



General Assembly

Seventy-second session

Official Records

Distr.: General
12 December 2017

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 44th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 9 November 2017, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Gunnarsson (Iceland)

Contents

Agenda item 71: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

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

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

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

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

Agenda item 28: Advancement of women (*continued*)

(b) Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women and of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly (*continued*)

Agenda item 64: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

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

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments (*continued*)

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

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), 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/>).



The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

Agenda item 71: Rights of peoples to self-determination (continued) (A/C.3/72/L.34)

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.34: Use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination

1. **Mr. Quintanilla Román** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution, highlighted the importance of preparing specific standards or guidelines to resolve potential deficiencies and promote human rights, especially the right of peoples to self-determination.

2. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burundi, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Lesotho, Madagascar, Myanmar, Namibia, Nigeria, Qatar, South Sudan, Uganda and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

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

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (continued) (A/C.3/72/L.30, A/C.3/72/L.31 and A/C.3/72/L.32)

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.30: Strengthening United Nations action in the field of human rights through the promotion of international cooperation and the importance of non-selectivity, impartiality and objectivity

3. **Mr. Quintanilla Román** (Cuba) introduced the draft resolution, which he urged Member States to adopt by consensus.

4. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, Cameroon, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Eritrea, Ghana, Guinea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Madagascar, Myanmar, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Senegal, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Uganda and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.31: Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order

5. **Mr. Quintanilla Román** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution, said that the Secretary-General, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and Member States should continue to work closely with

the Independent Expert of the Human Rights Council on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order.

6. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Algeria, Angola, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Myanmar, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Uganda and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.32: The right to food

7. **Mr. Quintanilla Román** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution, said that an alarming 815 million people worldwide, the vast majority of whom lived in developing countries, were suffering from hunger even though the world produced enough food to feed everyone. His delegation had tried to accommodate the concerns of all Member States and was confident that the draft resolution would again be adopted by the overwhelming majority of Member States.

8. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Agenda item 27: Social development (continued)

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation of youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (continued) (A/C.3/72/L.9)

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.9: Cooperatives in social development

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

10. **Mr. Sukhee** (Mongolia), introducing the draft resolution, said that cooperatives played an important

role in the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals by promoting sustainable development in the social, economic and environmental dimensions. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development had recognized cooperatives as an integral part of the private sector and a driver of productivity and job creation. Introducing an oral revision to the draft resolution, he proposed deleting paragraph 12.

11. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Albania, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zambia had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

12. **Ms. Simpson** (United States of America) said that her delegation had joined consensus on the draft resolution.

13. *Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.9, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Agenda item 28: Advancement of women (continued)

(b) Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women and of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly (continued) (A/C.3/72/L.67)

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.67: Follow-up to the Fourth World Conference on Women and full implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the outcome of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly

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

15. **Ms. Al-Temimi** (Qatar), Vice-Chair, introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Chair, said that the fact that the draft resolution was traditionally facilitated

by the Chair of the Third Committee was indicative of the universal commitment of all States to the achievement of gender equality, the empowerment of all women and girls and the realization of their human rights. It was important to ensure that the draft resolution placed sufficient emphasis on synergizing Member States' efforts to implement the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals.

16. *Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.67 was adopted.*

17. **Ms. Simpson** (United States of America) said that her delegation had joined consensus on the draft resolution. With regard to paragraph 29, each country should be able to determine whether temporary special measures were appropriate. Often the best way to improve the situation of women and girls was through legal and policy reforms to end discrimination and promote equal opportunities.

Agenda item 64: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (continued) (A/C.3/72/L.57)

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.57: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

18. **Mr. Laaksonen** (Finland), introducing the draft resolution, said that the resolution focused on essential policy elements and addressed themes relating to recent developments in forced displacement and statelessness that warranted special attention by the General Assembly. However, unwanted changes had been introduced into the text by editors in New York after its tabling and without consulting the main sponsor. The original language in paragraphs 6, 12 and 36 should be reinstated to reflect the consensus that had been reached through negotiations in Geneva.

19. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) reminded Committee members that draft resolutions were edited after tabling as a matter of course. The changes that had been introduced were not out of the ordinary. Editors consulted with main sponsors to clarify the authors' intended meaning and avoided making changes that might alter that meaning. Regarding paragraph 6, the insertion of the formal names of the conferences and summits in question did not require consultation with the main sponsor. The problem in truncating the formal names of the meetings by emphasizing their locations and dates was that, since multiple meetings were held in places such as London and Brussels in a given year, confusion could arise later as to which meeting was being referred to. Regarding paragraph 12, the change from "own county" to

“country of origin” had been done in order to use terminology that was standard in such resolutions, given the possibility that refugees may have fled a country that was a country of refuge, but not necessarily their own country. He did not have any comment about the change of “commitments” to the singular in paragraph 36. Provided that the Committee was in agreement with the oral revisions proposed, the Secretariat would comply with the request to reinstate the text.

20. In addition, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cote d’Ivoire, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Israel, Latvia, Liberia, Madagascar, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, New Zealand, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Serbia, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay and Zambia had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

21. **Ms. Morton** (Australia), speaking also on behalf of Canada and New Zealand, commended the ongoing efforts of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) to provide humanitarian assistance and protection to asylum seekers, refugees, internally displaced persons and stateless persons. Australia looked forward to working with the international community in 2018 to advance the commitments made under the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants.

22. In reference to paragraph 13 of the draft resolution, consent to principled humanitarian relief must not be withheld on arbitrary grounds: States had a primary obligation under international humanitarian law to meet the basic needs of the population under their control, including allowing the rapid passage and distribution of neutral and impartial humanitarian assistance. The specific needs of internally displaced persons should be addressed in accordance with the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement.

23. **Mr. Grout-smith** (United Kingdom) said that each year an increasing number of refugees depended on UNHCR to champion their right to a safe, dignified and durable solution. His delegation praised the leadership of the Office in facilitating the roll-out of the comprehensive refugee response framework, as well as its work with the World Bank and other development actors to deliver long-term support to refugee-hosting Governments and communities and to provide refugees with access to labour markets, health care and education. In line with his country’s position at the previous General Assembly session, his delegation would not sponsor the draft resolution because

paragraph 13 implied that the protection and assistance of internally displaced persons should be carried out only if affected States gave their full consent. States should allow and facilitate rapid and unimpeded passage of all relief consignments, equipment and personnel as part of their obligations under the Geneva Conventions.

24. **Mr. Cerutti** (Switzerland), said that the draft resolution was crucial in showing the support of the international community for the indispensable work of UNHCR, in particular in the context of the drafting of a global compact on refugees. It was unfortunate that a consensus could not be reached with respect to paragraph 13 on internally displaced persons. Parties in a conflict that could not meet the needs of the populations under their control were obligated by law to accept offers of aid from impartial humanitarian organizations. Those populations were to be treated in accordance with international humanitarian and human rights law and the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, and in Africa, with the African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa (Kampala Convention).

25. **Mr. Kashaev** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation was joining the consensus on the draft resolution. The Russian Federation supported the work of UNHCR, which performed well in providing international protection to refugees and other vulnerable groups. His delegation reiterated its position that it understood the term “responsibility-sharing” in accordance with the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees.

26. **Ms. Holmes** (United States of America) noted that there was consensus with respect to the value of the work of UNHCR. Alleviating suffering and providing impartial assistance had to be at the core of UNHCR and other humanitarian operations. She regretted that the draft resolution contained elements that ran counter to those fundamental principles. As a result, the United States of America would not sponsor the resolution, nor support the text without reservation or comment, and would disassociate from the consensus on paragraph 13. It was unacceptable for States to hide behind and distort the principle of sovereignty to obstruct the work of UNHCR and other international organizations. States would not be allowed to rely on the draft resolution to justify actions to impede and deny access or constrain operations. She looked forward to working with Member States in Geneva and New York to ensure that future resolutions contained language that reflected the need for full humanitarian access to all people in need, including internally displaced persons.

27. *Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.57, as orally revised, was adopted.*

28. **Mr. Jürgenson** (Estonia), speaking on behalf of the European Union, echoed the renewed call of the Commissioner of UNHCR for action to address the needs of asylum seekers, refugees, internally displaced persons and stateless persons. He recalled the recognition in the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants of the need for effective strategies to ensure protection of and assistance to internally displaced persons. He also recalled that, pursuant to international humanitarian law, States bore the primary obligation to meet the basic needs of the populations under their control, including by allowing impartial humanitarian relief, which must not be withheld on arbitrary grounds. The specific needs of internally displaced persons must be addressed in accordance with the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement.

