



General Assembly

Seventy-sixth session

53rd plenary meeting
Thursday, 16 December 2021, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

President: Mr. Shahid (Maldives)

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Reports of the Third Committee

The President: The General Assembly will consider the reports of the Third Committee on agenda items 28, 29, 65, 69 to 74, 108 to 110, 122 and 139.

I now request the Rapporteur of the Committee, Ms. Maria-Iuliana Niculae of Romania, to introduce the reports of the Committee in one intervention.

Ms. Niculae (Romania), Rapporteur of the Third Committee: It is an honour for me to introduce today to the General Assembly the reports of the Third Committee on the agenda items allocated to it by the Assembly at its seventy-sixth session, namely, items 28, 29, 65, 69 to 74, 108 to 110, 122 and 139.

It has been an intense session this year. During its main part, the Third Committee held 16 plenary meetings and — pursuant to the organization of work adopted at its first meeting and taking into account the prevailing conditions relating to the coronavirus disease on the working arrangements for its seventy-sixth session — the Committee also convened 29 virtual informal meetings to hear introductory statements from 65 special procedures mandate-holders, chairs of treaty bodies and other experts and 15 senior United Nations officials, as well as hold interactive dialogues on the agenda items. A total of 1,184 interventions were delivered by delegations during the interactive dialogues, and 230 informal consultations were held on the virtual platform provided by the Secretariat for the negotiation of draft proposals.

Finally, The Third Committee adopted a total of 62 draft resolutions, 18 of which were adopted by recorded vote, and one draft decision.

The reports, contained in documents A/76/454 to A/76/465, A/76/468 and A/76/469, include the texts of draft proposals recommended to the General Assembly for adoption.

For the convenience of delegations, a checklist of action taken in the Committee has been prepared by the Secretariat as contained in document A/C.3/76/INF/1, in English only.

Under agenda item 28, entitled “Social development”, and its sub-items (a) and (b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 51 of document A/76/454, the adoption of 10 draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 29, entitled “Advancement of women”, and its sub-items (a) and (b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 21 of document A/76/455, the adoption of three draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 65, entitled “Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 15 of document A/76/456, the adoption of two draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 69, entitled “Report of the Human Rights Council”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 12 of document A/76/457, the adoption of one draft resolution.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).



Under agenda item 70, entitled “Promotion and protection of the rights of children”, and its subitems (a) and (b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 15 of document A/76/458, the adoption of two draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 71, entitled “Rights of indigenous peoples”, and its sub-items (a) and (b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 10 of document A/76/459, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda item 72, entitled “Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance”, and its sub-items (a) and (b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 19 of document A/76/460, the adoption of two draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 73, entitled “Right of peoples to self-determination”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 20 of document A/76/461, the adoption of three draft resolutions.

Under the chapeau of agenda item 74, entitled “Promotion and protection of human rights”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 11 of document A/76/462, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under sub-item (a) of agenda item 74, entitled “Implementation of human rights instruments”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 11 of document A/76/462/Add.1, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under sub-item (b) of agenda item 74, entitled “Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 114 of document A/76/462/Add.2, the adoption of 23 draft resolutions.

In connection with draft resolution XIX, entitled “Countering disinformation for the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms”, I will make the following oral revision to operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. The comma in the second line of the paragraph following the words “the dissemination of disinformation” would be deleted. The latter part of operative paragraph 4 would therefore read:

“... the dissemination of disinformation which undermines the promotion of peace and cooperation”,

without the comma.

Under sub-item (c) of agenda item 74, entitled “Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 34 of document A/76/462/Add.3, the adoption of five draft resolutions.

Under sub-item (d) of agenda item 74, entitled “Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action”, the Third Committee wishes to advise the Assembly that no action was required under the item.

Under agenda item 108, entitled “Crime prevention and criminal justice”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 26 of document A/76/463, the adoption of seven draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 109, entitled “Countering the use of information and communications technologies for criminal purposes”, the Third Committee wishes to advise the Assembly that no action was required under the item.

