



# General Assembly

Seventy-sixth session

Official Records

Distr.: General  
11 February 2022

Original: English

---

## Third Committee

### Summary record of the 7th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 5 November 2021, at 10 a.m.

*Chair:* Mr. Doualeh ..... (Djibouti)

## Contents

Agenda item 28: Social development

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

Agenda item 69: Report of the Human Rights Council

Agenda item 73: Right of peoples to self-determination

Agenda item 74: Promotion and protection of human rights

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

Agenda item 28: Social development (*continued*)

Agenda item 108: Crime prevention and criminal justice

---

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 Management Section ([dms@un.org](mailto:dms@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/>).

21-16085 (E)



Please recycle



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

**Agenda item 28: Social development (A/C.3/76/L.8)**

*Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.8: Persons with albinism*

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

2. **Mr. Shilla** (United Republic of Tanzania), introducing the draft resolution also on behalf of Malawi, said that no report on the topic of persons with albinism had been issued in time for the current session. Nevertheless, the draft resolution, which was a technical rollover of General Assembly resolution 74/123, remained relevant to efforts to address challenges faced by such persons.

3. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Chad, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Madagascar, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Panama, Poland, Somalia, South Africa, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

4. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Cameroon, Fiji, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Portugal, Republic of Korea and Senegal.

5. *Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.8 was adopted.*

**(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, persons with disabilities and the family (A/C.3/76/L.16)**

*Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.16: Cooperatives in social development*

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

7. **Ms. Batsuren** (Mongolia), introducing the draft resolution, said that cooperatives had shown the value of a people-centred approach during the social and economic crisis triggered by the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic. Since cooperatives put people above profit, they would also have a significant role to

play in the post-pandemic world, in which a new social contract would be needed in order to foster a more inclusive, equitable, resilient and sustainable society.

8. Owing to the blended working methods of the current session, her delegation had made only technical updates to the most recent resolution on cooperatives in social development (General Assembly resolution 74/119). In the final text, the Assembly recognized the importance of the cooperative movement and encouraged Governments to create policies to leverage the cooperative enterprise model, collect comprehensive data on cooperatives and promote their role in bringing financial services to underserved groups and communities.

9. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zambia.

10. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Azerbaijan, Guinea, Malawi, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal and Zimbabwe.

11. *Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.16 was adopted.*

**Agenda item 69: Report of the Human Rights Council (A/C.3/76/L.62)**

*Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.62: Report of the Human Rights Council*

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

13. **Mr. Nze** (Nigeria), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of African States, said that the

establishment of the Human Rights Council had been a milestone in global efforts to promote and protect human rights for all based on a constructive, cooperative approach that avoided selectivity and double standards. The Group attached great importance to the framework of General Assembly resolution [60/251](#), including the subsequent institution-building package. The Group was mindful of the fact that the Council had been established as a subsidiary body of the Assembly and should report to the Assembly on an annual basis, in compliance with paragraphs 5 (c), (i) and (j) of that resolution. Adoption of the draft resolution implied that Member States also took note of the report of the Human Rights Council ([A/76/53](#)), including the addendum thereto ([A/76/53/Add.1](#)).

14. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Lebanon and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

15. **Mr. Baror** (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation wished to call for a recorded vote on the draft resolution, not on the grounds of the content of the report of the Human Rights Council, or of the Committee's consideration of that report, but because of his country's strong reservations about the merits of the Council itself and its ability to provide sound, impartial and objective recommendations. Nobody familiar with the work of the Council genuinely believed that it was a body that was true to the principles of impartiality, objectivity and non-selectivity stipulated in its mandate. Since the Council's establishment, Israel had been the subject of almost a half of its resolutions and a third of its special procedures, while the Council had also established a unique open-ended Special Rapporteur mandate and numerous other mechanisms related to Israel. The most striking in a long list of actions of bad faith was the establishment of yet another commission of inquiry against Israel after 4,000 rockets had been fired upon Israeli citizens. Although his country's extremely cautious and necessary response had been subject to close scrutiny, no reference had been made to that attack in the commission's mandate. He wondered whether the Council was unhappy with the very existence of the State of Israel, the homeland of the Jewish people and the only Jewish State in the world. His delegation would continue to oppose the draft resolution until reforms were made to the Council, and other Member States genuinely wishing to promote human rights should do the same.

