



General Assembly

Sixty-second session

Official Records

Distr.: General
14 December 2007

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 49th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 20 November 2007, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Wolfe (Jamaica)

Contents

Agenda item 42: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 63: Advancement of women (*continued*)

(a) Advancement of women (*continued*)

Agenda item 66: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

Agenda item 68: Elimination of racism and racial discrimination (*continued*)

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

Agenda item 69: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

Agenda item 70: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

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

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

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.



The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

Agenda item 42: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (continued) (A/C.3/62/L.82)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.82: Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa

1. **Mr. Jesus** (Angola), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, requested that action on the draft resolution should be deferred to allow delegations more time to consider the revised text.

2. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 63: Advancement of women (continued)

(a) Advancement of women (continued)
(A/C.3/62/L.20/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.20/Rev.1: Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women

3. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the programme-budget implications would not be available until the following day. He suggested that the Committee should therefore defer action on the draft resolution.

4. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 66: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (continued)

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (continued) (A/C.3/62/L.24/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.24/Rev.1: Rights of the child

5. **Ms. Carvalho** (Portugal) requested that action on the draft resolution should be deferred, as negotiations were still under way.

6. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 68: Elimination of racism and racial discrimination (continued)

(b) Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action (continued) (A/C.3/62/L.65 and L.66)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.65: From rhetoric to reality: a global call for concrete action against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and the comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action

7. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the draft resolution would give rise to programme-budget implications that would not be available until the following day. He suggested that action on the draft resolution should therefore be deferred.

8. *It was so decided.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.66: Report of the Human Rights Council on the preparations for the Durban Review Conference

9. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee), outlining the programme-budget implications, recalled that in the document entitled "Revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its resumed second session, its third session and its third special session in 2006" (A/61/530/Add.1), the Secretary-General had informed the Assembly that the requirements that would arise to support the preparatory process for the Review Conference would be absorbed in the provisions for the 2006-2007 biennium, while the estimated requirements for the following biennium would be considered in the context of that biennium's proposed programme budget. The Secretary-General would, in accordance with established practice, revert on the financial implications, if any, of the Review Conference, when the modalities of the Conference had been finalized.

10. **Mr. Jesus** (Angola), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, urged Member States to approve the draft resolution by consensus.

11. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Cuba, Dominica, Indonesia, Jamaica, Lebanon and Norway had joined the sponsors.

12. **Mr. Hagen** (United States of America) requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution, which called for an inappropriate use of limited United Nations resources. Particularly objectionable was the suggestion in the report of the Preparatory Committee (A/62/375) that the Secretary-General should find resources for funding numerous duplicative and costly preparatory meetings, including at the regional level,

with the implication that such funding should come from the regular budget. The United States had objections to the overall direction and procedures leading up to the Review Conference. The process by which the draft resolution had been brought before the Committee was also troubling. There had been no open discussions on its contents or on the 44-page report that it categorically endorsed.

13. **Ms. Eilon Shahar** (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that Israel, as a signatory to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, was committed to ensuring the equality of each individual without prejudice to their race, gender, ethnicity or religion. However, the Durban Conference of 2001 had been anything but a meeting to eliminate racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. Some delegations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) had manipulated the occasion to demonstrate their deep-seated prejudice and hatred for one Member State and one particular people, failing to show it the same respect, tolerance, fairness and equal treatment they demanded for themselves. Along with the United States, Israel had thus been compelled to withdraw from the Conference. Her delegation would continue to vote against resolutions that ignored the fact that the Conference had been a fiasco and that heralded it as a worthy display of international resolve to combat hatred and promote tolerance. Her delegation would vote against the draft resolution, in the hope that the mistakes of Durban would be rectified with time and that an honest consensus could be reached in which support for the elimination of racism and intolerance was wholehearted and without exception.

14. *At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.66.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo,

Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Australia, Cambodia, Canada, Fiji.

15. *The draft resolution was adopted by 169 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.*

Agenda item 69: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*) (A/C.3/62/L.63)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.63: The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination

16. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

17. **Mr. Attiya** (Egypt) said that the large number of sponsors reflected the importance the international community attached to helping the Palestinian people to break free from occupation and realize their inalienable and long-overdue right to self-determination. He hoped that the draft resolution would translate into a larger United Nations engagement in the Middle East peace process, in the context of the Quartet and confidence-building efforts, with a view to attaining a genuinely negotiated settlement towards a just, comprehensive and lasting peace. An unequivocal show of solidarity at a time of need would be a first step towards liberating all peoples from each and every form of foreign control. Adoption of the draft resolution would also contribute to the establishment by the Palestinian people of an independent, sovereign and viable State on their own land, alongside Israel, with East Jerusalem as its capital.

18. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) noted that Andorra, Bolivia, Dominica, Ethiopia, Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Timor-Leste had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

19. **Ms. Eilon Shahar** (Israel), requesting a recorded vote, said that her delegation recognized the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, but expected the Palestinians in turn to respect Israel's right to peace and security. Israel accepted the two-State vision and had been actively promoting it for some time, as evidenced by a number of international agreements to which it was a party. The inability of the Palestinian people to achieve statehood was thus not due to any lack of will on Israel's part, but to the Palestinians' failure to recognize that Israeli security was in their own interests, as well as being a prerequisite for Palestinian statehood. The road map and other international agreements were unequivocal in determining that both Israel and Palestine had rights as well as responsibilities.

20. However, draft resolutions such as the one before the Committee only affirmed Palestinian rights without demanding fulfilment of their responsibilities, which included denouncing terrorism and ending the violence. The world could not afford another failed State and Israel would not tolerate a State that allowed terrorism on its border. Stagnation and inaction were not in Israel's interest, which was why her Government continued to meet with the Palestinian leadership.

Currently, it was preparing for a dialogue in Annapolis, which would enable the culmination of the two-State vision. Israel would vote against the draft resolution.

21. **Mr. Hagen** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said the United States had worked continuously to support the socio-economic development and legitimate political aspirations of the Palestinian people. Its assistance to Palestinians compared favourably with its aid to other parts of the world and it was committed to a two-State solution. His delegation could not, however, support the draft resolution since it reflected an outdated approach conceived when the Palestinian people believed that the solution to their problems lay in the United Nations. There was indeed a role for the Organization, but that lay in supporting the two parties to work with each other, within the context of the Quartet. One-sided resolutions did nothing to resolve the issue; they only undermined the credibility of the United Nations, which must be perceived by both sides as an honest broker in the conflict.

22. **Ms. Nassau** (Australia) said that, although her delegation supported a peaceful negotiated settlement based on a two-State solution, it would abstain in the voting, since the text contained unbalanced language that would do nothing to help resolve the conflict.

23. *At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.63.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan,

Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Australia, Cameroon, Canada, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji.

24. *The draft resolution was adopted by 172 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.*

25. **Ms. Melon** (Argentina) said that, without prejudice to her country's recognition of the Palestinian people's right to build an independent and viable State, the exercise of the right to self-determination required the existence of an active subject in the form of a people under alien subjugation, domination and exploitation, as established in paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Therefore, if there was no such subject, there was no right to self-determination. That right should also be interpreted in accordance with the purposes and principles set out in the Charter of the United Nations,

resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2625 (XXV), and other relevant United Nations resolutions.

26. As for the question of the Malvinas Islands, the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee on Decolonization referred to the particular situation arising from that question. In particular, General Assembly resolution 2065 (XX) et seq. and all the decisions of the Special Committee on Decolonization recognized the existence of a dispute between the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom as the sole parties concerning sovereignty, establishing that the way to resolve it was through the resumption of bilateral negotiations in order to find a just, peaceful and definitive solution, taking into account the interests of the population of the Islands; the right to self-determination was not, therefore, applicable to that question.

27. **Ms. Tavares** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and associated process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; and, in addition, Iceland and Moldova, reiterated the European Union's firm commitment to enabling the Palestinian people to fulfil their right to self-determination. That would include the possibility of establishing a sovereign State in the framework of a two-State solution, as set forth in the Quartet's road map and agreed upon by both parties, resulting in a viable, contiguous, sovereign and independent Palestinian State existing side by side in peace with Israel living within recognized and secure borders. Such a solution constituted the best possible guarantee for the security of Israel and its acceptance as an integrated partner in the region.

28. The European Union, for its part, stood ready to contribute within the Quartet to preparations for the upcoming meeting in Annapolis and would continue to support the parties in their ongoing negotiations and in the subsequent implementation period. Progress in negotiations should go hand in hand with enhanced cooperation on the ground and the strengthening of Palestinian institutions, which would help improve the daily life of the Palestinian people. The European Union urged the parties to take additional steps towards meeting previous commitments, including under the road map and the Agreement on Movement and Access.

29. **Mr. Bowman** (Canada) reiterated his delegation's strongest possible support for the Palestinian people and their right to self-determination as part of the negotiated, two-State settlement laid out in the road map, endorsed by the Security Council, which Canada fully supported. He acknowledged ongoing efforts towards establishing a peaceful settlement and welcomed the current bilateral dialogue. However, since the resolution did not adequately address the responsibilities of both parties to the conflict, Canada could not fully support it and had chosen to abstain.