Agenda item 72 (a): Promotion and protection of human rights: Implementation of human rights instruments (*continued*) (A/C.3/72/L.20/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.20/Rev.1: Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment

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

30. **Ms. Kofoed** (Denmark), introducing the draft resolution, said that the United Nations had been built upon the fundamental principle of the absolute prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, as articulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and reaffirmed by subsequent international regional human rights instruments. Despite that, the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment continued to report occurrences of torture in all parts of the world, against which the General Assembly had a particular responsibility to speak out. The draft resolution before the Committee had been extensively restructured in order to make it a more useful tool for entities that were fighting torture. New paragraphs had been introduced with a view to better reflect developments that had occurred since the adoption of the previous resolution, including with respect to safeguards for those who had been arrested, education for law enforcement, the systematic review of interrogation practices, and measures by States to apply the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (Nelson Mandela rules), and to acknowledge the work of the Convention against Torture Initiative to achieve universal ratification and improved implementation of the Convention against

Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment by 2024.

31. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Angola, Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Chile, Cote d'Ivoire, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Israel, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Serbia, Timor-Leste, Turkey and Uruguay had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

32. **Mr. Mohamed** (Sudan) said that, while the United Nations system had by and large succeeded in its mission of maintaining international peace and security, the imposition of the authority of the International Criminal Court on 60 per cent of the world population would be harmful to world peace and create a serious conflict between peace and justice that would jeopardize both. The selective prosecution of a few individuals by the Court violated the overarching principle in the Charter of the equality of nations both big and small. It was clearly stated in the policy papers of the Court prosecutor that the Court exercised jurisdiction by deciding on admissibility, which was based on the criteria of possibility and feasibility. Therefore, selectivity in the practices of the court was not incidental, but rather institutional and inevitable. The jurisdiction and authority of the Court were a menace to peace and equality. While all Member States fully subscribed to the objectives of the resolution, the unwarranted imposition of Court jurisdiction only sowed discord. Importing language that promoted the authority of the Court into the draft resolution would be a disservice to the unanimously agreed goal to end torture. Therefore, Sudan moved for deletion of the seventh preambular paragraph and paragraph 4.

33. **Ms. Kofoed** (Denmark) expressed regret that the decades-long consensus on the draft resolution was being challenged. Denmark had hosted three rounds of consultations as well as numerous meetings in order to reach consensus on the draft resolution, during the course of which no objections had been raised to the references to the International Criminal Court. Denmark had attempted to reach a middle ground with Member States that had suggested edits. With respect to the seventh preambular paragraph, that text had been a part of the resolution for more than 10 years, and had been agreed by consensus. The text contained only undisputed statements of fact in referring to torture as a violation of the Geneva Convention of 1949 and the statutes of a number of international tribunals, including the Court. It did not give preferential treatment to the

Court, as a number of international legal instruments had been referred to in the text. It did not encourage prosecution at the Court, but merely noted that, pursuant to international customary law, torture could constitute a crime against humanity or a war crime. For those reasons, Denmark would vote against the proposed amendment. With respect to paragraph 4, which addressed the issue of accountability, prosecution and ending impunity, the language therein had been agreed by consensus since 2011. Denmark strongly supported holding accountable those guilty of war crimes and crimes against humanity. The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court complemented other legal frameworks. Given that all States that had taken part in the consultations had seen merit in retaining the language in those paragraphs, Denmark would vote against the hostile amendment proposal and encouraged all Member States to do the same.

34. **The Chair** said that recorded votes had been requested on the amendments proposed by the Sudan.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

35. **Ms. Morton** (Australia), speaking also on behalf of Canada, Iceland, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland, said that the proposal to delete the seventh preambular paragraph was unfortunate, given that the language had been agreed since 2006. The paragraph listed a number of international instruments that established that acts of torture could constitute crimes against humanity or war crimes. In that regard, it recognized the efforts taken to end impunity by ensuring accountability and punishing perpetrators.

36. The relevance of the reference to the International Criminal Court represented a key part of the common approach to the issue. It was therefore deeply disturbing that the established consensus was being attacked for reasons that were completely unrelated to the subject of the draft resolution and were detrimental to the common cause. She called on all delegations to vote against the draft amendment.

37. **Mr. Jürgenson** (Estonia), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that he deeply regretted the proposed amendments to the seventh preambular paragraph and paragraph 4, which had been in the text for many years. Numerous other international instruments that did not enjoy universal membership were referenced in the text; it was therefore completely wrong to say that the International Criminal Court was being given special attention.