16. **Ms. Ponikvar Velázquez** (Slovenia), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that the European Union member States would abstain from the voting. They had had concerns for some time, primarily on procedural grounds, about the initiative of requesting the Committee to take note of the entire report of the Human Rights Council: since it was possible to follow up individually on Council recommendations, the Committee did not need to take note of the Council resolutions in a generic manner.

17. Representatives of the European Union had considered the matter settled when a compromise was reached in the General Committee that the Third Committee would not consider the report in its entirety and, subsequently, when that agreement had been formalized in General Assembly resolution [65/281](#) on the review of the Human Rights Council. It was therefore disappointing that the draft resolution before the Committee still failed to reflect that common understanding. It had been sufficient for the Assembly to consider the report of the Council at its 24th plenary meeting on 29 October 2021, at which the European Union had expressed its views and listened to the views of others on the work and functioning of the Council. Given that many Member States continued to question the initiative, she hoped that in the future, open negotiations would be conducted prior to the submission of a draft resolution on the item.

18. *At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution [A/C.3/76/L.62](#).*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya,

Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Belarus, Israel.

*Abstaining:*

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

19. *The draft resolution was adopted by 107 votes to 2, with 59 abstentions.\**

20. **Mr. Pieris** (Sri Lanka) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in keeping with its continued engagement and cooperation with the Human Rights Council. Nevertheless, it rejected Council resolution [46/1](#), on promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka, which had been submitted without his country's consent and had been adopted in a divided vote. Sri Lanka remained committed to implementing its obligations under the

human rights treaties to which it was party and under voluntary arrangements.

21. **Ms. Oehri** (Liechtenstein), speaking also on behalf of Australia, Canada, Iceland, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland, said that those countries were strong supporters of the Human Rights Council and contributed actively to its work. Since its establishment in 2006, the Council had established itself as an authoritative voice in the promotion and protection of human rights, not least on account of the universal periodic review process, its special procedures and its close engagement with civil society and human rights defenders. Despite the challenging circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Council had continued to fulfil its mandate and respond to human rights violations in a timely and effective manner.

22. General Assembly resolution [65/281](#) reflected the understanding reached on institutional arrangements between the Human Rights Council and the Assembly: the Committee would discuss recommendations contained in the report of the Council, while the Assembly plenary would take action on the report of the Council. It was disappointing that that understanding had once again been disregarded, since Member States were required under the draft resolution to take note of the entire report. That was regrettable because it undermined the mandate of the Council.

23. **Ms. Nour Ali** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that her delegation reiterated its firm position against the politicization of human rights issues and mechanisms. Syria also opposed the use of such issues as political instruments to serve the interests of certain States at the expense of others, or to target Member States, including Syria, for reasons unrelated to international law, the Charter of the United Nations or human rights instruments or values. In that context, her delegation reiterated its position on agenda item 4 of the Human Rights Council, which was a manifestation of a selective attention to human rights in only certain countries, in contradiction of the provision of General Assembly resolution [60/251](#) on the obligation to eliminate double standards and politicization in the consideration of human rights issues. Resolutions of the Council adopted pursuant to that item, particularly the resolution on the situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic, reflected a biased approach. While her delegation did not deny the Council's competence in addressing human rights, as demonstrated by the technical aspects of the report, specific parts of the report, particularly those

---

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

concerning Syria, could not be ignored. Syria had therefore abstained from voting.

