

**General Assembly**

Seventieth session

**Official Records**Distr.: General  
21 December 2015

Original: English

---

**Third Committee****Summary record of the 48th meeting**

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 17 November 2015, at 10 a.m.

*Chair:* Mr. Hilale ..... (Morocco)**Contents**Agenda item 71: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)Agenda item 72: 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*)

Agenda item 28: Social development (*continued*)

- (b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*)

Agenda item 72: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

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

Agenda item 106: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

---

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit ([srcorrections@un.org](mailto:srcorrections@un.org)), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org/>).

15-20145 (E)



Please recycle



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

**Agenda item 71: Right of peoples to self-determination**  
(continued) (A/C.3/70/L.58)

*Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.58: Use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination*

1. **Ms. Thomas Ramírez** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that the text drew attention to the contributions of the Working Group on the use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination. It was important to build on the previous work of the Special Rapporteurs in that area, especially in connection with strengthening the international legal framework for the prevention and punishment of the recruitment, use, financing and training of mercenaries. Concrete proposals on potential standards or general guidelines were needed in order to enhance the protection of human rights, particularly the right to self-determination.

2. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Angola, Brazil, Burundi, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, the Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, India, Madagascar, Myanmar, Namibia, Niger, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, South Sudan, Uganda, Uruguay and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors.

**Agenda item 72: 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.3/70/L.30, A/C.3/70/L.31, A/C.3/70/L.32, A/C.3/70/L.33, A/C.3/70/L.34, A/C.3/70/L.36, A/C.3/70/L.37 and A/C.3/70/L.38)

*Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.30: Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order*

3. **Ms. Thomas Ramírez** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution, said that its provisions built on the work of the Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order.

4. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Angola, China, Côte d'Ivoire, the Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, the Lao People's

Democratic Republic, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Myanmar, Namibia, Niger, the Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, South Sudan, Sudan, Uganda and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.31: 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*

5. **Ms. Thomas Ramírez** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution, expressed the hope that it would be adopted by consensus.

6. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that China, the Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Guinea, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Myanmar, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, the Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, South Sudan, Sudan and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.32: Human rights and unilateral coercive measures*

7. **Ms. Thomas Ramírez** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the States Member of the United Nations that were members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said that those States reiterated their opposition to unilateral coercive measures, including those used as a tool of economic and political repression, especially against developing countries. States should refrain from adopting unilateral measures that violated international law and the Charter of the United Nations and impeded social and economic development and the full enjoyment of human rights.

8. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that China, Kyrgyzstan and South Sudan had joined the sponsors.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.33: Promotion of equitable geographical distribution in the membership of the human rights treaty bodies*

9. **Ms. Thomas Ramírez** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the States Member of the United Nations that were members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said that the draft resolution aimed to achieve a more balanced representation of different political, economic and legal systems in the membership of the human rights treaty bodies.

Members must be elected based on personal merit; they must be persons of high moral standing known for their impartial judgement and competency in human rights-related issues.

10. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Brazil, China and South Sudan had joined the sponsors.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.34: Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights*

11. **Ms. Thomas Ramírez** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the States Member of the United Nations that were members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said that the draft resolution recognized the essential role of enhanced international cooperation in achieving all goals of the United Nations, including the promotion of human rights. She hoped that delegations would maintain the spirit of constructive dialogue and cooperation that had contributed to the adoption of the draft resolution in previous years.

12. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that China, Paraguay, the Russian Federation and South Sudan had joined the sponsors.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.36: The right to food*

13. **Ms. Thomas Ramírez** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution, said that, while the right to food was widely recognized in international instruments, hundreds of millions of people still suffered from hunger, in part because of the global food crisis, and the vast majority of them lived in developing countries. The draft resolution was an updated version of the text on the same topic adopted in 2015.

14. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Angola, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, China, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, the Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Guinea, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, South Sudan, Sudan, Suriname, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the

United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.37: The right to development*

15. **Ms. Thomas Ramírez** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the States Member of the United Nations that were members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said that the draft resolution was a continuation of the efforts of the open-ended Working Group on the Right to Development of the Human Rights Council and the implementation of Human Rights Council resolution 30/28.

16. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that China and South Sudan had joined the sponsors.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.38: Human rights and cultural diversity*

17. **Ms. Thomas Ramírez** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the States Member of the United Nations that were members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said that the promotion and protection of human rights and respect for cultural diversity were important for advancing peace, human welfare, freedom and progress everywhere and for encouraging tolerance, dialogue and cooperation among different cultures, civilizations and peoples.

18. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Brazil, China and South Sudan had joined the sponsors.

**Agenda item 28: Social development (continued)**

**(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (continued) (A/C.3/70/L.9/Rev.1)**

*Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.9/Rev.1: Promoting social integration through social inclusion*

19. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

20. **Mr. Habich Morales** (Peru) said that, in light of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, States were working towards an ambitious and transformative vision for the future and adopting a new approach in order to fully implement the Sustainable Development Goals.

21. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined the sponsors.

22. *Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.9/Rev.1 was adopted.*

## **Agenda item 72: Promotion and protection of human rights (continued)**

### **Implementation of human rights instruments (continued) (A/C.3/70/L.27/Rev.1)**

*Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.27/Rev.1: Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment*

23. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

24. **Ms. Kofoed** (Denmark) said that one of the fundamental principles of the United Nations was the absolute prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. Nevertheless, torture continued to be used in all regions of the world.

25. A few oral revisions had been made to the draft resolution since the most recent informal consultations. In the sixth preambular paragraph, the word “all” should be deleted, the words “by complying” should be replaced with “in accordance”, and the phrase “including the absolute prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment” should be deleted. In paragraphs 27 and 33, the words “belonging to”, “communities” and “those” should be deleted.

26. The draft resolution had become a biennial resolution in 2013 and had undergone extensive restructuring to make it a more useful tool in the

efforts to combat torture. The language had been altered in some paragraphs, and a few new paragraphs had been introduced with a view to better reflecting the relevant obligations or developments that had arisen since the adoption of the previous resolution.

27. It was recalled that the prohibition of torture was a peremptory norm without territorial limitation. While attention had traditionally focused on issues related to the deprivation of liberty, the current text also recognized that States must respect the rights of persons facing the death penalty and of other affected persons in accordance with their international obligations, including respect for the non-derogable and absolute prohibition of torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. Furthermore, States parties were called upon to fulfil their obligations under the Convention against Torture. It was emphasized that States should fully integrate the rights of the marginalized and most vulnerable into torture prevention and protection. The draft resolution also welcomed the adoption of the revised Nelson Mandela Rules, the interim reports of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, as well as the Convention against Torture Initiative. She hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus, which would acknowledge the common objective of all States to combat torture in all its forms.

28. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Andorra, Angola, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia And Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Israel, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Turkey, Ukraine, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined the sponsors.

29. **Ms. Zahir** (Maldives) said that, as in previous years, her delegation supported the draft resolution. However, Maldives had been listed as a sponsor in error.

30. *Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.27/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

31. **Ms. Al-Saad** (Qatar), speaking on behalf of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf, said that the member States of the Council supported the draft resolution but wished to explain their position

on the sixth preambular paragraph, which referred to the death penalty. She emphasized that every State had the inalienable right to choose its political, legal and criminal justice system without interference of any kind and in accordance with the principle of national sovereignty of States that was guaranteed by Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations. Each State, in accordance with its sovereign right and its national laws, could decide whether to impose the death penalty.

32. **Mr. Ustinov** (Russian Federation) said that his Government recognized the importance of preventing torture, punishing the perpetrators and supporting and protecting victims of torture, which was why his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. However, it did not agree with a number of provisions in the document. In particular, his delegation understood the reference to marginalized persons and those most vulnerable exclusively in the context of the grounds of discrimination set forth in article 2, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Measures to support victims of torture should be taken in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Convention against Torture. Steps by national authorities to ensure that prison conditions complied with the Nelson Mandela Rules should be taken with due consideration for the existing social conditions in the concerned States.

33. **Mr. Barriga** (Liechtenstein), speaking also on behalf of Australia, Iceland, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland, said that the delegations of those States appreciated the efforts made to reach a consensus but regretted that it had been achieved by omitting to refer more clearly to the relationship between the death penalty and the absolute prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. The Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment had found that there was no categorical evidence of any method of execution currently in use that complied with the absolute prohibition in every case. The Human Rights Council and the General Assembly should follow that logic and make unambiguous statements in the future, and the sixth preambular paragraph should be read in that context.

