document A/74/399/Add.3, on the so-called "Situation of human rights in Islamic Republic of Iran".

At the outset, I would like to welcome the decision by Canada, though heavily guarded and conditional, to revisit its position on the inhumane apartheid policy pursued by Israel in Palestine. We hope it is not temporary and will lead to other prudent decisions, such as abandoning that politicized, futile draft resolution.

No one should take that recurring show of dishonesty seriously. Iranians do not. After all, why should such a draft resolution be taken seriously when Israel, which has committed all core international crimes, has constantly been among its main advocates? After all, why should anyone take human rights advice from the main sponsors of the draft resolution, when they have been the long-standing proponents of racism, colonialism,

foreign occupation, interventionism, preventive wars and the uprooting of indigenous peoples?

Those who have a consistent historical record of betraying their promises and violating values such as justice, the rule of law and democracy cannot reserve for themselves the right to intervene and the privilege to interpret human rights and international law. Assuming that those few self-appointed guardians of global virtues genuinely care about human rights in Iran is both farcical and insulting. History attests to their truly destructive behavioural pattern, which continues to this very day.

Even today, the leading sponsors of the draft resolution are the worst adversaries of human rights and democratic values in Iran and beyond. Even today, my people are struggling to protect their basic human rights against the genocidal economic war waged by the United States. The economic terrorism that the United States has unleashed against Iranians, especially the most vulnerable among them, deliberately and indiscriminately violates their basic human rights, including the right to food, the right to education, the right to health and the right to life.

Those acts of economic terrorism purposefully and ruthlessly deprive children with cancer and genetic diseases, as well as patients with diabetes, multiple sclerosis, asthma, polycythemia and other patients with life-threatening or rare conditions, of their basic rights to health and life.

Meanwhile, the imposition by the United States of its national laws on sovereign States is both the manifestation of tyranny at the international level and an open assault on the principle of equality among United Nations Member States. Let us not forget that it is in the United States where a white man's gun is more protected than a black child's life.

Therefore nothing could appear more absurd than observing the outcry for human rights in Iran by Governments that have never cared about them in the first place – Governments that have actively assaulted the human rights of the same people for whom they hypocritically claim to be concerned.

In orchestrating their Iranophobic campaign, nothing is off-limits. They shamelessly collude with renowned terrorists, cults and separatists to incite violence and destruction. They openly abuse all available platforms to provoke hate and misinformation.

Therefore, there is no reason for them to exclude the United Nations and its human rights machinery in order to exert even more pressure on Iran and Iranians.

Such behaviour is conducted routinely against anyone who dares to challenge their short-sighted political objectives, which are essentially based on arrogance, hypocrisy and mind-boggling lies. The issue of human rights is just another chapter in the blueprint of what is sinisterly dubbed “the maximum pressure policy” against Iranians —a code name for regime-change. While the Islamic Republic of Iran unambiguously believes in multilateralism and international law, it regards the draft resolution as harmful to the prospects for progress on the protection and promotion of human rights and as merely a reflection of the political agenda of a few States who consistently disrespect international law and advocate unilateralism and coercion. Please do not give them another chance to weaponize human rights against Iranians.

Mr. Yelchenko (Ukraine): I have the honour to thank all Member States that supported the draft resolution entitled “Situation of human rights in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, Ukraine” during the vote in the Third Committee on 14 November. We are grateful to all delegations that stood firm in the face of unprecedented direct threats emanated from one Member State during the consideration of the draft resolution in the Committee.

The General Assembly has considered this resolution for the fourth year in a row with a view to condemning all attempts to legitimize or normalize the attempted annexation of Crimea, which is an illegal act under international law and the root cause of massive human rights abuses and violations. The purpose of the draft resolution to be adopted today is to put an end to the ongoing human rights violations perpetrated by the Russian Federation in temporarily occupied Crimea.

In addition, the draft resolution highlights the obligations and legal responsibilities of the occupying Power for serious intentional breaches of applicable human rights treaties and international humanitarian law. The occupation of Crimea and its negative impact on human rights is an issue that is on the agenda of many international organizations and is being considered by international courts and tribunals. The General Assembly has directly examined it under three different agenda items.

By voting in favour of the draft resolution, the international community will further strengthen its non-recognition of any attempt to redraw borders by military force in violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, including respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States. Ukraine strongly denies all the Russian delegation's mantras with reference to occupied Crimea as exemplified once again by the cynical statement of the Russian representative moments ago. Crimea is and will remain an integral part of Ukraine.