24. **Mr. Hill** (United States of America) said that the multilateral system was the best vehicle for promoting respect for, and the protection of, human rights around the world. As his delegation had repeatedly expressed in the Third Committee, it viewed the draft resolution as procedurally unnecessary. It strongly objected to the disproportionate focus of the Council on Israel, including to its establishment for the first time in its history of an open-ended commission of inquiry in Israel, and to certain other resolutions that the Council had adopted over the previous year. The membership of certain States that had particularly poor human rights records also undermined that body's credibility.

25. **Mr. Pilipenko** (Belarus) said that his delegation consistently opposed the politicization of the work of the Human Rights Council. Unfortunately, the Council was growing more biased by the year, focusing on specific rights and countries, and issuing country-specific resolutions that were barely distinguishable from the positions of certain Western States. The Council sometimes gave the impression of being an extension of the Department of State of the United States of America or of the European External Action Service.

26. The discussion on the report of the Human Rights Council was a case in point: the unilateral and biased approach taken by some Member States created polarization and an atmosphere of confrontation in the United Nations, whereby the colonizers of yesteryear anointed themselves as saints and judges, and punished others harshly according to their own conception of human rights. Although such an approach might be expected in the current age of hype and short-termism, Member States deserved more civilized and respectful dialogue. Some States had even asserted that the Council was not for all but for a select few, as though unable to accept that the days of empires and colonies were over. Those trends were the results of the politicized activities of the Council and were encouraged by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and the United Nations Secretariat.

27. The Human Rights Council remained a vital body of the United Nations human rights system, but it was in need of a unifying agenda and a more balanced programme of work. The universal periodic review was also an effective mechanism for providing complex and comprehensive analysis of the human rights situations

in all countries without exception and its role should be strengthened. Since the report of the Council contained politicized opinions that were unacceptable to Belarus, his delegation had, however, voted against the draft resolution.

28. **Ms. Gebrekidan** (Eritrea) said that her delegation supported the draft resolution as it believed that, as a subsidiary body of the General Assembly, the Human Rights Council should submit its report for discussion by the Third Committee. That stance should not, however, be interpreted as an endorsement of the report of the Council. Eritrea opposed all politically-motivated mandates, country-specific mechanisms and selective approaches that targeted specific pays, while excusing others. It disassociated itself, in particular, from Council resolution 47/2 on the situation of human rights in Eritrea, which was politically motivated and contrary to the objectives on which the Council had been founded. The Council should promote human rights in all countries in a universal, objective and non-selective manner.

29. **Ms. Ershadi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that her delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution. Despite the existence of the universal periodic review process, certain countries were continuing the same old policies of confrontation and recrimination. Their insistence on politicizing and polarizing human rights issues, including through the introduction of country-specific resolutions, could result in the Human Rights Council following the same path as that of the former Commission on Human Rights. Her country disassociated itself, in particular, from Council resolution 46/18 on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, in line with its principled position with regard to country-specific mechanisms. The only way to guarantee the promotion and protection of human rights was by encouraging dialogue and cooperation, on the basis of respect for the development paths chosen by other countries, not by imposing one's own social systems on others. Her Government would continue to work closely on human rights issues with OHCHR and other competent human rights mechanisms.

### **Agenda item 73: Right of peoples to self-determination (A/C.3/76/L.46)**

*Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.46: The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination*

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



31. **Mr. Shahin** (Egypt), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, said that the Palestinian people in occupied Palestine, including East Jerusalem, continued to suffer as a result of the Israeli occupation and the denial of their natural and inalienable rights, including the right to self-determination. The text of the draft resolution was the same as the one submitted to the Committee during the seventy-fifth session of the General Assembly, except for some technical updates.

32. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, China, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Viet Nam.

33. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Belize, Brazil, Eritrea, Iceland, Montenegro, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic and Zimbabwe.