30. **Ms. Abdelhady-Nasser** (Observer for Palestine) said that the outcome of the vote reaffirmed the international community's unwavering support for the Palestinian people and for their right to self-determination, the fulfilment of which was essential to the enjoyment of all other basic human rights.

31. Expressing regret that it had not been possible to adopt the draft resolution by consensus, she said it was a matter of deep concern that Israel continued to vote against a resolution that simply reaffirmed basic principles of international law and called for the exercise, by the Palestinian people, of the right to self-determination. Voting against that right was contradictory to Israel's professed position in favour of a real peace settlement based on the existence of two States, and mutual recognition of that right was a prerequisite for achieving a just and lasting peace. Moreover, Palestinians as well as Israelis had a right to live in peace and security. To truly recognize a people's right to self-determination was to recognize that their continued subjugation under occupation was neither legal nor tenable. That should be obvious to all States that supported peace, even those that had voted against the draft resolution or abstained. It should also be obvious to Israel that its ongoing occupation did not ensure its security, but simply perpetuated instability and insecurity for both peoples and throughout the region.

32. The achievement of peace in the Middle East depended on a solution that guaranteed the basic and national rights of both peoples. Recognition of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination was the first step in that direction. For decades, the Palestinian people had struggled for that right to be realized. International support during those years had been instrumental in sustaining their resilience and their hope that one day there would be an independent State of Palestine, with East Jerusalem as its capital. Her

delegation's ultimate hope was that it would not need to consider such a draft resolution the following year. If it did, she hoped that the draft would at least be adopted unanimously.

Agenda item 70: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/62/L.35 and L.42)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.35: Combating defamation of religions

33. **The Chairman** informed the Committee that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

34. **Mr. Hayee** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), read out a number of oral revisions to the draft resolution. In the sixth preambular paragraph, the words "follow-up to" should be replaced by "implementation of"; in the seventh preambular paragraph, ", beliefs" should be inserted after "religions"; in the eighth preambular paragraph, the words "against human beings" should be deleted and the words "an affront to human dignity" replaced by "a violation of human rights"; in the ninth preambular paragraph, the phrase "different cultures and religions" should be replaced by "people belonging to different cultures, religions and beliefs"; in the tenth preambular paragraph, the words "and beliefs" should be inserted after "religions" and the phrase "the common values shared by all humankind" replaced by "common values"; in the eleventh preambular paragraph, the words "their national and" should be inserted before "international efforts" and the phrase "cultures and religions" replaced by "cultures, religions and beliefs"; in the twelfth preambular paragraph, the words "cultural and religious" should be deleted; the entire thirteenth preambular paragraph should be replaced by the sixteenth preambular paragraph, minus the words "and noting that the increased intellectual and media discourse is among the factors exacerbating such discrimination"; in the fourteenth preambular paragraph, the phrase "in addition to the negative projection of Islam in the media and the introduction and enforcement of laws that specifically discriminate against and target Muslims, particularly against Muslim minorities

following the events of 11 September 2001,” should be inserted after “in many parts of the world”; and in the fifteenth preambular paragraph, the phrase “is among the causes of” should be replaced by “could lead to” and the words “leads to” deleted.

35. Regarding the operative part, he said that, in paragraph 2, the words “some regions of” should be deleted; in paragraph 4, the word “also” should be deleted and the phrase “and incitement to religious hatred” inserted after “defamation of religions”; in paragraph 5, the word “further” should be replaced by “also”; in paragraph 7, the phrase “and incitement to religious hatred” should be inserted after “defamation of religions” and the words “members of” before “target groups”; in paragraph 9, the phrase “and incitement to religious hatred, against” should be inserted before “Islam and Muslims in particular”; in paragraph 10, the phrase “the right to freedom of expression, which should be exercised with responsibility” should be replaced by “the right to hold opinion without interference, and the freedom of expression, and that the exercise of these rights carries with it special duties and responsibilities” and the word “are” inserted twice, once before “provided by law” and once before “necessary”; in paragraph 11, the word “resolute” should be deleted and the phrase “dissemination of racist and xenophobic ideas and material aimed at any religion or its followers” replaced by “advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred”; in paragraph 12, the phrase “respect for all religions and their value systems” should be replaced by “respect for all religions and beliefs and the understanding of their value systems”; in paragraph 13, the phrase “respect different religions and beliefs” should be replaced by “respect people regardless of their different religions and beliefs”; in paragraph 14, the phrase “and incitement to religious hatred” should be inserted after “defamation of religions”; in paragraph 16, the word “initiate” should be replaced by “promote”, the phrase “religious diversity” should be replaced by “religious diversity and belief” and the phrase “support and promote” replaced by “support and participate in”; and, in paragraph 17, the words “members of” should be inserted before “any community”.

