



General Assembly

Sixty-second session

Official Records

Distr.: General
31 December 2007

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 51st meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 21 November 2007, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Wolfe (Jamaica)

Contents

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

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

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 62: Social development (*continued*)

- (a) Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (*continued*)
- (b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*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*)

- (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*)

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 70: Promotion and protection of human rights

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (continued)
(A/C.3/62/L.51)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.51: Situation of human rights in Belarus

1. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.
2. **Mr. Rees** (United States of America) said that Albania and Monaco had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution. Belarus had consistently ignored calls from the Third Committee, the former Commission on Human Rights and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) to change course and grant its citizens their basic rights. On the contrary, it had mounted a vigorous campaign of denial of its abysmal and deteriorating human rights record.
3. Belarus continued to use imprisonment as a political strategy for dealing with opposition figures and movements. Observation of elections by independent international observers was not permitted, and local observation was also severely restricted. The people of Belarus were deprived of the right of assembly, and political parties had been deregistered on the slightest pretexts. The authorities had broken into the private homes of those suspected of harbouring opposition political views, confiscating computers and printed material and jailing suspects. Trials were held behind closed doors and young people were pressured to testify against their peers.
4. In addition, the people of Belarus had little access to alternative or independent sources of information. Newspapers and leaflets about demonstrations were regularly confiscated, and State-run printing companies strongly discouraged from printing independent newspapers. Independent websites were consistently blocked and activity in Internet cafes closely monitored. Finally, civil society in Belarus continued to struggle against harsh and repressive restrictions designed to deny them a voice in the administration and future of their own country.
5. The Government of Belarus should be called to account. Contrary to certain claims, the resolution was

an honest and truthful account of the unfortunate facts on the ground in Belarus.

6. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Liechtenstein and Norway had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

7. **Mr. Shigabuddinov** (Uzbekistan) expressed his delegation's regret at the continuing practice of bringing country-specific resolutions before the Committee. Such resolutions did not advance the cause of human rights, but, on the contrary, put undue political pressure on specific Member States and thus complicated the situation. Human rights were best advanced through constructive dialogue and mutual respect between Member States within the Human Rights Council. Efforts to exploit the human rights situation in specific countries for political purposes were counterproductive.

8. **Ms. Rodríguez de Ortiz** (Venezuela) said that the Human Rights Council, under resolution 5/1, had discontinued the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus, sending a clear message to the international community that it would henceforth take action only on the basis of objectivity, non-selectiveness and transparency. Belarus, a signatory of the major human rights instruments, was cooperating in good faith with United Nations organizations. A number of countries were attempting, however, to use the Third Committee to undermine the work of the Human Rights Council and to resort to the malpractices of the former Commission on Human Rights. The Third Committee should free itself of past practices and not resort to country-specific resolutions, as they only served to create mistrust.

9. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation) said that country-specific resolutions were a major factor in the continuing atmosphere of politicization and confrontation that had destroyed confidence in the Commission on Human Rights. It had been hoped that the Human Rights Council would be able to rid itself of the negativity that had overshadowed the work of the Commission with the adoption of the universal periodic review mechanism. Unfortunately, those hopes had come to nothing.

10. One of the decisions reached by the Council had been to discontinue the confrontational and politicized mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus. The Council had thereby sent

a clear signal that such discussions of the human rights situation in that country were no longer acceptable. Belarus was a party to all the basic human rights instruments. It carried out its international obligations by submitting reports to the human rights treaty bodies and engaged in cooperation and dialogue with all United Nations human rights bodies.

11. **Ms. Halabi** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that she regretted the insistence of some States on introducing country-specific resolutions of a political nature, which could affect relations between countries. Dealing with human rights issues in a selective manner was tantamount to interfering in the internal affairs of sovereign States and contrary to the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. All human rights matters should be examined under internationally recognized instruments and in the appropriate forum, namely the Human Rights Council. Her delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

12. **Ms. Bhoroma** (Zimbabwe) said that country-specific resolutions did not advance the human rights agenda and only massaged the egos of their sponsors. No single country was without a blemish on human rights issues, including the sponsors of such resolutions, which were about settling political scores and constituted a further example of hypocrisy and double standards. Zimbabwe would support the motion for the adjournment of the debate. It would not support the draft resolution.