Under agenda item 110, entitled “International drug control”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 10 of document A/76/465, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda item 122, entitled “Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 6 of document A/76/468, the adoption of one draft decision.

Under agenda item 139, entitled “Programme planning”, the Third Committee wishes to advise the Assembly that no action was required under the item.

I take this opportunity to acknowledge the commendable and wise leadership of our Chair, His Excellency Mohamed Siad Doualeh, the Permanent Representative of Djibouti to the United Nations, and to thank my other fellow Bureau members, the Vice-Chairs, namely, Mr. Joongil Shin of the Republic of Korea; Mrs. Devita Abraham of Trinidad and Tobago; and Ms. Hanne Carlé of Belgium.

I would further like to thank, on behalf of the Bureau, the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Ziad Mahmassani, and his able team from the Department of General Assembly and Conference Management, Mina, Wannes, Catalina, Paolo and Yasmine, for the support and guidance provided to the Bureau and to delegations, as well as the other offices in the Secretariat that supported the work of the Committee.

Finally, I am grateful to all Third Committee experts for their hard work, cooperation, constructive spirit and support for the Bureau.

The President: I thank the Rapporteur of the Third Committee for her introductions.

On behalf of the General Assembly, I would also like to thank His Excellency Mohamed Siad Doualeh, Permanent Representative of Djibouti to the United Nations and Chair of the Third Committee, members of the Bureau and all representatives for the work accomplished during this session.

The positions of delegations regarding the recommendations of the Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records. Therefore, if there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the reports of the Committee which are before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The President: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote. May I remind members that in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee and that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats. When there are multiple proposals under an agenda item, statements in explanation of vote before the vote on any or all of them should be made in one intervention, followed by action on all of them, one by one. Thereafter, there will also be an opportunity for statements in explanation of vote after the vote on any or all of them in one intervention.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendations contained in the reports of the Committee, I would like to advise representatives that we are going to proceed to take decisions in the same manner as was done in the Committee, unless the Secretariat is notified otherwise in advance.

That means that where recorded votes were taken, we will do the same. I should also hope that we may proceed to adopt without a vote those recommendations that were adopted without a vote in the Committee.

The results of the voting will be uploaded on the e-deleGATE portal, under "Plenary Announcements".

I would like to draw the attention of members to a note by the Secretariat entitled "List of proposals contained in the reports of the Third Committee for consideration by the General Assembly", which has been issued as document A/C.3/76/INF/1.

Members are reminded that additional co-sponsors are no longer accepted now that draft resolutions and decisions have been adopted in the Committee. Any clarification about co-sponsorship in the Committee reports should be addressed to the Secretary of the Committee.

Furthermore, any corrections to the voting intention of delegations after the voting has concluded on a proposal should be addressed directly to the Secretariat after the meeting. I count on members' cooperation in avoiding any interruptions to our proceedings in that regard.

Agenda item 28 (continued)

Social development

(a) Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly

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

Report of the Third Committee (A/76/454)

The President: The Assembly has before it 10 draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 51 of its report.

We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to X, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled "Persons with albinism". The Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 76/130).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations Volunteers programme and twentieth anniversary of the

International Year of Volunteers”. The Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 76/131).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled “Addressing the challenges of persons living with a rare disease and their families”. The Committee adopted draft resolution III without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 76/132).

The President: Draft resolution IV is entitled “Inclusive policies and programmes to address homelessness, including in the aftermath of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19)”. The Committee adopted draft resolution IV without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 76/133).

The President: Draft resolution V is entitled “Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, 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, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, 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, 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, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

None

Draft resolution V was adopted by 184 votes to 2 (resolution 76/134).

The President: Draft resolution VI is entitled “Cooperatives in social development”. The Committee adopted draft resolution VI without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 76/135).