38. The European Union wished to reiterate its unwavering support for the International Criminal Court as a critical tool for fighting impunity and contributing

to peaceful societies. Peace and justice were complementary, not mutually exclusive. The gross violations of international humanitarian law and human rights witnessed around the world were a sharp reminder of the increasing relevance of the Court, whose role was to complement, not replace, existing national judicial systems. The primary responsibility for investigating and prosecuting crimes remained with individual States. All perpetrators of such crimes must be held accountable for their actions: a key element of the Rome State was its equal application.

39. The 28 member States of the European Union would therefore vote against the proposed amendments and urged all other States, in particular those party to the Rome Statute, to do the same.

40. **Mr. Wagner** (Germany) said that he regretted to see amendments proposed that challenged a consensus that had been achieved and protected for many years. The language in both paragraphs was well balanced. With regard to the seventh preambular paragraph, the Rome Statute considered acts of torture to be crimes. For many years, that paragraph had been accepted by all, including by States not party to the Rome Statute. A deletion would send the wrong signal. The International Criminal Court was key to holding perpetrators accountable and ensuring justice for the victims. His delegation would therefore vote against the proposed amendments and urged all other States to do likewise.

41. **Mr. De Souza Monteiro** (Brazil), speaking also on behalf of Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Peru, Paraguay and Uruguay, said that the International Criminal Court was the first permanent court set up to put an end to impunity for the most serious crimes and had been an important step towards a rules-based world order. As an instrument for ensuring that those accused were judged with fairness and full respect for their rights, the Court was a vehicle for justice and peace. Pursuant to articles 7 and 8 of the Rome Statute, torture could constitute both a crime against humanity and a war crime, and therefore fell under the Court's jurisdiction.

42. In light of those considerations, those countries understood that the language used the seventh preambular paragraph and paragraph 4 was not only factually correct, but also thematically relevant. It should therefore be kept in its entirety, as had been the case for several years. They would vote against the proposed amendments, and encouraged other delegations to do the same.

43. **Ms. Charrier** (France) said that the draft resolution referred to numerous legal texts that considered torture to be a crime against humanity or a

war crime under certain conditions. It was profoundly regrettable that such evidence was being contested.

44. France fully supported the International Criminal Court, whose action was determined by the principle of complementarity. National judicial systems bore the primary responsibility for justice, but the Court was able to act impartially and independently when those failed. That was why so many States supported the Rome Statute, which was a unique instrument for combating impunity for the most serious crimes. The many victims of torture, in Syria and elsewhere, must not be denied hope of justice. France therefore called on countries to vote against the proposed amendments and to support the draft resolution.

45. *At the request of the representative of Denmark, a recorded vote was taken on the oral amendment proposed by the Sudan to delete the seventh preambular paragraph.*

In favour:

Algeria, Belarus, Burundi, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, Iraq, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritania, Oman, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Sudan, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Abstaining:

Angola, Bahrain, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Ethiopia, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Pakistan, Qatar, Rwanda, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia.

46. *The oral amendment to delete the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.20/Rev.1 was rejected by 101 votes to 21, with 32 abstentions.*

47. **Ms. Kirianoff Crimmins** (Switzerland), speaking also on behalf of Australia, Canada, Iceland, New Zealand, Norway and Liechtenstein in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the proposed amendment to paragraph 4 was extremely unfortunate, given that it consisted of language that had been agreed upon since 2011. In calling for perpetrators of all acts of torture to be prosecuted and punished, the paragraph recognized the efforts taken to end impunity by ensuring accountability and punishing perpetrators. The relevance of the International Criminal Court had been a key part of the common approach to the issue. It was therefore deeply disturbing that the established consensus was being attacked for reasons that were completely unrelated to the subject of the draft resolution and were detrimental to the common cause. She called on all delegations to vote against the draft amendment.

48. *At the request of the representative of Denmark, a recorded vote was taken on the oral amendment proposed by the Sudan to delete paragraph 4.*

In favour:

Algeria, Belarus, Burundi, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, Gabon, Iraq, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritania, Oman, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece,

Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Abstaining:

Angola, Bahrain, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Libya, Malaysia, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Qatar, Rwanda, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia.