13. **Mr. Durdyev** (Turkmenistan) said that his delegation had welcomed the establishment of the Human Rights Council and the subsequent agreement on the institution-building package, including the universal periodic review mechanism. Such an approach could create a constructive atmosphere for the discussion of human rights issues. It was therefore disappointing that the Committee continued to duplicate the Council's work. His delegation favoured non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States. Human rights would be best advanced through dialogue. The politicization of human rights and the inability or reluctance on the part of some delegations to acknowledge progress made were unacceptable. His delegation would therefore not support the draft resolution.

14. **Mr. Emadi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the situation in Belarus did not warrant such a draft resolution, which pursued purely political purposes.

His delegation opposed country-specific resolutions, which undermined the credibility of the United Nations. Any effort to promote and protect human rights should be within the framework of the Human Rights Council.

15. **Mr. Saeed** (Sudan) said that the draft resolution was overpoliticized, selective and arrogant, and reflected the attitude of the main sponsor who was acting like the policeman of the world. Dialogue and cooperation were preferable to confrontation, and his country was opposed, as a matter of principle, to country-specific resolutions.

16. **Ms. Jang** (Democratic Republic of Korea) said that the main sponsor had introduced the draft resolution because of the strategic importance of Belarus. Any approach to human rights issues should be unbiased and not interfere with the internal affairs of sovereign States. Her delegation would vote against the draft resolution if a recorded vote was taken.

17. **Ms. Nassau** (Australia) said that all United Nations bodies, including the Third Committee, should address human rights issues. All texts should be examined on their merits. The Committee would be failing to live up to its responsibilities if it did not discuss human rights violations wherever and whenever they occurred.

18. **Mr. Dapkiunas** (Belarus) said that no procedural motion stood in the way of the debate on the draft resolution concerning Belarus. However, he wondered whether that debate amounted to a fair consideration of the human rights situation on its merits and whether delegations had received a balanced and unprejudiced assessment of the situation in his country.

19. There had been no real dialogue but merely an exchange of statements in which speakers had been more intent on putting forward their own views than listening to others. Of all the Main Committees of the General Assembly, the Third Committee had the most divisive voting patterns. That kind of voting not only caused divisions among States but undermined even the strongest argument and moral concern.

20. The sponsors of the draft resolution did not have any procedural excuse to explain the lack of an open and constructive dialogue on the allegations contained therein. If anything, the debate had reflected the Committee's inability to make a sound judgement on the appropriate ways and means of dealing with

delicate situations. Even with a tangible alternative, such as the universal periodic review, many were lulled into believing that a shortcut on human rights was possible.

21. What really mattered was the approach that Member States would adopt from now on. He wondered if they would continue to exaggerate their differences or display such rare qualities as humility and tolerance.

22. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation) said that, as indicated in its general statement, his delegation considered that draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.51 undermined the institution-building package adopted by the Human Rights Council and was thus totally inappropriate. His delegation therefore moved the adjournment of the debate on the draft resolution, in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedure.

23. **The Chairman** invited two speakers to support the motion and two to oppose it before it was put to the vote in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedure.

24. **Mr. Guo Jiakun** (China) said that the Human Rights Council had been established to save the international community from political confrontation. With the completion of the Council's institution-building procedure, the Third Committee, as the General Assembly's specialized human rights body, should steer clear of double standards. His delegation therefore supported the motion for the adjournment of the debate.

25. **Mr. Gala López** (Cuba) said that his delegation was opposed to subjectivity and double standards in human rights matters, which should not be used to advance political ends or to seek domination. In view of the manipulation exemplified in draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.51, his delegation supported the motion.

26. **Mr. Bucci** (San Marino) said that, in his delegation's view, no-action motions deprived Member States of the right to express their opinions on issues they deemed important for the international community and for the promotion and protection of human rights. Every Member State should be entitled to submit resolutions on any such issue and to receive an international response. His delegation would therefore vote against the motion.

27. **Ms. Carvalho** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that, when delegations put

forward a draft resolution, especially concerning grave human rights violations, the Committee ought to take action. If other delegations had concerns about the political motive behind a given resolution, the appropriate response was to vote against it or to abstain. The systematic and repeated call for motions to adjourn debates sine die represented an attempt to prevent the consideration of resolutions on procedural grounds, denying Member States their sovereign right to bring before the General Assembly any concern that they deemed to merit its attention. Such action ran contrary to the practices of the General Assembly and the spirit of dialogue.