The President: Draft resolution VII is entitled “Promoting social integration through social inclusion”. The Committee adopted draft resolution VII without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 76/136).

The President: Draft resolution VIII is entitled “Policies and programmes involving youth”. The

Committee adopted draft resolution VIII without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution VIII was adopted (resolution 76/137).

The President: Draft resolution IX is entitled “Follow-up to the Second World Assembly on Ageing”. The Committee adopted draft resolution IX without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution IX was adopted (resolution 76/138).

The President: Draft resolution X is entitled “Preparations for and observance of the thirtieth anniversary of the International Year of the Family”. The Committee adopted draft resolution X without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution X was adopted (resolution 76/139).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 28 and its sub-items (a) and (b)?

It was so decided.

The President: The Assembly has before it three draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 21 of its report.

We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to III, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled “Improvement of the situation of women and girls in rural areas”. The Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 76/140).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled “Violence against women migrant workers”. The Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 76/141).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled “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”. The Committee adopted draft resolution III without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 76/142).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 29 and its sub-items (a) and (b)?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 65 (*continued*)

Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions

Report of the Third Committee (A/76/456)

The President: The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 15 of its report.

I now give the floor to the representative of Finland, who has asked to speak in explanation of vote or position before action is taken on draft resolutions I and II.

Ms. Schroderus-Nevalainen (Finland): The omnibus resolution on the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner (UNHCR) for refugees is an annual resolution supporting the humanitarian and non-political mandate of UNHCR. It deals with the common ground that enables UNHCR to work in the interests of us all and, most essentially, for the benefit of those forcibly displaced.

This year it has been Finland’s privilege to facilitate the negotiations in Geneva and to present the draft resolution to the Third Committee and the General Assembly here in New York. I wish to give this statement on behalf of the Nordic countries: Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and my own country, Finland.

After last year’s technical rollover due to the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, we saw a return to substantial negotiations. Our colleagues in Geneva worked very hard to reach an agreement on several key issues, some of which are delicate and difficult. I wish to thank all participating Member States for their cooperation and contributions.

The draft resolution reiterates the strong call for international solidarity and burden- and responsibility-sharing in accordance with the global compact on refugees. It affirms the commitment to ensure international protection to all in need and the

importance of working towards durable solutions for persons of concern to UNHCR.

The text has a number of new elements, for example, response to COVID-19 and climate change, gender issues, the situation and participation of internally displaced persons and the need to fight the abuse of asylum systems. The draft resolution received strong and solid support from an overwhelming majority of Member States across all regions, which was made evident in its adoption by the Third Committee last month. We are very pleased that 81 countries have co-sponsored it.

It is therefore regrettable that a vote has been requested for a draft resolution that has traditionally enjoyed broad cross-regional support and been adopted by consensus. Unfortunately, we have seen a departure from that tradition in recent years. In a situation where humanitarian needs continue to grow and the number of persons of concern to UNCR is projected to reach 100 million soon, we need more unity and solidarity. I urge all Member States to support the important work of UNHCR and vote in favour of this draft resolution.

The President: We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I and II, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled “Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland,

Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, 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, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Eritrea, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Libya, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution I was adopted by 180 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 76/143).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled “Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa”. The Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 76/144).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 65?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 69 (continued)**Report of the Human Rights Council****Report of the Third Committee (A/76/457)**

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 12 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, 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-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, 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, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea, 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, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, 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

The draft resolution was adopted by 118 votes to 2, with 61 abstentions (resolution 76/145).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 69?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 70**Promotion and protection of the rights of children****Report of the Third Committee (A/76/458)**

The President: The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 15.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolutions I and II, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled "The girl child". The Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 76/146).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Rights of the child". The Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 76/147).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 70 and its sub-items (a) and (b)?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 71**Rights of indigenous peoples****Report of the Third Committee (A/76/459)**

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 10 of its report.

The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 76/148).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 71 and its sub-items (a) and (b)?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 72**Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance****Report of the Third Committee (A/76/460)**

The President: The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 19 of its report.