49. *The oral amendment to delete paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.20/Rev.1 was rejected by 102 votes to 21, with 32 abstentions.*

50. **Mr. Mohamed** (Sudan) said that all forms of torture were prohibited under the Constitution of Sudan, which had acceded to all international instruments on torture and had welcomed all recommendations submitted to it under the universal periodic review of the Human Rights Council. Sudan's position regarding references in General Assembly resolutions to the International Criminal Court remained unchanged. He thanked all Member States that had voted in favour of the proposed amendment to the draft resolution and underscored that, although that amendment had been rejected, Sudan remained steadfast in its support for the draft resolution's overarching goal, namely the prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

51. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.3/72/L.20/Rev.1](#) as a whole.

52. **Ms. Eckels-Currie** (United States of America) said that torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment was a violation of law and affront to human dignity. The United States attached great importance to fulfilling its legal obligations in that regard and had made considerable efforts to ensure that

its detention and interrogation practices complied with such obligations, including those under international humanitarian law. The United States was deeply committed to preventing violations of the prohibition against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, to pursuing justice on behalf of victims and to denying perpetrators safe haven in its country. Her delegation encouraged other States to consider current United States policies and practices for the implementation of their obligations. Lastly, its sponsorship of the draft resolution did not reflect an endorsement of all the findings and conclusions of the Special Rapporteur's reports.

53. *Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.20/Rev.1 was adopted.*

54. **Mr. Saito** (Japan), welcoming the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus, said that the prevention of torture was a well-established principle under international human rights law and the international community should act together to implement it in full.

55. Nevertheless, it was a matter of concern that, during the informal consultations, some Member States had tried to insert paragraphs on the abolition of the death penalty or a moratorium on execution. Any reference to the death penalty went beyond the primary objective of the draft resolution. There was no universal understanding that the death penalty constituted an act of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. It was therefore up to each Member State to decide whether or not to abolish the death penalty. Addressing both issues in a single resolution would complicate matters, since it would not only lead to conflict among Member States but would also make it difficult to take coordinated action on the prevention of torture.

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

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) ([A/C.3/72/L.23](#))

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.23: Strengthening the role of the United Nations in enhancing periodic and genuine elections and the promotion of democratization

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

57. **Ms. Eckels-Currie** (United States of America), introducing the draft resolution, said that she hoped its emphasis on the importance of sovereignty and non-interference would enable States to set aside their unfounded concerns regarding international election

observation. The United States welcomed the strong support for the new language on respecting the will of voters and condemning vote tampering and the unlawful removal of democratically elected officials. She urged all Member States to support its adoption.

58. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen and Zambia had joined the sponsors.

59. **The Chair** drew attention to the draft amendments contained in documents [A/C.3/72/L.64](#), [A/C.3/72/L.65](#) and [A/C.3/72/L.66](#).

60. **Ms. Mozolina** (Russian Federation) said that the issues raised in draft resolution [A/C.3/72/L.23](#) were important for the strengthening of democratic institutions in Member States and the provision of assistance in holding elections to those institutions. Although her delegation supported many of the elements contained in the draft resolution, the text required further improvement. Her delegation had therefore been obliged to propose three amendments ([A/C.3/72/L.64](#), [A/C.3/72/L.65](#) and [A/C.3/72/L.66](#)).

61. The proposed amendments were intended to make the draft resolution more balanced. The third amendment ([A/C.3/72/L.66](#)) was to remove the reference to the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of Conduct for International Election Observers, as they had not been the result of any intergovernmental agreement. Her delegation was opposed to the attempt to legitimize, through a General Assembly resolution, documents prepared by a group of non-governmental organizations when those documents had not been discussed at the intergovernmental level. Her delegation fully supported the idea of harmonizing the methods and standards for international election observation, as set out in paragraph 13 of the draft resolution.

62. Should the amendments be deemed unacceptable by the sponsors of the draft resolution, she would request a recorded vote.

63. **The Chair** said that the proposed amendments would be considered one by one. He noted that the draft amendment contained in document [A/C.3/72/L.64](#) had no programme budget implications.

64. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Burundi, China, Malawi, Nicaragua, Timor-Leste and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined the sponsors.

65. **Ms. Eckels-Currie** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation would vote against the amendment proposed by the delegation of the Russian Federation. The resolution, throughout which the importance of sovereignty and non-interference had already been sufficiently highlighted, was not and had never been primarily about election observation missions, and election observation was not the mission of the Electoral Assistance Division. The amendment inappropriately drew attention away from the important focus on States respecting the will of the people and upholding the rule of law in the conduct of elections, and could undermine the ability of the Division to provide technical assistance to States upon their request.