36. Lastly, he announced that the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela wished to join the list of sponsors.

37. **Mr. Hagen** (United States of America) requested a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.35, as orally revised.

38. **Mr. Malhotra** (India), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation firmly opposed the defamation or negative stereotyping of any religion, but had a number of concerns with the draft resolution, in particular its excessive focus on one religion. Most countries had communities belonging to many religions. The international community should be concerned about the defamation and negative stereotyping of any of them. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote.

39. **Mr. Hagen** (United States of America) said that his country had been founded on the principle of freedom of religion. A country must not only recognize, but also protect, its citizens’ right to choose a religion, change religion and worship freely. Consequently, countries must not discriminate against individuals who chose a particular religion or chose to practise no religion at all. Neither, however, must they close their eyes to attacks against individuals because of their religion. Countries must have a legal framework in place so as to allow individuals the freedom of worship without fear of persecution.

40. His delegation agreed with many of the general tenets in the draft resolution but felt that it was incomplete insofar as it emphasized one religion in particular. More inclusive language would have better furthered the objective of promoting religious freedom.

41. **Ms. Tavares** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process countries Montenegro and Serbia; and, in addition, Georgia and Moldova, said that the European Union firmly believed in tolerance, non-discrimination and freedom of expression, thought, religion or belief and was convinced that dialogue could help overcome gaps in perceptions, concepts and ideas. It also attached great importance to combating all forms of discrimination based on religion or belief and incitement to religious hatred. The General Assembly and the Human Rights Council should continue to address those issues, including through dialogue with the relevant special procedures. It was important to raise the alarm about the serious instances of intolerance, discrimination and acts of violence based on religion or belief,

intimidation and coercion motivated by extremism that were occurring throughout the world. A comprehensive and balanced approach was needed to combat intolerance. Religious intolerance was a global problem and not limited to certain regions or certain religions or beliefs. Followers of all religions and beliefs, as well as non-believers, could be victims of human-rights violations. Any list of victims could only be exclusive.

42. Several resolutions discussed directly in the plenary Assembly related to culture, peace and religions. Third Committee resolutions should be clearly focused on human rights and based on specific human-rights concepts and have a rights-based approach to issues at hand. The concerns set out in the draft resolution amounted to religious intolerance, the fight against which had always been a core element of the Organization's human-rights agenda and had been addressed specifically by the General Assembly for over 30 years. For the European Union, "defamation of religions" was not a valid concept in a human-rights discourse. From a human-rights perspective, members of religious or belief communities should not be viewed as parts of homogenous entities. International human-rights law protected primarily individuals in the exercise of their freedom of religion or belief, rather than the religions as such. Moreover, in most legal systems, "defamation" was a legal concept that entitled individuals or entities with legal personality to redress against slander or libel. Given that religions or beliefs did not enjoy legal personality in most States, it was difficult to see how the concept of "defamation of religions" could be used to promote human rights or to provide protection from or redress against human-rights violations.

43. The European Union had repeatedly expressed its concerns regarding the general approach, conceptual framework and terminology of the draft resolution, stressing that discrimination based on religion or belief must be addressed in all its aspects and was not confined to any one religion or belief or any one part of the world; that the protection of the rights of persons belonging to religious minorities was central to freedom of religion or belief; that all human rights must be respected and protected at an equal level; and that promoting respect for adherence to all religions or beliefs was best addressed in a comprehensive manner. The Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief herself had indicated that the use of the concept

of defamation of religion could be counterproductive, as the main focus should remain the rights and freedoms of individuals.