Before proceeding further, I should like to inform members that action on draft resolution II, entitled "A global call for concrete action for the elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and the comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action", is postponed to a later date to allow time for the review of its programme budget implications by the Fifth Committee.

The Assembly will take action on draft resolution II as soon as the report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications is available.

We will now take a decision on draft resolution I, entitled "Combating glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Ukraine, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tonga, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution I was adopted by 130 votes to 2, with 49 abstentions (resolution 76/149).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (a) of agenda item 72?

It was so decided.

The President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 72 and its sub-item (b).

Agenda item 73

Right of peoples to self-determination

Report of the Committee (A/76/461)

The President: The Assembly has before it three draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 20 of its report.

We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to III, one by one.

We first turn to draft resolution I, entitled “The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, 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, Guinea-Bissau, 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, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, 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, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Australia, Cameroon, Honduras, Kiribati, Lithuania, Palau, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, South Sudan, Tonga

Draft resolution I was adopted by 168 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions (resolution 76/150).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled “Use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba,

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Colombia, Liberia, Mexico, Palau, Switzerland, Tonga

Draft resolution II was adopted by 128 votes to 52, with 6 abstentions (resolution 76/151).

The President: We now turn to draft resolution III, entitled "Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination". The Committee adopted it

without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 76/152).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 73?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 74

Promotion and protection of human rights

Report of the Third Committee (A/76/462)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 11 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution, entitled "The human rights to safe drinking water and sanitation". The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 76/153).

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments

Report of the Third Committee (A/76/462/Add.1)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 11 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Optional Protocol thereto: participation". The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 76/154).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (a) of agenda item 74?

It was so decided.

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective

enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms

Report of the Third Committee (A/76/462/Add.2)

The President: The Assembly has before it 23 draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 114 of its report.

Before proceeding further, I should like to inform members that action on draft resolution XIX, entitled “Countering disinformation for the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms”, as orally revised, is postponed to a later date to allow time for the review of its programme budget implications by the Fifth Committee.

The Assembly will take action on draft resolution XIX, as orally revised, as soon as the report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications is available.

The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolutions, one by one.

We first turn to draft resolution I, entitled “United Nations Human Rights Training and Documentation Centre for South-West Asia and the Arab Region”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, 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, Guinea-Bissau, 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, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Draft resolution I was adopted by 185 votes to 1, with 1 abstention (resolution 76/155).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled “Freedom of religion or belief”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 76/156).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled “Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping, stigmatization, discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against persons, based on religion or belief”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 76/157).

The President: Draft resolution IV is entitled “International Convention for the Protection of

All Persons from Enforced Disappearance”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 76/158).

The President: Draft resolution V is entitled “Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 76/159).

The President: Draft resolution VI is entitled “Promotion of equitable geographical distribution in the membership of the human rights treaty bodies”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United

Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

None

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 130 votes to 52 (resolution 76/160).

The President: Draft resolution VII is entitled “Human rights and unilateral coercive measures”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives,

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

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

None

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 131 votes to 54 (resolution 76/161).

The President: Draft resolution VIII is entitled “Human rights and cultural diversity”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon,

Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

None

Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 131 votes to 55 (resolution 76/162).

The President: Draft resolution IX is entitled “The right to development”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Cyprus, Georgia, Greece, Iceland, Ireland,

Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovenia, Spain, Uruguay

Draft resolution IX was adopted by 131 votes to 24, with 29 abstentions (resolution 76/163).

The President: Draft resolution X is entitled "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". The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution X was adopted (resolution 76/164).

The President: Draft resolution XI is entitled "Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone,

Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Armenia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Liberia, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay

Draft resolution XI was adopted by 124 votes to 54, with 9 abstentions (resolution 76/165).

The President: Draft resolution XII is entitled “The right to food”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, 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, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, 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, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

None

Draft resolution XII was adopted by 186 votes to 2 (resolution 76/166).