66. **Mr. Jürgenson** (Estonia), speaking on behalf of the European Union in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the member States of the European Union opposed the draft amendments and supported the resolution as drafted. They called on all other States committed to the protection and promotion of human rights to do likewise.

67. The draft resolution underlined the importance of regional instruments and, as stated in the preamble to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, freedoms were best maintained by an effective political democracy. The draft resolution stressed the importance of respecting the free will of voters as expressed in free and fair elections, which was a principle enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

68. **Ms. Kirianoff Crimmins** (Switzerland), speaking on behalf of Australia, Canada, Iceland, New Zealand, Norway, Liechtenstein and Switzerland in explanation of vote before the voting, said that those countries strongly supported draft resolution [A/C.3/72/L.23](#) and were of the view that, since the draft resolution already covered the issue of election observation, the three amendments were not needed. Election observation was important for improving the quality of elections,

building the confidence of societies, detecting and deterring errors or fraud and protecting the rights of participants, as duly reflected in the draft resolution. Those countries fully supported the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of Conduct for International Election Observers. They also supported the participation of civil society organizations in United Nations mechanisms and believed that the contributions of such organizations could improve international electoral observation missions. Australia, Canada, Iceland, New Zealand, Norway, Liechtenstein and Switzerland would vote against the three amendments.

69. **Mr. Ramírez Carreño** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that it was important for the draft resolution to establish that representatives of Member States must participate in the elaboration of the standards, principles and rules of electoral observation. In addition, the role of Governments, in which the sovereignty of the people resided, must take precedence over that of any organization.

70. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment contained in document A/C.3/72/L.64.*

In favour:

Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Congo, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Palau, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa,

San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen.

Abstaining:

Angola, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Paraguay, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Vanuatu.

71. *The amendment contained in document A/C.3/72/L.64 was rejected by 79 votes to 39, with 32 abstentions.*

72. **The Chair** drew attention to the amendment contained in document A/C.3/72/L.65 and noted that it had no programme budget implications.

73. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Burundi, China, Nicaragua and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined the sponsors.

74. **Ms. Eckels-Currie** (United States of America) said that her delegation would vote against the amendment proposed by the delegation of the Russian Federation. The resolution, throughout which the importance of sovereignty and non-interference had already been sufficiently highlighted, was not and had never been primarily about election observation missions, and election observation was not the mission of the Electoral Assistance Division. The amendment inappropriately drew attention away from the important focus on States' respecting the will of the people and upholding the rule of law in the conduct of elections and could undermine the ability of the Division to provide technical assistance to States upon their request.

75. **Mr. Ramírez Carreño** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that the draft amendment was an important means of guaranteeing that election observation missions did not interfere in States' internal affairs. The principle that the country concerned should be involved in any United Nations operation applied to any kind of initiative. During over 23 elections in his country, there had always been international observers, including from the regional organizations Union of South American Nations and the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States. As a matter of principle, however, such organizations had always adapted to the national legislation and respected the principle of non-interference.

76. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment contained in document A/C.3/72/L.65.*

In favour:

Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Congo, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Malaysia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Palau, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen.

Abstaining:

Angola, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Paraguay, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Vanuatu.

77. *The amendment contained in document A/C.3/72/L.65 was rejected by 77 votes to 40, with 29 abstentions.*

78. **The Chair** drew attention to the amendment contained in document [A/C.3/72/L.66](#) and noted that it had no programme budget implications.

79. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that China, Nicaragua and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined the sponsors.

80. **Ms. Eckels-Currie** (United States of America) said that her delegation had requested a vote on the amendment proposed by the delegation of the Russian Federation, which sought to delete what had been consensus language for years, and would vote against it. Paragraph 13 called for the harmonizing of methods and standards on election observation and merely expressed appreciation for the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of Conduct for International Election Observers, which had been endorsed by the African Union, the European Commission, the Organization of American States and many other organizations. She urged delegations to vote against the amendment, as they had done in previous years.

81. **Ms. Mozolina** (Russian Federation) recalled that her delegation had proposed equivalent amendments in previous years, explaining its position each time. The delegation of the United States should respect the position of delegations that supported the amendment and find a solution for the text of paragraph 13. That delegation had staunchly refused to engage in any negotiations on that paragraph, and it was doubtful whether such an approach could be called consensual.