The draft resolution to be adopted today is an important instrument for putting an end to all human rights violations and abuses against residents of Crimea and contributing to the inevitable deoccupation of the Ukrainian peninsula. The vote of members will help to achieve those goals and protect our shared values as enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

Mr. Xing Jisheng (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): It is the consistent position of China to tackle differences in the area of human rights on the basis of equality and mutual respect and through constructive dialogue and cooperation. We oppose the politicization of human rights or using the issue of human rights to exert pressure on other countries and we also oppose country-specific resolutions on human rights. Therefore, we disassociate ourselves from the consensus on the draft resolution on the human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and will vote against all the other country-specific human rights resolutions.

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

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 74/166).

The President: Draft resolution II 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, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus,

Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu, Yemen

Against:

Afghanistan, Armenia, Belarus, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Serbia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia

Draft resolution II was adopted by 81 votes to 30, with 70 abstentions (resolution 74/167).

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Plurinational State of Bolivia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled “Situation of human rights in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, Ukraine”. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu

Against:

Armenia, Belarus, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, Guinea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Philippines, Russian Federation, Serbia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Haiti, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the

Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Draft resolution III was adopted by 65 votes to 23, with 83 abstentions (resolution 74/168).

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Plurinational State of Bolivia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen

Against:

Algeria, Belarus, Burundi, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mauritania, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey,

Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Armenia, Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritius, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Tajikistan, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zambia

Draft resolution V was adopted by 106 votes to 15, with 57 abstentions (resolution 74/169).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Nigeria informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

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

Mrs. Kocyigit Grba (Turkey): I take the floor to provide an explanation of our vote on resolution 74/169. The crisis in Syria began when the democratic aspirations and legitimate demands of Syrians were crushed by force. Innocent civilians have been killed with chemical weapons and barrel bombs or have been subjected to arbitrary detention, torture, starvation and abduction. In the face of those grave violations, the General Assembly has adopted this annual resolution through the Third Committee to advocate for the protection of human rights in Syria and to combat impunity. Turkey has supported those efforts from the very first resolution adopted in 2011 (resolution 66/176). We have co-sponsored all subsequent resolutions ever since and have actively contributed to their drafting.

Needless to say, the focus of the resolution is supposed to be the widespread violations of international human rights and humanitarian law suffered by the Syrian people at the hands of Bashar Al-Assad. However, we regret that this year's drafting exercise was handled inadequately by the penholder and in a manner far from impartial, as reflected in the statement made by that delegation during the deliberations of the

Third Committee, which casts serious doubts on the competence of that delegation to continue holding the pen on this issue.

In particular, paragraph 49 on developments in the north-east of Syria deliberately distorts the facts on the ground. It is clear that such language is motivated by the political calculations of certain Member States, whose interests are not served by the results of Turkey's limited cross-border counter-terrorism operation. That language is not intended to inform us about the suffering of Syrian people but instead tells us why certain Member States are almost always remembered by their frequent use of double standards and hypocrisy.

In contrast to those countries, we cannot condone lies or the selective reflection of events. Therefore, for the first time in nine years, Turkey has regrettably been forced to vote against the adoption of the resolution, although I would like to underline that, except for one specific paragraph, we subscribe to its core message.

With regard to paragraph 49, I should like to the record straight. The violence in north-eastern Syria has been inflicted by the Kurdish People's Protection Units (YPG), the Syrian offshoot of the terrorist organization the Kurdish Workers Party (PKK), and we are not surprised to see that those most concerned with the so-called recent escalation of violence in north-eastern Syria are those who also supported that terrorist organization, both politically and materially.

Yet, PKK/YPG attempted to establish its own totalitarian state in north-eastern Syria in contravention of the territorial integrity and unity of Syria. It is widely documented that they oppressed the local populations who opposed their rule, in particular the Arabs and Kurds, and forcibly displaced them from the areas under their control. That is the real demographic change that has already occurred in the region, which resolution 74/169 conveniently disregards.

That group went as far as releasing Da'esh terrorists to carry out terror acts in Turkey or north-western Syria, yet there is no mention of those outrageous actions in resolution 74/169. Turkey, on the other hand, as the only country that has engaged in hand-to-hand combat against Da'esh, has recaptured hundreds of Da'esh combatants that were released from prisons by YPG. To claim that Turkey's operation eroded the fight against Da'esh is disingenuous to say the least, particularly given the fact that the leader of that terrorist group was recently eliminated.