The President: Draft resolution XIII is entitled “Protection of and assistance to internally displaced persons”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XIII was adopted (resolution 76/167).

The President: Draft resolution XIV is entitled “Effective promotion of the Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XIV was adopted (resolution 76/168).

The President: Draft resolution XV is entitled “Terrorism and human rights”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XV was adopted (resolution 76/169).

The President: Draft resolution XVI is entitled “National human rights institutions”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XVI was adopted (resolution 76/170).

The President: Draft resolution XVII is entitled “Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XVII was adopted (resolution 76/171).

The President: Draft resolution XVIII is entitled “Protection of migrants”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XVIII was adopted (resolution 76/172).

The President: Draft resolution XX is entitled “The safety of journalists and the issue of impunity”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XX was adopted (resolution 76/173).

The President: Draft resolution XXI is entitled “Implementing the Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms

through providing a safe and enabling environment for human rights defenders and ensuring their protection, including in the context of and recovery from the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XXI was adopted (resolution 76/174).

The President: Draft resolution XXII is entitled “Ensuring equitable, affordable, timely and universal access for all countries to vaccines in response to the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, 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, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, 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, 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

Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Armenia, Australia, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution XXII was adopted by 179 votes to none, with 7 abstentions (resolution 76/175).

The President: Draft resolution XXIII is entitled “Strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XXIII was adopted (resolution 76/176).

The President: I shall now give the floor to those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position after adoption.

Mr. Kuzmin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Allow me to explain the position of the Russian Federation with regard to resolution 76/176, entitled “Strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections”.

We welcome the attempt of the text’s author, the United States delegation, to address the crucial issue of democratic electoral processes. We underscore the importance of international cooperation in order to organize universal, direct, periodic and genuine elections. The provisions of the resolution noting the leading role of States in the organization of elections based on national legislation and their international

obligations is commendable. We agree with the United States delegation that unconstitutional and illegal interference in the actions of representative bodies is unacceptable. Similarly, we echo the resolution in condemning the removal from power of democratically elected officials, as was the case in 2014 in Ukraine, for example. All of those passages are correct.

Although the authors ignored a number of constructive proposals during the negotiations, the document certainly had the potential of being adopted by consensus. We therefore wonder why the co-penholders decided to include the subject of sexual orientation and gender identity, as well as women in all their diversity. Why impose concepts and definitions that are not universally recognized at the international level? What does this phenomenon of personality have to do with the issue of electoral processes? Do voters in the United States need to confirm their sexual orientation when collecting their ballots? Unfortunately, filling documents with artificial, contrived problems in order to advance national agenda is a common phenomenon in Third Committee draft resolutions, and we cannot support that approach.

My delegation is therefore forced to dissociate itself from the consensus on the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 7.

Mr. Pilipenko (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): The Republic of Belarus acknowledges the importance and relevance of the subject of resolution 76/176 and shares the lofty aims and principles enshrined in that document.

In previous years, my delegation traditionally supported the consensus and always voted in favour of the resolution. Unfortunately, this year, for the first time, the Republic of Belarus cannot fully support the resolution, the text of which is extremely imbalanced and full of contradictory and vague wording that shifts the focus of the document in favour of aggressively advancing concepts that are not agreed and have not been adopted at the international level.

Belarus is also deeply disappointed in the way in which the negotiation process on the resolution’s text was conducted. Requests and appeals from individual countries to have their national interests taken into account were not heeded and, possibly, even intentionally ignored. The results of the vote in the Third Committee on the oral amendments submitted on behalf of a group of States, including Belarus, clearly

show that there is a lack of consensus among Member States on this problematic terminology. The use in United Nations documents of this wording not only does not enjoy the broad support of Member States, but it also undermines the unity of nations and the principle of multilateralism.