44. The European Union had repeatedly indicated its willingness to engage in dialogue and to work towards a balanced text and terminology acceptable to all stakeholders. In that regard, it had presented a series of proposals aimed at changing the text's focus from "Combating defamation of religions" to "Combating incitement to religious hatred", a more widely accepted concept in the field of human rights. For the text to be acceptable to the European Union, all references to "defamation of religions" would have to be suppressed. While some of the European Union's amendments had been accepted, they had not changed significantly the general approach, conceptual framework or terminology of the draft resolution. The European Union would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

45. **Mr. Llanos** (Chile) agreed that freedom of religion must be respected in a general and unrestricted manner, without discrimination against individuals or religions. However, freedom of expression, too, must be respected and guaranteed by the State. Both freedoms were fundamental human rights and could be limited only by those exceptions laid down in the law, provided such exceptions were in accordance with international legal instruments. His delegation agreed with the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief (A/62/280, para. 77) that criminalizing defamation of religions might create an atmosphere of intolerance and increase the chances of a backlash, and that accusations of defamation of religions might stifle legitimate criticism. His delegation stressed the importance of strengthening dialogue between cultures and religions in order to promote mutual knowledge and understanding and supported efforts undertaken in that regard, in particular through the Alliance of Civilizations. In the light of the foregoing, his delegation would abstain in the vote.

46. *At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.35, as orally revised.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia,

Cameroon, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen.

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Japan, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mexico, Mongolia, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Solomon Islands, United Republic of Tanzania.

47. *Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.35, as orally revised, was adopted by 95 votes to 52, with 30 abstentions.**

48. **Ms. Noorita** (Singapore) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the understanding that it applied to all religions. Singapore was a multiracial, multireligious city State. The religious, cultural and racial differences among its people must not become sources of misunderstanding and friction. Defamation of all kinds bred intolerance, stereotypes and distrust, and undermined societal harmony and cohesion.

49. Her delegation agreed that the exercise of the right to freedom of expression must not be at the expense of others. Such freedoms came with responsibility and accountability. Harmful rhetoric and demonization along racial, cultural and religious lines often led to conflict and violence and had no place in any society. Intolerance and ignorance should not be part of the way people viewed one another if mutual respect and harmony were the goal.

50. Her delegation supported efforts to combat religious defamation. It recognized the value of diversity and felt strongly that it must do what it could to combat intolerance.

51. **Mr. Ashiki** (Japan) said that discrimination based on religion was illegal in his country. His Government therefore took a great interest in the subject and appreciated the improvements made to the draft resolution since the previous year. The Government had secured freedom of expression for its citizens as an important human right. For that reason, Japan had expressed a reservation regarding article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

52. **Mr. Suárez** (Colombia) said that freedom of worship and the equality of churches and religious faiths before the law were enshrined in the Colombian Constitution. His Government firmly believed that the media could help promote greater understanding among all religions, beliefs, cultures and peoples, thereby facilitating dialogue among societies and creating an environment conducive to the exchange of human experiences.

* The delegation of Burkina Faso subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

53. Everyone had the right to freedom of expression. The exercise of that right, despite carrying with it special duties and responsibilities, could be subject only to certain restrictions, as established in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. His delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because some parts of it, in particular paragraph 10, contained restrictions on the right to freedom of expression that were not in conformity with article 19 of the Covenant.

54. **Mr. Attiya** (Egypt) expressed appreciation to all delegations that had voted in favour of the draft resolution, the adoption of which should put an end to extremist trends that discriminated on the grounds of race, religion and language. The spirit of understanding that had reigned during informal consultations was reflected in the revisions submitted by the representative of Pakistan on behalf of OIC. His delegation would have preferred that spirit to have been reflected in the vote also and hoped that it would have an impact on the vote in future years. Lastly, he stressed that the Third Committee was indeed the place to consider such resolutions since, according to the Charter and the rules of procedure, it was responsible for social, humanitarian and cultural issues, of which human-rights issues were just a part.

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)
(A/C.3/62/L.37/Rev.1)

55. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said that at their 2006 Summit Conference, the Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries had re-emphasized that the exploitation of human rights for political purposes, including selective targeting of individual countries for extraneous considerations, should be prohibited. Cuba, in its capacity as Chair of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement, encouraged all members of the Movement to adhere to those principles when casting their votes on country-specific draft resolutions.

56. **Ms. Martins** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union always tried to conduct the negotiation of country-specific draft resolutions in a way that provided a platform for dialogue with the country concerned and other interested delegations. The General Assembly would undermine its own credibility if it remained

silent on grave and widespread violations of human rights in situations where the country concerned refused to cooperate, or where an approach based on dialogue would lead to a result not reflecting the gravity of the situation. The General Assembly had the obligation to alert the international community to those violations.

57. The European Union did not view the creation of the Human Rights Council as precluding the General Assembly from adopting country-specific resolutions. The creation of the universal periodic review was intended to reinforce the protection of victims of human-rights violations and to complement, rather than replace, the existing instruments. The universal periodic review was a regular exercise with a four-year rotation span. The victims of urgent and exceptional human-rights situations could not afford to wait four years. The international community must not shy away from its responsibilities and use procedural motions to avoid debate on country resolutions. That would be tantamount to telling the victims of human-rights abuses that their suffering could not even be addressed by the General Assembly.