The text is also misleading in its interpretation of the humanitarian situation. As one of the leading donors in the humanitarian field, Turkey ensures every month the safe passage of lifeline convoys to millions of Syrians through the United Nations cross-border mechanism. We provide protection to about 9 million Syrians in both Turkey and Syria. Our humanitarian support to north-eastern Syria continues unabated today.

More than 370,000 Syrians have voluntarily returned to their homes in areas we have liberated from terrorism in the north-west. We are working towards the same objective in the north-east and are continuing to alleviate the suffering of the population, in close co-operation with the United Nations and humanitarian organizations. We should also not forget that some European countries that are giving lectures on those issues have continued to suspend humanitarian aid to Syrians under false pretexts.

Finally, on the political track, as the guarantor of the opposition, Turkey played a pivotal role in the launch of the Constitutional Committee, which met in Geneva following the launch of Operation Peace Spring. Therefore, the political process, far from being undermined as claimed in the text, is advancing thanks to our ceaseless efforts to that end. On the other hand, it is those who have supported the PKK/YPG and have attempted to lecture us in our fight against terror that bear primary responsibility and have “seriously undermined the stability and security of the whole region”.

Sensitive issues require careful, transparent and fair consideration, and, above all, impartiality and objectivity. Unfortunately, the process of deliberations on resolution 74/169 was driven by the biased and revanchist agendas and obsessions of some countries, which is why our calls during the deliberations to include mention in the resolution of vital issues such as the repatriation of Da'esh fighters, the ethnic cleansing and demographic engineering pursued by PKK/YPG and the European Union's pledges regarding Syrian refugees fell on deaf ears.

That is not surprising given that shame is in retreat in some parts of the world, but Turkey will never accept outrageous allegations and we will never be intimidated by hypocrisy. We will continue our efforts to address the suffering of the Syrian people, protect their human rights and work towards the transformation of Syria into a democratic, secular and stable country.

Mr. Cepero Aguilar (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation is making this statement in order to disassociate itself from the consensus on resolution 74/166, entitled “Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea”, pursuant to our position against the imposition of selective and politically motivated resolutions and mandates. We believe that only genuine international corporation based on the principles of objectivity, impartiality and non-selectivity constitutes the ideal way effectively to promote and protect the human rights of all.

We hope that in this case, as in many others, an opportunity will be given for the universal periodic review mechanism to foster debate free from politicization or confrontation and to encourage respectful cooperation with the country concerned.

Resolution 74/166 continues to advocate the path of sanctions and the dangerous and counterproductive involvement of the Security Council in matters outside its jurisdiction. Cuba cannot therefore join consensus on a resolution that seeks to expand punitive Security Council sanctions in situations that do not represent a threat to international peace and security. We will not be complicit in attempts to deny the people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea their right to peace, self-determination and development.

We wish to indicate that our opposition to that selective and politicized mandate is not based on value judgments on other pending matters mentioned in the twenty-fourth preambular paragraph, which calls for a fair and honourable solution agreeable to all parties concerned.

Mr. Hassani Nejad Pirkouhi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation would like to disassociate itself from resolution 74/166. In our view, the counterproductive and confrontational approach of the resolution contravenes the principles of universality, non-selectivity and objectivity in addressing human rights issues.

Mrs. Ndayishimiye (Burundi) (*spoke in French*): I have the honour of making this statement after the voting on resolutions 74/166, 74/167, 74/168 and 74/169, regarding which my delegation would like to recall that it rejects as a matter of principle all country-specific resolutions. Burundi firmly believes that dialogue, cooperation and consensual mechanisms constitute the appropriate tools for considering human rights issues. Unfortunately, politically motivated selectivity

and double standards have diverted the Human Rights Council from the objectives assigned to it at the time of its establishment by the General Assembly. The delegation of Burundi therefore voted against those resolutions.

The President: Before I call on speakers in exercise of the right of reply, I would like to remind members that statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first statement and five minutes for the second and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Al Khalil (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): I am exercising the right of reply following the statement made by the representative Turkey.