We firmly urge partners to show respect and understanding for the positions of other Member States and to avoid using in intergovernmental documents terminology that leads to division among Member States, in order to achieve consensus in the General Assembly, which becomes increasingly difficult with every passing year.

The subject of elections is the foundation of the normal functioning of all democratic States and is too valuable to treat the texts of relevant resolutions so carelessly and irresponsibly. Belarus remains committed to the subject of strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections and stands ready to continue to cooperate constructively with all those interested in advancing this subject.

In order to demonstrate our lack of agreement with the approaches used by the text's authors, Belarus is forced to dissociate itself from the resolution.

Ms. Arab Bafrani (Islamic Republic of Iran): The Islamic Republic of Iran has joined the consensus on the resolution entitled "Strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections", which was just adopted as resolution 76/176.

My Government is committed to the principles of human rights and democracy, which has been demonstrated in its respect for human rights and the promotion of democracy through the holding of fair, inclusive and genuine elections. Article 6 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran stipulates that the affairs of the country must be administered on the basis of public opinion expressed through elections. We are responsible for the full and equal participation of our citizens, particularly women, girls and persons with disabilities, in elections.

The Islamic Republic of Iran joined the consensus on resolution 76/176. However, the language contained in the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 7, namely, "women in all their diversity" and "sexual orientation and gender identity", is controversial

and not agreed United Nations language. Accordingly, the Islamic Republic of Iran disassociates itself from those two paragraphs.

Mr. Shahin (Egypt): We have always been a strong supporter of this resolution, and we join in the consensus on it this year (resolution 76/176). We voted in favour of the resolution in the past, when voting was requested, and co-sponsored it without interruption starting with the seventieth session of the General Assembly. Unfortunately, we were not able to co-sponsor the resolution at this session because of the controversial language in the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 7.

We fully support the objectives of the resolution and stress the importance of the United Nations role in enhancing elections and thereby promoting democratization. In addition, Egypt reaffirms its commitment to combating all forms of discrimination, stereotyping, intolerance and related violence directed against all individuals without discrimination whatsoever, including against citizens in the exercise of their right to participate in public affairs. Nevertheless, Egypt strongly rejects any attempt to undermine the international human rights system by imposing vague concepts pertaining to cultural and social matters, including private individual conduct, which fall outside the internationally agreed human rights framework. Such attempts constitute an expression of disregard for the universality of human rights and disrespect for cultural and social norms.

My delegation joined many Member States in proposing amendments in the Third Committee to delete the controversial language in the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 7. This move came after all efforts to engage during the consultation constructively failed. The amendments to delete the terms "women in all their diversity" and "sexual orientation and gender identity" in the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 7, respectively, garnered the support of 58 countries, representing millions if not billions of people in the world who demand respect for their value system and are asking to be allowed to exercise their right to develop at their own pace and according to their own will, just like everyone else. This large number of countries supporting the amendments that sought to delete the controversial language should have been perceived as a solid and unmistakable message as to the non-consensual nature of this language. These

amendments should have been understood as a plea for reason to prevail and wisdom to take the lead.

My delegation therefore expresses its reservations on and dissociates itself from the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 7. We categorically reject using non-agreed terms. We will not accept them as agreed language. Furthermore, my delegation notes that it understands the term “human rights defenders” as defined in the context of the Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, under resolution 53/144.

Mr. Sadnovic (Indonesia): I would like to make the following statement in explanation of our position on the resolution just adopted (resolution 76/176).

Indonesia joined the consensus in adopting the resolution since we believe that democracy is key to building lasting peace and achieving sustainable development. As the world’s third largest democracy, we are proud to have developed a notable track record for organizing free, fair and peaceful elections. However, we would like to express our concern that the resolution contains a term that lacks an internationally agreed definition, namely, “women in all their diversity”, even when some countries have expressed their reservations about such language and have proposed a constructive way forward.