34. **Mr. Baror** (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation wished to call for a recorded vote on the draft resolution, as it had in previous years, and would vote against it. Israel did not dispute the right of peoples to self-determination, and indeed, had joined the consensus on the draft resolution on the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination (A/C.3/76/L.58). However, it opposed singling out Israel, politicizing the work of the Third Committee and undermining the credibility of the United Nations. Many delegations supporting the draft resolution had previously voiced their opposition to the politicization of the Committee's work, but had failed to reflect that opposition in their voting on the draft resolution.

35. He wondered whether the many resolutions previously adopted, and the resources devoted to the topic over the years, had furthered the prospect of peace or of the realization of the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination. Israel did not expect delegations to suddenly change their pattern of voting, but called on them to at least question it. Given the

unsuccessful outcome of their traditional approach, they might see that it was high time for a new one.

36. *At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.46.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Australia, Cameroon, Guatemala, Honduras, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, Togo, Tonga.

37. *The draft resolution was adopted by 158 votes to 6, with 10 abstentions.*

38. **Mr. Alvarez** (Argentina) said that his delegation recognized the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and its right to establish an independent and viable State. It had voted in favour of the draft resolution, which reflected his country's recognition of the State of Palestine as a free and independent State, within the 1967 borders, and in accordance with whatever would be agreed by the parties during the negotiation process. That recognition was consistent with the desire of the Government of Argentina to favour negotiations for the end of the conflict and its deep belief in the peaceful coexistence of all peoples. He confirmed the unwavering support of Argentina for the right of Israel to be recognized by all and to live in peace and security within its borders.

39. Exercise of the right to self-determination presupposed that there was an active subject in the form of a people subject to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation, as defined in General Assembly resolution [1514 \(XV\)](#), paragraph 1. Without such a subject, there was no right to self-determination. Argentina welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution and hoped that it could contribute to the prompt realization of the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people, including their right to an independent Palestinian State.

40. **Mr. Magham** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. The situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory was worse than ever, following 70 years of belligerence by the Israeli regime. Palestinians were subjected to apartheid, deepening hardship and human rights violations, while the child-killing Israeli regime, flouting the condemnation of the international community, had stepped up its confiscation of Palestinian property and land and repeatedly resorted to excessive force, military aggression and grave violations of international law. Unfortunately, with the international community failing to shoulder its responsibility to protect the rights of the Palestinian people, the destructive policies and practices of Israel threatened not only the Palestinian people, but also peace and security beyond that region.

41. The international community, and the United Nations in particular, had the responsibility to counter the hostile policies adopted by Israel against both the Palestinian people and other countries in the region. The inhumane blockade of the besieged Gaza Strip, in particular, had brought about a catastrophic humanitarian situation and disrupted the security and living conditions of Gazans. Support for the Palestinians must continue until they could realize their fundamental rights, especially the right to self-determination, and establish an independent State of Palestine with Al-Quds al-Sharif as its capital. History had shown that the Palestinian people had no choice but to continue resisting occupation, aggression and inhuman acts. The most effective solution to the Palestinian question would be to return Palestinian refugees to their homeland and to hold a referendum on self-determination, so that Muslims, Jews and Christians could choose their own political system and enjoy their rights freely and equally.

#### **Agenda item 74: Promotion and protection of human rights**

##### **(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms ([A/C.3/76/L.35](#), [A/C.3/76/L.36](#) and [A/C.3/76/L.48](#))**

*Draft resolution [A/C.3/76/L.35](#): United Nations Human Rights Training and Documentation Centre for South-West Asia and the Arab Region*

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

43. **Ms. Alnesf** (Qatar), introducing the draft resolution, said that the United Nations Human Rights Training and Documentation Centre for South-West Asia and the Arab Region had been established in Doha in accordance with General Assembly resolution [60/153](#). It organized training and issued documentation on the subject of human rights in line with international standards and promoted a culture of human rights in the region in cooperation with Governments, United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations. The draft resolution acknowledged the growing role of the Centre and its impact on the promotion of human rights capacities in the region, which was demonstrated by the fact that various partners had offered it support and cooperation. The Centre had adapted its approach in light of the COVID-19 pandemic and continued to organize online activities to implement its annual plan

of work. Qatar welcomed the Centre's two-year plan to enhance its efforts to meet the needs of the 25 States that it served within its mandate, while focusing on youth, in line with the fourth phase (2020–2024) of the World Programme for Human Rights Education. The draft resolution encouraged States to provide contributions to the Centre.

44. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Afghanistan, Australia, Bahrain, Canada, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Yemen.

45. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Bangladesh, Cameroon, Guinea and Nigeria.

46. **Ms. Nour Ali** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation had requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution. Her country was a leader in the promotion and protection of human rights, particularly in the Arab region, and had placed human rights at the forefront of its legislative and organizational efforts and policies. However, over the previous 10 years, other States had attempted to destroy those gains and destabilize Syria by providing financial, logistical and military support to terrorists. Human rights were global, indivisible and interdependent, and therefore it did not make sense for a State sponsor of terrorism to host a United Nations training and documentation centre or submit draft resolutions on the matter of human rights. An arsonist could not also be a firefighter.

47. **Ms. Alnesf** (Qatar), making a general statement before the voting, said that it was regrettable that the delegation of Syria had requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution, which concerned a United Nations Centre whose work was of great importance in the region. Syria, instead of addressing the content of that draft, had launched false accusations at Qatar. That Qatar was host to the Centre did not change the fact that the Centre belonged to OHCHR and had been established pursuant to a resolution of the General Assembly. Syria had not participated in the discussions, nor had it put forward any proposals related to the draft resolution, showing that it was not interested in supporting the Centre. The baseless accusations of the Syrian delegation were intended to divert attention from

its reasons for undermining United Nations efforts to promote human rights in the region. Qatar would not address the allegations against it and called on States to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

48. *At the request of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.35.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, 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:*

Iran (Islamic Republic of).

49. *The draft resolution was adopted by 176 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.*

*Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.36: Freedom of religion or belief*

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

51. **Mr. Malovrh** (Slovenia), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia and Serbia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that only technical updates had been made to the text, with a view to encouraging Member States to focus on implementation.

52. The European Union was firmly committed to promoting understanding of the universality, indivisibility, interrelatedness and interdependence of all human rights, and had set, as key priorities of its human rights policy, the protection and promotion of freedom of thought, religion and belief and the elimination of discrimination on the basis of religion or belief. The rights of individuals to manifest their religion and belief, either individually or in community, were therefore protected, but not the right to disseminate religious or other views of the world. As the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief had previously stated, it was also important for religions not to be immune from criticism, rejection or insult. Free exercise of the freedom of religion and belief ultimately involved the promotion of tolerance and mutual understanding, and contributed to democracy, sustainable development, the rule of law, and durable peace and stability.

53. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Georgia, Guatemala, Israel, Japan, Lebanon, Marshall Islands, Monaco, New

Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, San Marino, Serbia, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Uruguay.

54. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Brazil, Canada, Guinea, Kiribati, Nigeria, Republic of Korea, Senegal and Sierra Leone.

55. *Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.36 was adopted.*

*Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.48: Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping, stigmatization, discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against persons, based on religion or belief*

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

57. **Mr. Shahin** (Egypt), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, said that no substantial changes had been made to the text adopted on the same topic at the seventy-fifth session of the General Assembly.

58. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Australia, Canada, Cuba, Japan, Peru, Thailand and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

59. He then noted that Eritrea also wished to become a sponsor.

60. *Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.48 was adopted.*

61. **Mr. Hill** (United States of America), noting that that the full version of his statement would be posted on his delegation's website, said that he wished to address various cross-cutting priorities for his country and to clarify issues related to draft resolutions that would be adopted during the current session of the General Assembly. Draft resolutions adopted by the Assembly did not change the current state of conventional or customary international law and did not create new legal obligations. Any reaffirmation of instruments to which a Member State was previously party applied only to those States that had initially affirmed them.