28. Accusations of selectivity and double standards, together with the inaccurate assertion that Western countries sought to avoid international scrutiny, were regrettable. European Union member States had opened themselves up to scrutiny, cooperating fully with the human rights treaty bodies, the special procedures and the universal periodic review mechanism of the Human Rights Council.

29. The Committee had a mandate to look at human rights situations and had adopted resolutions expressing its concern about the worst such situations for over 30 years. In many cases, international condemnation had helped to increase the pressure on countries that had since turned into strong democracies. Thus action should be taken by the Committee to address the international community's concerns and urge the Government of Belarus to comply with decisions taken by the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies. The European Union strongly urged delegations to vote against the motion to adjourn the debate, regardless of their voting intentions on draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.51.

30. *A recorded vote was taken on the motion for the adjournment of the debate on draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.51.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, China, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic,

Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Abstaining:

Brazil, Cape Verde, Colombia, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominica, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Moldova, Morocco, Mozambique, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Solomon Islands, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago.

31. *The motion for the adjournment of the debate on draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.51 was rejected by 79 votes to 65, with 31 abstentions.*

32. **Mr. Dapkiunas** (Belarus) expressed his delegation's regret that the motion to adjourn the debate on the draft resolution had been rejected,

although it understood the difficulty encountered by many delegations in supporting it. At the same time, contacts with many permanent representatives and Third Committee experts had given his delegation a clear picture of the true feelings of most States. There was a general distaste for unfounded and politically motivated resolutions, which were at best subjective and, on occasion, amounted to coercion. Although there was wide support for an honest and well-founded appraisal of human rights situations, the consideration of country-specific situations was the prerogative of the Human Rights Council.

33. **Ms. Carvalho** (Portugal), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania and Montenegro; and, in addition, Norway, said that draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.51 related to an issue of particular concern to the international community with regard to the human rights situation in Belarus, where the right to freedom of expression, association and assembly continued to be systematically violated. The Government of Belarus had systematically refused to cooperate with the Human Rights Council and, previously, the Commission on Human Rights. Human rights defenders and political opponents were harassed and intimidated and the criminal justice system was used to silence them. Independent media, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), students' organizations, independent trade unions, religious organizations and other bodies of civil society faced persecution. Both the presidential elections of 2006 and the municipal elections of 2007 had failed to meet international criteria on fairness and freedom. Those who spoke out against the regime risked losing their jobs and their freedom. Cases of enforced disappearances and/or summary executions had been reported and officials implicated in human rights violations continued to enjoy impunity.

34. The adoption of the draft resolution would be of fundamental importance in persuading the Government of Belarus to improve the human rights situation, end the impunity of violators of human rights and start a process of democratization.

35. **Mr. Myint** (Myanmar) said that the draft resolution was yet another clear case of the politicization of human rights by a powerful State in

order to exert pressure on a developing country. Such a politically motivated approach would not promote the cause of human rights but, by creating an atmosphere of mistrust and confrontation, diminish it. As a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, his delegation adhered to the Movement's principled position on country-specific resolutions. It was opposed to the selective targeting of individual countries, which was contrary to the founding principles of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Charter of the United Nations. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

36. **Mr. Jeenbaev** (Kyrgyzstan) said that, in view of the sterling work by Belarus on the trafficking of persons, especially children, his delegation would not support the draft resolution.

37. **Ms. Gendi** (Egypt) reiterated her delegation's opposition to country-specific draft resolutions on human rights situations on the grounds that they were selective and politicized human rights issues. Moreover, they applied differing criteria that were not conducive to objectivity in dealing with the problems at hand, without resort to threat or confrontation, in a context of international cooperation and capacity-building. The unilateral style in which such draft resolutions were tabled, without any objective discussion by the General Assembly, was also wholly at odds with the efforts to intensify international cooperation on human rights in a multilateral setting. Without exception, human rights in all countries should be periodically reviewed by the Human Rights Council.