The representative of Turkey mentioned her country's concern about the Syrian people and for protecting them and preserving their rights. That is null and void. Turkey has carried out aggression against the protected population in the northern part of Syria under the pretext of fighting terrorism. This is nothing but a reflection of the policy of a State that clearly wishes to perpetrate massacres while hiding behind humanitarian slogans. Despite international condemnation, Turkey persists in its blatant aggression against Syria and continues to sow chaos and death, in stark contravention of international laws and norms. These actions and policies publicly unveil Turkey's true intentions behind its aggressive policies.

The Syrian Arab Republic has confronted the aggression of Turkey in many areas by fighting and defeating its proxies and terrorists. We stress that we will address the flagrant Turkish aggression in all its forms and in all parts of Syria using all legitimate ways and means. We emphasize that counter-terrorism in Syria is ongoing and that nothing — especially such statements by the representative of Turkey or her likes — will stop it. The protection of the Syrian people is exclusively the mission of the Syrian Arab Army and the Syrian State.

It would appear that the representative of Turkey is harbouring illusions, especially when she talks about the behaviour of her country towards the crisis in Syria. Turkey opened its borders to more than 70,000 terrorists who have been perpetrating killings and terrorist acts in Syria for more than eight years now.

Mrs. Kocyigit Grba (Turkey): I will be very brief. I would like to underline that I do not consider the

Syrian representative to be my legitimate counterpart. He is the representative of a regime that has the blood of innocent Syrians on its hands and I will therefore not honour him with a response.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic on a point of order.

Mr. Al Khalil (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): Mr. President, I request that you compel the representative of Turkey to abide by the rules and procedures, and to address my country as the Syrian Arab Republic. We are under the dome of the General Assembly. We must speak first and foremost in accordance with the established rules and procedures.

The President: The General Assembly has concluded this stage of its consideration of sub-item (c) of agenda item 70.

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

Report of the Third Committee (A/74/399/Add.4)

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

It was so decided (decision 74/518).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (d) of agenda item 70?

It was so decided.

The President: The General Assembly has concluded this stage of his consideration of sub-item (d) of agenda item 70.

Agenda item 106

Crime prevention and criminal justice

Report of the Third Committee (A/74/400)

The President: The General Assembly has before it eight draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 29 of its report. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to VIII, one by one.

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "Integrating sport into youth crime prevention and criminal justice strategies". The Third Committee

adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 74/170).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled “Follow-up to the Thirteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and preparations for the Fourteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 74/171).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled “Education for Justice and the rule of law in the context of sustainable development”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 74/172).

The President: Draft resolution IV is entitled “Promoting technical assistance and capacity-building to strengthen national measures and international cooperation to combat cybercrime, including information-sharing”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 74/173).

The President: Draft resolution V is entitled “Countering child sexual exploitation and sexual abuse online”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 74/174).

The President: Draft resolution VI is entitled “Technical assistance provided by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime related to counter-terrorism”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 74/175).

The President: Draft resolution VII is entitled “Improving the coordination of efforts against trafficking in persons”, as orally revised by the Rapporteur. The Third Committee adopted it without

a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise, taking into account the oral revision?

Draft resolution VII, as orally revised, was adopted (resolution 74/176).

The President: Draft resolution VIII is entitled “Strengthening the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme, in particular its technical cooperation capacity”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution VIII was adopted (resolution 74/177).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 106?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 107

Countering the use of information and communications technologies for criminal purposes

Report of the Third Committee (A/74/401)

The President: I should like to inform members that action on the draft resolution contained in the report of the Third 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 the draft resolution as soon as the report of the Fifth Committee on its programme budget implications is available.

The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 107.

Agenda item 108

International drug control

Report of the Third Committee (A/74/402)

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 entitled “International cooperation to address and counter the world drug problem”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 74/178).

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 121

Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

Report of the Third Committee (A/74/404)

The President: The General Assembly has before it a draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 8 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft decision entitled “Draft programme of work of the Third Committee for the seventy-fifth session of the General Assembly”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 74/519).

The President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 121.

Agenda item 136

Programme planning

Report of the Third Committee (A/74/403)

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

It was so decided (decision 74/520).

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 136.

On behalf of the General Assembly, I would like to thank Mr. Christian Braun, Permanent Representative of Luxembourg to the United Nations and Chair of the Third Committee, the members of the bureau and delegates for a job well done.

The General Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of the reports of the Third Committee before it at this meeting.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.