82. **Ms. Eckels-Currie** (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, asked whether the sponsor of a draft amendment could make a general statement with regard to the amendment.

83. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that, under the rules of procedure, the sponsor of a draft amendment could make a general statement.

84. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment contained in document A/C.3/72/L.66.*

In favour:

Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, China, Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus,

Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Palau, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen.

Abstaining:

Angola, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guinea, Guyana, India, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Paraguay, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Singapore, South Africa, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago.

85. *The amendment contained in document A/C.3/72/L.66 was rejected by 88 votes to 25, with 34 abstentions.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.23: Strengthening the role of the United Nations in enhancing periodic and genuine elections and the promotion of democratization

86. **The Chair** said that the representative of the Russian Federation had requested a vote on the draft resolution.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

87. **Mr. Sandberg** (Norway) said that his country underscored the importance of the support in the draft resolution for the Electoral Assistance Division, which provided critical assistance to requesting States in implementing their commitments to holding democratic elections. Norway appreciated that the draft resolution stressed the role of regional and subregional organizations, which were key partners of the United Nations in providing electoral assistance to States. It was also pleased that the draft resolution highlighted the need for political leaders to foster an environment in which all citizens, regardless of their political affiliation, had the motivation, incentive, right and opportunity to continue to participate in democratic

processes and express their views. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution.

88. **Mr. Chu** (China) announced that China was abstaining from voting on resolution [A/C.3/72/L.23](#). There were many forms of democracy around the world and there did not exist a one-size-fits-all model of democracy. The form of democracy and the political system of each country should be in harmony with its current realities and be grounded in its history, culture and stage of development. One country importing wholesale the model of democracy of another would not help the former to achieve stability and sustainable development. Non-interference in the affairs of other countries was a principle in the Charter of the United Nations and should be at the foundation of all United Nations resolutions. Unfortunately, that principle had not incorporated in the draft resolution by its sponsors. China would adhere to its own interpretation of the draft resolution and would not accept any content that might contradict its domestic practices.

89. **Ms. Matlhako** (South Africa) said that the omission in the draft resolution of the inextricability of economic development and the process of democratization reflected the inadequacies of the text. States committed to the process of democratization should not have to choose between printing ballot papers and feeding starving children; those States, with the support of the international community, should instead be transitioning towards achieving both simultaneously and without prejudice to economic, social and cultural rights. It was regrettable that her delegation's proposal in that regard had not been accommodated in the final text. Her delegation would continue to engage on equivalent resolutions in the future, with the hope that the priority issue would be given the attention it deserved and that the requisite balance would be brought to the text to ensure that all States committed to the process of democratization could make the transition regardless of their developmental status.

90. **Ms. Mozolina** (Russian Federation) said that free elections were a key element of the political life of all States. International assistance in the monitoring of elections should therefore be focused on protecting and promoting electoral rights and freedoms, helping States to fulfil their international obligations to hold democratic elections and referendums, and supporting sustainable democratic institutions and the rule of law. While her delegation supported the majority of the elements contained in the draft resolution, it firmly condemned interference in the internal affairs of States, including in elections. It fully supported and would continue to support the provision of assistance in organizing and holding elections to interested States. It

was disappointed by the reluctance of the authors of the draft resolution to reach a compromise and listen to the positions of other delegations. Her delegation could not agree in particular to the universalization of the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of Conduct for International Election Observers through a General Assembly resolution. It hoped that, in future, the delegation of the United States, as the main sponsor, would remember that the draft resolution was important to all Member States and would therefore take into account the positions of all States concerned.

91. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.23.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Angola, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe.

92. *Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.23 was adopted by 148 votes to 0, with 14 abstentions.*

93. **Mr. Chang** (Singapore) said that his country recognized the importance of fair, periodic and genuine elections and was committed to ensuring the full and effective participation of all citizens, including persons with disabilities. With reference to paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, under the law of Singapore, in order to keep voting secret and safeguard the integrity of elections, persons with disabilities could, upon their request, be assisted but only by presiding officers, who were obliged to mark the ballot paper as directed by the voter and to keep the vote secret.

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.24: International Day of Remembrance of and Tribute to the Victims of Terrorism

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

95. **Mr. Rasuli** (Afghanistan) introduced the draft resolution and expressed his hope that it would be adopted by consensus, as other resolutions on international days had been.

96. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had joined the sponsors: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Montenegro, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Sudan, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam.

97. *Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.24 was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.