38. The same countries that annually sponsored country-specific draft resolutions also regularly voted in the Human Rights Council against draft resolutions on flagrant human rights violations in the occupied Arab territories, thereby signalling the double standards employed in judging respect for human rights. Such action not only affirmed the politicization of human rights issues but also betrayed disregard for the specific cultural, religious and traditional features that were the key components of life in any country. Ways of dealing with human rights violations in an identical manner, despite such differences, should be explored. In the light of those considerations, Egypt would be voting against the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in Belarus.

39. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.51.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Against:

Algeria, Armenia, Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Gambia, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka,

Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia.

40. *Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.51 was adopted by 68 votes to 32, with 76 abstentions.*

41. **Mr. Onischenko** (Ukraine) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in the belief that the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should apply to all countries. His delegation favoured effective dialogue between the international community and Belarus, Ukraine's neighbour and trading partner, on human rights and other issues. It had voted against the no-action motion, since such a device precluded the possibility of considering the substantive issues involved.

42. **Ms. Williams** (Jamaica) said that, session after session, the consideration of country-specific resolutions gave rise to an acrimonious atmosphere in the Committee. In view of the fact that no country could boast of a perfect human rights record, her delegation strongly supported the universal periodic review mechanism within the newly established Human Rights Council, whereby all Member States would be subject to scrutiny. It also welcomed the provision enabling the Council to hold special sessions to examine situations requiring urgent attention. The relationship between the Council and the Committee had not yet been settled, although it would, she hoped, be clarified as the Council fully assumed its role.

43. The continuing concern over the selective targeting of some countries and the inconsistencies and lack of respect for Member States had called into question the Committee's effectiveness as a forum for constructive dialogue and engagement with the promotion and protection of human rights. The policy of "naming and shaming", which sought to embarrass sovereign countries, had led only to strong resistance and counterproductive rebuttals, which defeated the purpose of addressing even those situations that deserved to be dealt with in a concerted manner by the international community. Her delegation had therefore consistently abstained on country-specific resolutions and on no-action motions. Such votes should not be interpreted as meaning that Jamaica condoned or was indifferent to human rights violations, particularly by national authorities. The international human rights instruments continued to set the standards for the promotion and protection of human rights and her

delegation urged all States to abide by their obligations under international law.

44. **Ms. Abdelhak** (Algeria) said that her delegation had voted against the draft resolution because it felt that country-specific resolutions fostered a climate of confrontation that was harmful to the cause of human rights. In a bid not to repeat the mistakes of the Commission on Human Rights, the Human Rights Council had set up the universal periodic review mechanism, which was the only appropriate way of considering the human rights situation in any country. A cooperative approach, based on real dialogue, would promote the protection of human rights in countries under consideration. Stigmatization was not the answer.

45. **Mr. Peralta** (Paraguay) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, the issue of human rights was a very sensitive one and, following the adoption of the institution-building package of the Human Rights Council, especially the universal periodic review mechanism, it would be more appropriate for country-specific resolutions to be taken up by the Council.

46. **Ms. Viotti** (Brazil) said that the universal periodic review mechanism established by the Human Rights Council could make an important contribution to avoiding the excessive politicization and selectivity that had sometimes prevailed in the Commission on Human Rights. Brazil was willing to submit to a transparent and constructive assessment under that mechanism and strongly encouraged all other countries, including Belarus, to do the same. Although the Council had decided not to renew the special procedure on the situation of human rights in Belarus, her delegation encouraged the Government of that country to engage in dialogue with the Council and all the other United Nations human rights mechanisms.

47. **Mr. Strigelsky** (Belarus) said that his delegation recognized neither the form nor the content of the resolution that had been adopted. The accusations it contained were unfounded and inaccurate. The resolution had no legal, political or moral force. Belarus conscientiously participated, and would continue to participate, in the international human rights mechanisms, including the special procedures.

48. The decision on the institution-building package of the Human Rights Council gave his delegation hope for the future conduct of the United Nations human

rights system, since it would ensure that human rights issues would be decided on a balanced and equitable basis. Belarus was prepared to participate openly and sincerely in such a process. It also wished to engage in dialogue on human rights with all countries without exception. The basis for such dialogue lay in equal partnership and mutual respect.