58. **Mr. Sangqu** (South Africa) said that one of the reasons for creating the Human Rights Council had been to have a body with credibility to address all human-rights issues, including country-specific resolutions. The Human Rights Council had been created to ensure that all human rights were addressed in a non-selective, non-politicized manner and thereby eliminate double standards. It must therefore be allowed to do its work as spelled out in its founding resolution. His delegation shared the concerns expressed by the representative of Cuba, speaking as Chair of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement.

59. **Mr. Butagira** (Uganda) said that one reason for setting up the Human Rights Council had been to encourage dialogue rather than the demonization of some countries. The Council had started on the right course, but was not being given an opportunity to work. He was not concerned at the moment about the merits of specific draft resolutions. The issue was to encourage the Council to function. All country-specific human-rights resolutions must first be submitted to the Human Rights Council, and his delegation would oppose any action that would undermine the role of the Council.

60. **Mr. Sergiwa** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his delegation rejected any draft resolution that targeted specific countries, for it would foster a policy of confrontation, complicate the effort to find appropriate solutions to human-rights issues within States and offer an opportunity to settle political accounts, exert pressure on the target States and falsify their human-rights records.

61. The best way to approach human-rights questions was to avoid double standards and take into account the different religious, cultural and social particularities of peoples, having recourse to objective dialogue based on mutual respect, impartiality and transparency. A mechanism for universal periodic review had been agreed on in the Human Rights Council to avoid the selectivity and politicization that had characterized the Commission on Human Rights.

62. It had also been agreed that work on that mechanism would commence during the first half of the coming year, and hopes were pinned on it to review the human-rights situation in all Member States. Human-rights questions in specific countries should be left to that mechanism, which represented a compromise between different tendencies and geographical blocs.

63. **Ms. Halabi** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that her delegation wished to express its total rejection of the selective exploitation of human-rights issues aimed at interfering in the internal affairs of States on the pretext of defending those rights. Such action violated the principle of the sovereign equality of all Member States under the Charter.

64. Responsible, objective dialogue and understanding based on mutual respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity, transparency, absence of selectiveness and avoidance of superior, hegemonistic attitudes in international relations represented the proper way to bring rapprochement between States and enhance cooperation for the protection of human rights.

65. Her delegation would therefore vote that no action should be taken on the draft, and, should it be put to a vote, would vote against it.

66. **Mr. Saeed** (Sudan), said that country-specific resolutions were one of the worst legacies of the Commission on Human Rights and a clear example of the double standards that had characterized its work and

ultimately led to its replacement by the Human Rights Council, which aimed to strengthen human rights through dialogue, cooperation and non-confrontation. The institution-building package recently adopted by the Committee included modalities for the universal periodic review. The fact that all States would be subject to review would help prevent selectivity and the targeting of developing countries. The States in question would participate fully in drafting the primary document on which the review would be based. Country-specific resolutions would not contribute in any way to meeting the Council's objectives or to enhancing human rights, but merely suited the political purposes of certain parties. For that reason, his delegation would continue to reject such resolutions.

67. **Ms. Medal** (Nicaragua) said that the Human Rights Council, through the universal periodic review, was the appropriate forum for considering human-rights issues. The principles of universality, impartiality, objectivity and non-selectivity must be followed in order to ensure the consistency and credibility of efforts to promote human rights.

68. **Mr. Rees** (United States of America) said that one of the basic purposes of the United Nations was to serve as a forum in which the spotlight was shone on human-rights violations and action was called to correct them. He urged members to consider the consequences of a no-action motion: it would give perpetrators of human rights violations a sense of comfort and immunity, while intensifying the loneliness and helplessness of the victims. A successful debate, on the other hand, would send the message to perpetrators that the world was watching, and to the victims, that they were not alone.

69. **Ms. Nassau** (Australia) said that the General Assembly would undermine its own credibility if it remained silent in situations of grave and widespread violations of human rights. The Human Rights Council had a mandate to address situations of human-rights violations, but action in one forum did not preclude action in others. Any country-specific resolution should be considered on its own merits. No one who truly opposed double standards could support any other approach. Preventing debate on certain country situations would create the impression that certain countries were above or beyond consideration by international human-rights bodies and would run counter to the principles of universality and interdependence of all human-rights issues.