34. **Ms. Li** (Singapore), reiterating her country's unwavering commitment to condemning and preventing torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, said that the State had the primary

responsibility to promote and protect the rights of all persons under its jurisdiction, including all persons facing criminal sentences. Singapore's security agencies had strict guidelines that governed the conduct of their officers, and her Government acted in full compliance with its international obligations, including the absolute prohibition of torture and other ill-treatment, when imposing criminal sentences. Her delegation felt that there was no need to single out particular criminal sentences, as had been done in the sixth preambular paragraph.

35. **Mr. Elbahi** (Sudan) said that his delegation wished to place on record its reservation regarding the reference made to the death penalty in the sixth preambular paragraph. International law guaranteed the full sovereign right of each State to develop and enact its laws and regulations in accordance with its culture, religion and customs. Furthermore, his delegation completely disassociated itself from the references to the International Criminal Court in the seventh preambular paragraph and in paragraph 4. Finally, it would have been more appropriate, in paragraphs 27 and 33, to use the language agreed upon in General Assembly resolution 70/1 on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

**(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (continued)** (A/C.3/70/L.52/Rev.1, A/C.3/70/L.54, A/C.3/70/L.57 and A/C.3/70/L.64)

*Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.52/Rev.1: Effective promotion of the Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities*

36. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

37. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Canada, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Sweden, Ukraine, the United States of America and Uruguay had joined the sponsors.

38. *Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.52/Rev.1 was adopted.*



39. **Mr. Ruiz Blanco** (Colombia) said that his country supported the right to non-discrimination of all persons belonging to any national or ethnic, religious or linguistic minority and had traditionally sponsored the draft resolution. However, the fourth preambular paragraph was unacceptable, as its content went beyond the scope of the draft resolution by referring to an issue that was under discussion in the Second Committee. In his delegation's opinion, the inclusion of the fourth preambular paragraph prejudged the outcome of that discussion. Although his delegation had refrained from sponsoring the draft resolution, it supported the rest of its content and therefore did not oppose the consensus.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.54: Strengthening the role of the United Nations in enhancing periodic and genuine elections and the promotion of democratization*

40. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

41. **Ms. Mendelson** (United States of America) said that her delegation welcomed the reference in the text to ensuring full access to all stages of the election process for persons with disabilities and was pleased that the text also included strengthened language on the interrelatedness of transparency, social inclusion, democracy, human rights, governance and the rule of law for ensuring free and fair elections.

42. She understood that the representative of the Russian Federation might request a vote on the entire draft resolution, thus politicizing a text that had always been adopted by consensus in the past. The draft resolution was important for the United Nations system, because it provided the mandate for the Electoral Assistance Division of the Department of Political Affairs, and it was even more important for the Member States that received such assistance. Voting on the draft resolution would send the wrong signal.

43. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, the Central African Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kyrgyzstan, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Paraguay, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea,

Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Turkey, Uruguay, Vanuatu and Zambia had joined the sponsors.

44. **The Chair** drew attention to the amendment contained in document [A/C.3/70/L.64](#) and noted that it had no programme budget implications.

45. **Mr. Ustinov** (Russian Federation) said that the issues raised in draft resolution [A/C.3/70/L.54](#) were extremely important for the strengthening of democratic institutions in Member States, as well as in terms of the international community providing assistance to those institutions. His delegation supported many of the elements contained in the text, but since one of its own proposals had not been included, it had been obliged to prepare an amendment to the draft resolution.

46. The proposed amendment reflected his delegation's wish, as expressed at the sixty-eighth session of the General Assembly, to remove the reference to the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of Conduct for International Election Observers, as they had not been the result of any intergovernmental experts' agreement or part of any intergovernmental process. His delegation was opposed in principle to the attempt to legitimize, through a General Assembly resolution, documents prepared by a group of non-governmental organizations when those documents had not been discussed at the intergovernmental level. His delegation fully supported the idea of harmonizing the methods and standards for international election observation, as set out in paragraph 12 of the draft resolution, as his delegation had long advocated such action at various levels, including in regional organizations such as the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.

47. His delegation believed that the amendment made the draft resolution more balanced. Should the amendment be deemed unacceptable by the sponsors of the draft resolution, he would request a recorded vote.