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

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

50. **Mr. Jesus** (Angola) said that consultations had been held on revisions to the draft resolution on assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa (A/C.3/62/L.82). The sponsors proposed the addition of two additional preambular paragraphs, which would read:

“Recognizing the particular vulnerability of women and children among refugees and other persons of concern, including exposure to discrimination, sexual and physical abuse,

“Recognizing also that refugees, internally displaced persons and, in particular, women and children are at an increased risk of exposure to HIV/AIDS, malaria and other infectious diseases,”

In paragraphs 4 and 7, the information contained in paragraphs 4 and 6, respectively, of General Assembly resolution 61/139 had been updated. The sponsors also proposed deleting paragraph 10 and, in the following paragraph, inserting “within its mandate” after the words “High Commissioner”. In paragraph 18, the words “notes with interest ... other relevant actors” should be replaced by the words “encourages the High Commissioner to continue to take steps to better ensure the civilian and humanitarian character of asylum, in consultation with States and other relevant actors, and takes note of the UNHCR operational guidelines in this regard”.

51. Lastly, he expressed satisfaction that a number of States that were not members of the African Union wished to sponsor the draft resolution: Antigua and

Barbuda, Austria, Azerbaijan, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Timor-Leste and the United States of America.

52. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Afghanistan, Albania, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Lithuania, Malta, Moldova, Montenegro, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, and Turkey wished to join in sponsoring the draft resolution, as orally revised.

53. *Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.82, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Agenda item 62: Social development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (*continued*) (A/C.3/62/L.10/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.10/Rev.1: Implementation of the Outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly

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

55. **Mr. Hayee** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, requested that action on the draft resolution should be deferred.

56. *It was so decided.*

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*) (A/C.3/62/L.4, L.5/Rev.1 and L.7/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.7/Rev.1: Promoting youth participation in social and economic development

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

58. **Mr. Woodroffe** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the other main sponsor, Senegal, the other sponsors listed and Australia, Canada, Chile, Slovenia and Switzerland, said that the title of the draft resolution should be “Policies and Programmes Involving Youth: youth in the global economy — promoting youth participation in social and economic development”.

59. The recognition by Governments, on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the World Programme of Action for Youth to the Year 2000 and Beyond, of the need to strengthen efforts to deliver internationally agreed commitments on youth was all the more important in today’s changing social and economic environment. While it was true that youth today were better poised than ever before to participate in, and benefit from, global development (A/62/61-E/2007/7, para. 5), the challenges presented by rapid changes in the global economy must be addressed if it were to be fully inclusive to all young people. The two main sponsors hoped that the adoption of the draft resolution would go some way towards helping to achieve that.

60. The sponsors were also pleased that, by adopting the draft resolution, the General Assembly would also be adopting the Supplement to the World Programme of Action for Youth, as agreed at the current year’s session of the Commission on Social Development. The document identified five new priority areas of particular relevance to young people and the actions that Governments should take in response. With its inclusion as an annex to draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.7/Rev.1, it was his understanding that A/C.3/62/L.4 would be withdrawn. Lastly, he expressed appreciation to all delegations that had participated in negotiations and to the youth delegates. The latter’s commitment to the broader work of the General Assembly and the United Nations was clear. He hoped that the draft resolution reflected the key role they had to play in discussions.

61. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Belize, Brazil, Burundi, the Comoros, Croatia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guyana, Iceland, Lebanon, Liberia, Mauritania, Moldova, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Nicaragua, Paraguay, the Philippines, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, Uruguay and Zambia wished to join in sponsoring the draft resolution, as orally corrected.

62. *Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.7/Rev.1, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

63. **The Chairman** said that, in view of the comments made by the representative of the United Kingdom, he took it that the Committee did not wish to take action on the draft resolution contained in A/C.3/62/L.4.

64. *It was so decided.*

65. **Mr. González** (Costa Rica) said that he wished to take advantage of the discussion under agenda item 62 (b) to point out that his delegation had fully intended to join the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.5/Rev.1 entitled “Implementation of the World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons: realizing the Millennium Development Goals for persons with disabilities” but had been unable to do so owing to its absence from the room at the time of its adoption.

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.61)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.61: Inadmissibility of certain practices that contributed to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

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

67. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation) said that the authors of the draft resolution were alarmed by the recent spread of extremist groups, such as neo-Nazis and skinheads, who targeted people based on the colour of their skin or their religion, as well as immigrants and minorities. Such groups drew inspiration from the very ideology that the United Nations had been established to combat. The continued glorification of Nazi crimes and former members of the Waffen SS organization was inadmissible and a matter of deep concern, since it fuelled very contemporary and dangerous forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance that must be combated at both the national and international levels. Appropriately, the draft was being considered on the sixty-second anniversary of the first Nuremberg trial.