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.37/Rev.1. Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

70. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

71. **Ms. Tavares** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union and Japan, said that El Salvador, Honduras and New Zealand had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution. The sponsors' aim was to call attention to the systematic, widespread and grave violations of human rights occurring in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, as reported by reliable sources. The Government of that country was strongly urged to respect fully all human rights and fundamental freedoms and to resolve questions of international concern relating to the abduction of foreigners. The sponsors of the draft resolution had tried to engage the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in negotiations on the text, but with no success. All efforts had been made to ensure that the text was balanced and reflected the concerns of all parties who were genuinely interested in giving voice to the people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In that regard, and pursuant to extensive consultations with interested delegations, a new preambular paragraph had been added, welcoming the inter-Korean summit held in October 2007 as well as the recent progress achieved in the Six-Party Talks, and encouraging the improvement of the human-rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, including through effective follow-up.

72. The sponsors appealed to all States genuinely interested in the promotion of human rights to enable the General Assembly to give voice to the victims of human-rights violations in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea by voting in favour of the draft resolution.

73. **Mr. Oshima** (Japan) said that the human-rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, including the abduction issue, was a matter of serious international concern. The draft resolution urged the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to work constructively with the United Nations human-rights mechanisms. The High Commissioner for Human Rights and her Office were ready to extend technical cooperation, yet thus far, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had not responded positively. It had also refused to allow the Special

Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to enter that country. The Government should cooperate with and grant full access to the Special Rapporteur, other United Nations human-rights mechanisms and humanitarian organizations. The abduction issue remained unresolved. Japan strongly called upon the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to respond to the request contained in the draft resolution by letting the abductees return to Japan and other countries of origin without delay.

74. While the Human Rights Council had started its activities, the Third Committee continued to play an important role as the sole universal body within the United Nations charged with addressing human-rights issues. The Council had not completed its institution-building and might need more time before it could fully establish its working methods. The universal periodic review would begin in 2008, but would not be able to address the grave and continuing violations of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea until that country's review was conducted two years hence. It was incumbent upon the Third Committee to extend support to those individuals and their families whose human rights were being so gravely violated. He appealed to all delegations to support the draft resolution.

75. **Mr. Pak** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his delegation categorically rejected the revised draft resolution because it was full of fabricated information and had a sinister political purpose. The ultimate goal of the United States and the European Union was to eliminate his country's ideas and system and impose their values, and the revised draft resolution constituted the culmination of politicization, selectivity and double standards.

76. The text made no mention of gross human-rights violations such as the United States invasion of Iraq, with its attendant massacre of civilians; the suppression of Korean residents in Japan; and the discrimination against minorities in Western countries. It was a clear demonstration of hypocrisy, and the sponsors had made a serious miscalculation. His country would remain steadfast in its determination to consolidate and develop its socialist system.

77. His delegation called for a vote on the revised draft resolution and hoped that all justice-loving countries would vote against it.

78. **Mr. González** (Costa Rica), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the human-rights situation in a number of countries was deplorable, and he requested the Member States concerned to respond to the international community's call for change.

79. However, such issues should be addressed by the Human Rights Council. Only a few days before, the Third Committee had adopted the institution-building package of the Council, thereby making it the most appropriate forum for such discussions. The universal periodic review would help to strengthen the Council's credibility by examining all countries on an equal basis. The Council should therefore be given the opportunity to fulfil the role for which it had been created, and he called on Member States to refrain from dealing with the subject in the same way as at previous sessions.

80. **Ms. Moreira** (Ecuador) said that although human-rights situations throughout the world were a matter of concern for the international community, they should be examined by the universal periodic review within the Human Rights Council, which had been specifically set up for that purpose.

81. Believing that the Council was the only body competent to review human-rights situations on a non-selective basis, her country would abstain from voting on country-specific draft resolutions in the Third Committee.

82. His delegation fully supported all procedures within the Human Rights Council, including thematic mandates, and believed that specific, serious human-rights violations should be examined by the Council at special sessions.

83. **Mr. Acharya** (Nepal) said that his country was extremely concerned about the abduction of foreigners, and called upon the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to return the abductees immediately. His delegation would nonetheless vote against the revised draft resolution as a matter of principle. The recently adopted institution-building package of the Human Rights Council sought to address country-specific issues, and the Third Committee should henceforth focus on developing norms and looking into thematic issues suggested by the Council.