48. **Ms. Mendelson** (United States of America) said that her delegation would vote against the amendment proposed by the delegation of the Russian Federation, which sought to delete what had been consensus language in the draft resolution for almost a decade. Operative paragraph 12 referred to the harmonizing of methods and standards on election observation and to appreciation for the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of

Conduct for International Election Observers, which had been endorsed by the African Union, the European Commission, the Organization of American States and many other organizations. She urged delegations to vote against the amendment, as they had done in previous years.

48. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment contained in document A/C.3/70/L.64.*

*In favour:*

Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sudan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia.

*Abstaining:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bhutan, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Gambia, India, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania.

50. The amendment contained in document A/C.3/70/L.64 was rejected by 101 votes to 24, with 34 abstentions.

51. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.54 had been requested by the delegation of the Russian Federation.

52. **Ms. Mendelson** (United States of America) said that her delegation was deeply disappointed that a vote had been requested on the draft resolution, as previous versions had been adopted by consensus for more than 15 years. Member States from around the world had directly benefited from the elections work of the Department of Political Affairs over the past two years. The new language on ensuring full access to all stages of the elections process for persons with disabilities had been unanimously supported by all delegations involved in the negotiation process. Calling for a vote at the present juncture served only to call into question the international community's commitment to promoting the needs of persons with disabilities. It was unfortunate that the text would not be adopted by consensus because of the ill will of one Member State, especially given the minimal changes made to the text and the attempt to accommodate many proposals.

53. **Mr. Reisen** (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the member States of the European Union, said that those States would be voting in favour of the draft resolution. The current version of the text placed particular emphasis on access for persons with disabilities to all stages of the election process. The main sponsor had engaged constructively in negotiations in order to produce a consensus text. The European Union called on all Member States that were committed to protecting and promoting civil and political rights to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

54. **Ms. Morton** (Australia), speaking also on behalf of Australia, Canada, Iceland, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland, said that the request

for a vote on the draft resolution as a whole for the first time in its history was particularly regrettable because the text contained important language on the full and effective participation of persons with disabilities. Accountability of Governments and transparency of elections were integral to establishing and sustaining democratic societies. Election observation could detect and deter errors or fraud and protect the rights of vulnerable groups. The tangible benefits of United Nations election monitors had been seen in recent elections. Australia, Canada, Iceland, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland fully supported the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of Conduct for International Election Observers and underscored their relevance to the draft resolution. Those States also supported the participation of civil society in United Nations mechanisms; the contributions of civil society could improve international election observation missions.

55. **Mr. Yesod** (Israel) said that the draft resolution provided the basis for United Nations electoral assistance, which was important for many States in their transition to democracy. It referred to the full and effective participation of persons with disabilities, one of the most marginalized groups, on an equal basis with others and was thus the embodiment of the promise to leave no one behind contained in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Israel would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution.

56. **Mr. Ustinov** (Russian Federation), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that international election observation should be an impartial, transparent and depoliticized process that followed a robust methodology and was designed to provide assistance in organizing election processes and realizing the electoral rights of citizens. International election observation should not turn into an instrument for exerting pressure on sovereign States and making politicized assessments. The methodology should be developed with the direct participation of States, which was why his delegation had proposed the deletion of the reference to the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of Conduct for International Election Observers. Those texts had not been produced on the basis of intergovernmental negotiations, yet the draft resolution implied that they enjoyed universal support. Accordingly, his delegation could not support the draft

resolution and had been forced to request a recorded vote on the entire text. His delegation would abstain.

57. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.54.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, 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, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

*Against:*

None.



*Abstaining:*

Angola, Azerbaijan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Namibia, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe.

58. *Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.54 was adopted by 155 votes to 0, with 15 abstentions.\**

59. **Ms. Li** (Singapore) said that Singapore recognized the importance of fair, periodic and genuine elections, and was committed to ensuring the full and effective participation of all citizens, including persons with disabilities, on an equal basis. With reference to operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, Singaporean law provided for persons with disabilities to be assisted on request by a presiding officer, who was obliged to mark the ballot paper in the manner directed by the voter and was under oath to keep the vote secret.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.57: United Nations Human Rights Training and Documentation Centre for South-West Asia and the Arab Region*

60. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

61. **Ms. Al-Saad** (Qatar) said that the draft resolution highlighted the increasing demand placed on the Centre by Member States and other stakeholders, which reflected a growing appreciation for the Centre's role and its impact on strengthening human rights capacities in the Arab region. The budget of the Centre was provided for in the proposed budget of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) for the period 2016-2017, which meant that the draft resolution had no budget implications.

62. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Afghanistan, Australia, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey,

Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Yemen had joined the list of sponsors.

63. **Mr. Qassem Agha** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the Qatari delegation had once again introduced a draft resolution calling for funding for the Centre, even though Qatar had pledged to cover the Centre's expenses when offering to host it. The Organization's resources should be put to more effective use, particularly given the ongoing financial crisis faced by the key entities of the United Nations, including OHCHR and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

64. The Centre had not carried out enough activities since its establishment to justify the attempt to obtain funding from the regular budget. While his delegation agreed with the statement in the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution that regional cooperation played a fundamental role in promoting and protecting human rights, it was well known that the spirit of that paragraph was not being applied in the region. Instead of cooperation, there was only regional aggression by neighbouring States, including Qatar, against the Government and people and the sovereignty and territorial integrity of his country. Lastly, while the Centre had its headquarters in Doha, it was not a regional centre, but rather a national centre employed by the Qatari authorities in the service of their agenda of supporting non-governmental organizations and opposition elements in the States of the region in order to sow chaos and division, undermine their societies and interfere in their internal affairs, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and other international instruments. His delegation therefore requested a vote on the draft resolution and would vote against it.

65. **Ms. Al-Saad** (Qatar) said that the Centre provided valuable services. The report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Human Rights Training and Documentation Centre for South-West Asia and the Arab region (A/70/414) had highlighted the importance and effectiveness of the Centre and the need for it in South-West Asia and the Arab region. Unfortunately, the representative of the Syrian regime continued to attempt to politicize the work of the Centre. Qatar and the rest of the developing States had long called for the human rights pillar to be accorded sufficient financial resources to fulfil the mandate to strengthen and protect human rights. In that context, the Centre should be funded

\* The delegation of Sudan subsequently informed the Committee that it had not intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution, but had intended to abstain.

from the general budget under the section on human rights, with a view to upholding the principle of independence and the credibility of its work. Her delegation had full confidence in the oversight mechanisms of the United Nations that evaluated the activities of all United Nations programmes and activities.

66. **Ms. Brooke** (United States of America) said that her delegation was disappointed that the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic had once again requested a vote on the draft resolution, when it had been the only delegation to oppose the draft resolution in past years. Institutions such as the Centre played an important role for countries seeking assistance in building their capacity on human rights issues. The United States, which was a sponsor of the draft resolution, strongly supported the work of the Centre.

67. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.57.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, 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, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Syrian Arab Republic.

*Abstaining:*

Angola, Democratic Republic of the Congo.

68. *Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.57 was adopted by 169 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.*

69. **Ms. AlMuzaini** (Kuwait), speaking on behalf the Gulf Cooperation Council, said that the member States of the Council had voted in favour of the draft resolution and expressed their sadness at the attempt by a certain State to sow discord with regard to an entity that operated under OHCHR supervision, conducted training and documentation activities in accordance with international human rights standards and provided valuable services to the region. In light of the greatly increasing and diverse needs in the field of human rights in South-West Asia and the Arab region, the member States of the Council encouraged all Member States to continue to support the Centre.

#### **Agenda item 106: Crime prevention and criminal justice (continued) (A/C.3/70/L.16/Rev.1)**

*Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.16/Rev.1: United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders*

70. **The Chair** said that he had been advised that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

71. **Mr. Fawundu** (Sierra Leone), speaking on behalf of the African Group, said that the draft resolution was an updated version of the text submitted at the

sixty-ninth session and reflected the report of the Secretary General on the United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders ([A/70/121](#)). Most of the language from the previous text had been retained and a few technical and editorial changes had been made to incorporate new developments. The following new paragraphs had been introduced: the fifth, fifteenth and sixteenth preambular paragraphs, and paragraphs 7, 8 and 19.

72. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Italy had joined the sponsors.

73. *Draft resolution [A/C.3/70/L.16/Rev.1](#) was adopted.*

*The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.*