68. In paragraph 3, the words “remove or transfer” should be deleted, and “or” should be inserted before “demolish”.

69. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Angola, Benin, Bolivia, Cape Verde, Namibia and Nigeria had joined the list of sponsors.

70. **Mr. Durdyev** (Turkmenistan) said that the draft resolution was most timely. Racism, xenophobia and related intolerance were no longer merely the purview of political fringes. Ideologies which mankind had paid an unprecedented price to overcome were once again being extolled, with huge financial support and new recruits among young people. Racist and extremist groups frequently invoked their right to freedom of expression; however, there was no such thing as a democratic right to insult different peoples and religions, or incite hatred, discrimination, violence and intolerance. In Turkmenistan, such crimes were strictly prohibited by law and the various ethnic communities lived in peace and harmony. The international community had a legal and moral obligation to outlaw racist and xenophobic activities. He thus fully supported the draft resolution and urged other delegations to vote in favour of it.

71. **The Chairman** said that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.61, as orally revised.

72. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation) asked who had requested the recorded vote.

73. **The Chairman** said that the recorded vote had been requested by the representative of the United States.

74. **Ms. Lopes** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Montenegro and Serbia; and, in addition, Georgia and Moldova and in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the European Union was strongly committed to the global fight against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. Neo-Nazism was a particularly abhorrent manifestation of racism and xenophobia and must be combated firmly by all. As noted by the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance in his latest report (A/62/306), neo-Nazism persisted in many societies. The threat of neo-Nazism

must be tackled within comprehensive efforts to eliminate all forms of racism and xenophobia through effective measures at the international, national and regional levels, including through the full implementation of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. The ideas that neo-Nazism sought to undermine were at the core of what the United Nations stood for. Combating neo-Nazism must, therefore, be a common and consensual priority for all. It should not be used for extraneous purposes, thereby diluting the significance of such issues, but should unite States in their common goal of eliminating racism from their respective societies.

75. For those reasons, the European Union had participated actively in informal consultations with a view to finding ways to ensure that the draft resolution provided a real and serious response to contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. While the main sponsors had been willing to negotiate and address some of the concerns raised by the European Union and other delegations, the grounds for the European Union's past concern about the initiative remained largely unchanged.

76. Instead of comprehensively addressing the human rights concerns related to racism and racial discrimination, the draft resolution continued to have a selective and unsubstantiated focus, disregarding those concerns and deflecting attention from them. Additionally, as in previous years, the European Union would have liked the inaccurate citations of the Judgement of the Nuremberg Tribunal to have been rectified. The European Union had therefore proposed that the draft resolution should adopt a more comprehensive, objective and legally appropriate approach that could provide real added value to the global fight against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance.

77. Another matter of concern related to the view taken in the draft resolution for addressing such practices. The European Union fully agreed on the need to combat manifestations of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. However, to be effective, such efforts must be in line with articles 4 and 5 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and could not undermine human rights and fundamental freedoms as defined by international

human rights law. That principle should be brought out more clearly in the draft before the Committee.

78. For those reasons, the European Union would abstain in the vote.

79. **Mr. Hagen** (United States of America) said that no country abhorred and condemned the ideology of hatred and Nazism more than his. Americans were grateful to live in a country where racial and religious tolerance was widely practised and all persons could voice their opinions and practise their beliefs without fear of Government retribution. However, the draft resolution failed to distinguish between actions and statements that, while offensive, might be protected by freedom of expression and actions and statements that incited violence and should therefore be prohibited.

80. Curtailing expression was not a viable means of eliminating racism and related intolerance. On the contrary, only through the free flow of ideas, unfettered discussion and vigorous debate could deplorable ideologies be challenged and the truth be discovered. In the words of two famous jurists, the purpose of freedom of expression was to help protect a "marketplace of ideas". Accordingly, Government should not prohibit or punish any speech because of an underlying confidence that in a free society hateful ideas would fail on account of their own intrinsic lack of merit.