84. **Mr. Strigelsky** (Belarus) said that Belarus opposed politicized country-specific resolutions as a

matter of principle. The consideration of the human-rights situation in a particular State fell to the Human Rights Council, which possessed the relevant independent and impartial machinery. States responsible for violating human rights must be held to account, but the extent to which they complied with their human-rights obligations should be examined in a civilized manner, with no one group of countries allowed to impose their opinion. Country-specific resolutions did not take account of alternative viewpoints on delicate human-rights issues. Belarus would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

85. **Ms. Gendi** (Egypt) said that her country consistently rejected all resolutions which were based on selectivity and double standards and which politicized the approach to human-rights issues. Egypt therefore voted against all draft resolutions on human-rights situations in specific countries owing to its profound belief that human-rights situations within States must be dealt with through a cooperative approach based on building States' capacity to respect human rights within their territory, not a confrontational one based on reviling States for their human-rights situations in accordance with the wishes of States or groups of States acting as self-appointed watchdogs of human rights throughout the world.

86. It considered that human-rights issues should be dealt with through the Human Rights Council and its periodic review mechanisms, disregarding levels of economic development and political interests. It further considered that the international assessment of human-rights conditions must take into account cultural and religious backgrounds and ethnic diversity, which were unifying factors, rather than divisive elements used to impose outside standards based on a false feeling of the superiority of the cultures and religions of the States that proposed such draft resolutions. Egypt would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

87. **Ms. Rodríguez de Ortiz** (Venezuela) said that her delegation opposed country-specific draft resolutions introduced by certain countries for political reasons. Such texts intervened in the affairs of sovereign States and were used as instruments to promote political interests. The sponsors of the draft resolution had committed human-rights violations themselves, and yet no resolutions had been submitted against them; that was a further example of double standards in the area of human rights.

88. **Mr. Zainuddin** (Malaysia) said that his delegation would vote against the revised draft resolution as it opposed country-specific texts. That position should not be interpreted as condoning gross violations of human rights, and he called on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to improve its relations.

89. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.37/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Against:

Algeria, Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Myanmar, Oman, Russian Federation, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Colombia,

Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

90. *Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.37/Rev.1 was adopted by 97 votes to 23, with 60 abstentions.*

91. **Mr. Pham Hai Anh** (Viet Nam) said that his delegation had voted against the revised draft resolution, as it did not support country-specific resolutions. Human rights should be promoted through dialogue and cooperation, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 60/251. However, he was concerned about the issue of abductions in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

92. **Mr. Singh** (India) condemned the abduction of nationals of one country by another. It shared the anguish of the affected families and the Japanese people.

93. **Mr. Suárez** (Colombia) said that his country had suffered the harmful consequences of abductions perpetrated by criminal organizations and had taken successful measures to counter them. Urging Member States to take decisive action, he expressed his solidarity with the victims of abduction throughout the world and called for the unconditional release of all abductees.

94. **Ms. Zhang Dan** (China) said that her country opposed any country-specific resolutions designed to exert pressure on developing countries, such as the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which had been taking steps to improve the situation. She hoped that solutions could be found through dialogue and cooperation.

95. **Ms. Abdelhak** (Algeria) said that her delegation had voted against the revised draft resolution because country-specific texts maintained a climate of confrontation that was detrimental to human rights.

The recently approved universal periodic review was the most appropriate mechanism to examine human rights.

96. **Mr. Anshor** (Indonesia) said that progress could be achieved only through dialogue and cooperation on the basis of mutual respect, and it was regrettable that there had been no dialogue between the sponsors of the draft resolution and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Confrontational initiatives failed to bring about significant change and, for that reason, his delegation had voted against the revised draft resolution.

97. Believing that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should step up its efforts to fulfil its obligations under various international human-rights instruments, his delegation called upon that country to pay heed to the legitimate concerns expressed by the international community, especially regarding the matter of abductions. His country was ready to extend its cooperation to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the area of human rights.

98. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba) said that the draft resolution had been a further example of selectivity and double standards. His country was opposed to country-specific texts and had accordingly voted against the revised draft resolution.

99. **Mr. Skinner-Klée** (Guatemala) said that country-specific resolutions could be useful in cases of serious human-rights situations warranting the international community's attention, and as a complement to the work of the Human Rights Council, but there should be a better balance between the General Assembly and the Council in the examination of human rights. The universal periodic review was a useful tool to examine human-rights situations in all countries, free from selectivity and politicization. Those criteria had not been met in the revised draft resolution, and his country had therefore abstained in the voting.

100. **Ms. Ribeiro Viotti** (Brazil) said that the formation of the Human Rights Council had created an enabling environment to address human rights through dialogue. However, the lack of willingness on the part of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to engage in dialogue was worrying and warranted a clear message. Her delegation had therefore voted in favour of the revised draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.