62. The United States supported the full achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals and the full implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The 2030 Agenda was a non-binding document that did not create rights or obligations under international law.

63. All language related to trade issues discussed or negotiated in the General Assembly had no relevance to United States trade policy, obligations or commitments, or to the agenda of the World Trade Organization and to discussions or negotiations within that framework.

64. As a long-standing leader on development issues, the United States was committed to partnering with countries to accelerate their development in a transparent and sustainable manner. However, it opposed any references to the right to development, which did not have an agreed meaning in international law.

65. The United States was not a party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the rights referred to therein were not applicable in United States courts. Likewise, the language in draft resolutions did not inform his country's understanding of its obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

66. When Member States were called upon in draft resolutions to strengthen certain aspects of education, including curricula, the text would be interpreted in line with relevant federal, state and local authorities.

67. The United States strongly supported the freedoms of expression and religion or belief and opposed any attempts to unduly limit the exercise thereof.

68. While the United States was fully engaged in making lasting progress in the achievement of a clean, healthy and sustainable environment, that did not amount to a human right as understood in the ordinary sense.

**Agenda item 28: Social development (continued)**  
(A/C.3/76/L.15/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.15/Rev.1: Fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations Volunteers programme and twentieth anniversary of the International Year of Volunteers*

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

70. **Mr. Costa Filho** (Brazil), introducing the draft resolution also on behalf of Japan, said that the COVID-19 pandemic had shown volunteerism to be a key aspect of the social development agenda. The United Nations Volunteers programme was referred to in the title of the draft resolution in recognition of its important role in fostering the participation of volunteers around the world.

71. Although many countries could not yet fully comprehend the impact of COVID-19 on volunteerism, volunteers worldwide had demonstrated solidarity during the pandemic by contributing to the efforts of Governments and the private sector to address the emergency needs of vulnerable groups. The crisis had also prompted communities to accelerate the pace of digitalization, leading to more innovative and inclusive forms of volunteering. The upcoming publication of the report entitled *2022 State of the World's Volunteerism Report: Building Equal and Inclusive Societies* would provide further information on data and trends observed during the pandemic. The draft resolution should provide a framework for the development of volunteerism in the years to come.

72. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, India, Ireland, Jordan, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Slovakia, South Africa, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

73. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Bhutan, Cameroon, Comoros, Congo, Djibouti, Eritrea, Guinea, Iraq, Liberia, Libya, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Timor-Leste and Uruguay.

74. **Mr. Kimihiro** (Japan) said that, as facilitator of the draft resolution, his delegation had tried to conduct the informal consultations in a transparent and cooperative manner. In the final text, Member States acknowledged the important role that volunteers had played in overcoming vulnerabilities acutely felt during the human security crisis caused by the COVID-19

pandemic and emphasized the contribution of volunteerism to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda. Japan was the country that had proposed the proclamation of the International Year of Volunteers in 1997 and was a fervent advocate for volunteerism. As members of the international community worked together to tackle persistent and emerging challenges and to advance a common agenda, the spirit of volunteerism was needed more than ever. In the future, youth would play a particularly important role in strengthening inclusiveness and fostering innovation in volunteer activities.

75. *Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted.*

**Agenda item 108: Crime prevention and criminal justice** (A/C.3/76/L.2, A/C.3/76/L.3, A/C.3/76/L.4, A/C.3/76/L.5 and A/C.3/76/L.6)

*Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.2: Fourteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice*

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

77. *Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.2 was adopted.*

*Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.3: Reducing reoffending through rehabilitation and reintegration*

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

79. *Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.3 was adopted.*

*Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.4: Integrating sport into youth crime prevention and criminal justice strategies*

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

81. *Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.4 was adopted.*

*Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.5: Strengthening criminal justice systems during and after the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic*

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

83. *Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.5 was adopted.*

*Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.6: Preventing and combating crimes that affect the environment*

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

85. *Draft resolution A/C.3/76/L.6 was adopted.*

*The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.*