81. Free and unhindered expression was a cornerstone of democratic governance. Democracy depended on a knowledgeable citizenry whose access to uncensored ideas, opinions and information enabled it to participate as fully as possible in public life. For that reason, prohibitions should be restricted to forms of expression that directly threatened the public good by inciting imminent violence or other unlawful activity. Accordingly, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

82. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on A/C.3/62/L.61, as orally revised.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros,

Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Papua New Guinea, 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.

83. *Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.61 was adopted by 122 votes to 1, with 52 abstentions.*

84. **Mr. Vigny** (Switzerland) expressed appreciation to the Russian Federation for the last-minute change it had made to paragraph 3, as it had allowed his

delegation to continue to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

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

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.62: Use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination

85. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee), presenting a statement of programme budget implications of the draft resolution in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, said that in order to implement the activities requested by paragraphs 15 and 18 of the draft resolution, total additional requirements under Section 23 of the proposed programme budget for the 2008-2009 biennium were estimated at \$139,600 to cover the costs of one two-day regional governmental consultation per year. That sum would include travel and daily subsistence allowance for the members 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 (\$29,200); travel of representatives from each country of the region (\$66,800); interpretation services (\$9,300); travel and daily subsistence allowance for accompanying staff (\$9,300); and conference services, including facilities, secretariat services and other miscellaneous expenses for the duration of the consultation (\$25,000). No provisions had been included under Section 23 of the proposed programme budget for 2008-2009 since the estimated additional resources had yet to be requested, in light of the continuing review by the Human Rights Council of its subsidiary machinery. A consolidated statement of requirements arising from the review and the potential absorptive capacity from reduced requirements arising from an amended programme of work under the proposed programme budget would be reported subsequently to the Assembly.

86. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba) said that the draft resolution took account of the analysis and recommendations found in the latest report 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 (A/62/301). By adopting the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request, *inter alia*, that the Working Group should continue to take into account, in the discharge

of its mandate, the fact that mercenary activities continued to occur in many parts of the world and were taking on new forms, manifestations and modalities, and that the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights should convene other regional governmental consultations on traditional and new forms of mercenary activities as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination.

87. He wished to propose the following oral revisions to the text: the sixth preambular paragraph should be deleted; in the tenth preambular paragraph, the word “noting” should be inserted before “the fact that”; and in paragraph 15, the phrase “in the Republic of Panama” should be inserted after “for convening”.

88. Furthermore, Belarus, Costa Rica, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Togo, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution.

89. Lastly, he called on all Member States to vote in favour of the draft resolution, as orally revised, so as to deliver a strong message of support for efforts to address the use, recruitment, financing and training of mercenaries.

90. **Ms. Mizarela** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and associated process countries Albania and Serbia; and, in addition, Georgia and Moldova, said that she shared many of the concerns expressed in the reports of the Working Group. She also recognized the dangers and the potentially deep negative impact that contemporary forms of mercenarism had on the length and nature of armed conflicts. However, she was not convinced that the matter was best tackled from the perspective of violations of human rights and the right of peoples to self-determination, or that the Third Committee and Human Rights Council were the proper forums to address the issue. The elaboration of a definition of mercenaries and the linkages between mercenary activities and terrorism fell, moreover, within the competence of the Sixth Committee. The European Union would therefore vote against the draft resolution, but continue to actively engage with States on the issue.

91. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.62.*

In favour:

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

Against:

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

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

Abstaining:

Chile, Fiji, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Switzerland, Tunisia.

92. *Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.62 was adopted by 122 votes to 51, with 6 abstentions.*

93. **Ms. Melon** (Argentina) said that her country supported the right to self-determination of peoples under colonial domination and alien occupation, in line with resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2625 (XXV). However, the draft resolution just adopted should be interpreted and applied in accordance with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Political and Decolonization Committee relating to the question of the Malvinas Islands. She referred, in particular, to General Assembly resolution 2065 (XX) et seq., which recognized the existence of a dispute between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom concerning sovereignty and requested them to resume bilateral negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful, just and definitive solution, taking into account the interests of the peoples of the Islands.

94. **Mr. Llanos** (Chile) said that the equation of the activities of certain private security companies with the activities of mercenaries in the tenth preambular paragraph was unjustified, since there was no legal instrument that clearly defined the new modalities of mercenarism. His delegation had therefore abstained in the vote.