Indonesia also reaffirms the obligation of all States to take all appropriate measures to ensure that every citizen has the effective right and opportunity to participate in elections on an equal basis. However, we also regret the introduction of the reference to “sexual orientation and gender identity” in operative paragraph 7 and would like to voice our reservation with regard to this term, as this too is not agreed language. We regret that amendments to make the text more consensual without affecting the core objective of the resolution could not be adopted.

Moving forward, Indonesia believes that the resolution needs to be focused on strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing genuine and periodic elections and that it should steer away from controversial elements that do not enjoy wide support from Member States.

Mrs. Xu Daizhu (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): With regard to resolution 76/176, on strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections, would like hereby to speak in explanation of our vote.

Democracy is the shared value of humankind. China supports the United Nations in providing technical support and assistance to Member States upon their request for the holding of their democratic elections. However, it must be pointed out that while this resolution called for the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization, the way the penholder conducted negotiations was regrettably anything but democratic and stood in stark contrast to the purposes of the resolution.

The penholder insisted on using non-consensual language in many parts of the draft resolution, while the sound proposals advanced repeatedly by China and many other countries were ignored by the penholder. It was precisely due to the unfair, non-transparent and non-constructive manner in which the negotiations were held that Member States failed to reach an agreement on the draft.

China stresses once again that “human rights defenders” as a term does not have an internationally agreed, nationally recognized and legally based definition. Countries have different views with regard to who can be referred to as a human rights defender. China is opposed to introducing concepts in a draft resolution for which there is no consensus within the United Nations, and it opposes the use of the term “human rights defender”. We call upon the penholder to adopt an open, inclusive and democratic approach when conducting future negotiations so as to facilitate an agreement among the parties.

Mr. Al-Mouallimi (Saudi Arabia): (*spoke in Arabic*): In our civilized world, attempts by certain States to adopt a non-democratic approach in order to impose values and concepts that are disputed internationally are unacceptable. Attempts by those States to adopt commitments on sexual orientation and sexual identity in accordance with paragraph 7 of resolution 76/176, which was adopted today, are also unacceptable. We reject these provisions because they contradict the basic rules of international law, as well as the United Nations Charter, which underlines the importance of respecting the sovereignty of States and their domestic regulations and legislation. We also

reject them because they run counter to the essence of democracy, which is based on respecting the opinion of others and the non-imposition of values and concepts that are not accepted by other societies. Otherwise there would be no difference between the ideal model of democracy and that of authoritarianism, which is based on hegemony and monopolizing the truth.

God created man and woman, male and female. Anything else would contradict what God has created on Earth. The imposition of values and concepts that do not fit with God's creation is rejected by the countries whose culture, religious identity, habits and traditions reject those values and concepts.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia emphasizes its steadfast position with regard to sexual identity and orientation, which are concepts with which we do not agree because they contravene our historical Arab and Islamic identities. These concepts also contravene laws and legislation of many States Members of the United Nations. We therefore express our rejection of and reservations with respect to the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 7 of resolution 76/176.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and other brotherly and friendly countries tried to negotiate a removal from the text of the resolution of references to sexual identity and orientation that appeared in an extraneous and imposed paragraph that was not agreed upon in previous resolutions. Logically, there should not be such a paragraph in the resolution. Democracy does not ask voters for their sexual identity. This subject has no link at all with the concept of democracy and its meanings.

Unfortunately, we were not able to get a reasonable response to our attempts on this issue. In that context, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia firmly believes that each State has the right to adopt laws and legislation that are consistent with the moral values of its society, culture and religious identity. Since those who proposed resolution 76/176 ignored our steadfast position on these very sensitive terms and concepts in the text of the resolution, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia expresses its reservation with regard to both the relevant paragraphs and the resolution as a whole.

Mr. Abd Aziz (Malaysia): Malaysia is committed to promoting and protecting democratic institutions and democratic principles, as well as the rule of law with

regard to electoral processes, all of which is enshrined in the Malaysian Constitution.