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

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments *(continued)* (A/C.3/62/L.26/Rev.1 and L.27)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.26/Rev.1: Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment

95. **The Chairman** informed the Committee that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implication.

96. **Ms. Wandel** (Denmark) said that the absolute prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment was a fundamental principle of human rights, clearly enshrined in the

Universal Declaration of Human Rights and reaffirmed in all relevant international and regional human rights instruments. The consensus text before the Committee was the result of open-ended consultations with a large number of sponsors and other delegations. She wished to introduce a small oral revision to the tenth preambular paragraph. After the word "Council", the words "and its relevant resolutions" should be inserted.

97. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Australia, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, the Federated States of Micronesia, Israel, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Rwanda, Timor-Leste and the United States of America had joined the sponsors.

98. **Mr. Stigelsky** (Belarus) said that since his delegation's concerns had been incorporated in the revised text (A/C.3/62/L.26/Rev.1), Belarus would join the sponsors of the draft resolution and withdraw its proposed amendment, contained in document A/C.3/62/L.27.

99. *The draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/62/L.26/Rev.1 was adopted, as further orally revised.*

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (continued) (A/C.3/62/L.30/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.30/Rev.1: Strengthening the role of the United Nations in enhancing the effectiveness of the principle of periodic and genuine elections and the promotion of democratization

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

101. **Mr. Hill** (United States of America) said that Member States appreciated the vital role of the United Nations in promoting democracy, particularly free and fair elections, worldwide, as evidenced by the strong show of support for the draft resolution. He urged the Committee to adopt the text by consensus.

102. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the sponsors had been joined by Andorra, Armenia, Bangladesh, Cameroon, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, India, Iraq, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia,

Liechtenstein, Malta, Sierra Leone, Switzerland and Ukraine.

103. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba) said that his delegation recognized that the United Nations had provided electoral assistance at the request of Member States and agreed that the United Nations Trust Fund for Electoral Assistance must be maintained. However, the draft resolution needed to reflect more clearly that elections were an internal affair of States and an expression of sovereignty. In that regard, his delegation was concerned by the reinsertion in the text of the fifth preambular paragraph, which did not appear in the original version and which referred to two Commission on Human Rights resolutions that, in his delegation's view, did not take adequate account of the fact that a single model of democracy did not exist and that democracy did not belong to one country or region, and failed to adequately reaffirm due respect for sovereignty, self-determination and territorial integrity. It was for that reason that the same paragraph had been submitted to a vote two years earlier. His delegation had hoped that the paragraph in question would not be reinserted, so as to allow the draft resolution to be adopted by consensus. In view of its reinsertion, he was obliged to request a separate vote on the paragraph.

104. *At the request of the representative of Cuba, a recorded vote was taken on the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.30/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta,

Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Belarus, Bolivia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Mali, Myanmar, Namibia, Papua New Guinea, Singapore, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

105. *The fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.30/Rev.1 was adopted by 142 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.**

106. **Mr. Attiya** (Egypt), speaking on a point of order, said that rule 129 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly stipulated that, if parts of a proposal were voted on separately, the parts of the proposal which were approved should be put to the vote as a whole.

107. **Mr. Hill** (United States of America) said that the situation did not seem to be governed by rule 129, since Cuba had not moved for division and the gavel had already been struck.

108. **Mr. Tidjani** (Cameroon) recalled a similar situation four years previously (A/C.3/58/SR.34).

109. **The Chairman** suggested that action on the draft

* The delegation of Trinidad and Tobago subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of the fifth preambular paragraph.

resolution should be resumed at the following meeting in order to spare the interpreters.

110. **Mr. Saeed** (Sudan) said that an interruption of proceedings in the middle of taking action on a draft resolution might set an unfortunate precedence.

111. After a procedural discussion in which **Mr. Attiya** (Egypt), **the Chairman** and **Mr. Saeed** (Sudan) took part, **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) confirmed that whenever a delegation moved to divide a proposal, which included voting on a particular paragraph, rule 129 was applied.

112. *A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as a whole.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, 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, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, 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, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal,

Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, 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.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Syrian Arab Republic, Zambia.

113. *Draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.30/Rev.1 was adopted by 173 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.**

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

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