Malaysia has in place a good system of governance that has served us well, and we seek to improve on and strengthen the system even further. As a young nation only 64 years old, Malaysia is continuously introducing democratic reforms. We recognize the need for a more inclusive and participatory system of governance. As a manifestation of this, Malaysia recently amended its Constitution to lower the voting age of citizens from 21 years to 18 years, and next year, Malaysians will no longer be required to register to vote, as registration will be automatic.

Malaysia has always been a strong supporter of resolution 76/176 and its predecessor resolutions. Prior to this year, Malaysia was one of the resolution's sponsors. Regrettably, with inclusion of non-consensual terms, Malaysia was not able to co-sponsor the resolution this year, as it had done in previous years.

My delegation would like to reiterate our reservations on and dissociate ourselves from the terms "women in all their diversity", in the ninth preambular paragraph, and "sexual orientation and gender identity", in operative paragraph 7, of the resolution, as previously mentioned, as these terms are vague, non-consensual and inconsistent with Malaysia's position. We too do not understand why these terms are relevant to the electoral process.

Notwithstanding my delegation's reservation, we have joined the consensus in adopting resolution 76/176, out of our earnest belief in democratic principles and in the larger spirit of the resolution.

Mr. Lam Padilla (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): Guatemala joins the consensus in the adoption of resolution 76/176, entitled "Strengthening the role of the United Nations in promoting democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections", because we recognize the importance of democracy as a universal value, and the respect for human rights and the rule of law as fundamental pillars of society.

We also recognize that men and women are equal in the right to enjoy all civil and political rights. Likewise, women should have equal access to political participation, as well as the same opportunities as men in terms of leadership and decision-making at all levels.

My delegation wishes to express that the State of Guatemala promotes and defends the human rights

recognized in the international covenants for all its citizens pursuant to the provisions of the country's Constitution and does not discriminate on any grounds. Likewise, we recognize the right of all persons to enjoy their fundamental freedoms.

However, that does not require altering the anthropological bases on which our system as a whole rests. Consequently, Guatemala dissociates itself from those parts of the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 7 that are incompatible with or contravene our current national legislation and recent public policy adopted for the protection of family and institutional life. Unfortunately, although we co-sponsored this resolution in the past, we are unable to co-sponsor it today because of the inclusion of the controversial language in those paragraphs.

Accordingly, we disassociate ourselves from the terms "women in all their diversity", "sexual orientation" and "gender identity" contained in the aforementioned paragraphs because they represent language that is not in accordance with international human rights law.

Ms. Shoman Khot (Jordan): My delegation would like to thank the delegation of the United States for resolution 76/176. Jordan joined the consensus and supports the resolution, as we firmly believe that the United Nations should play an important role in the promotion of democratic values and national governance, the rule of law and respect for the human and public rights of individuals.

However, we would like to express our reservation on the twenty-fifth preambular paragraph because it does not reflect international law or established State practice, as neither equates the right of citizens of a State to participation in public life with the rights of those who are born within a State's territory. A State is under no obligation under customary international law to grant nationality to an individual born on its territory or to grant him or her the same rights to participate in public life and political processes as its nationals.

With regard to the ninth preambular paragraph, Jordan will interpret it in accordance with its national laws and does not view itself to be bound by any expansive definition beyond its national laws.

Ms. Saleem (Pakistan): We take the floor to explain our position on resolution 76/176 following its adoption by consensus.

Free and fair elections are the cornerstone of the democratic process. In Pakistan, we have a robust parliamentary democracy, and free and fair elections are periodically held in the country. In recent years, the Government has taken significant steps to strengthen the democratic process and the holding of free and fair elections, including the recent introduction of electronic voting machines.

We thank the delegation of the United States for introducing this important resolution. However, we note with regret that despite expressed lack of agreement, non-consensual language and controversial terms that are not recognized under international human rights law were retained in the ninth preambular paragraph of the resolution and in its operative paragraph 7 of the resolution. These terms are also not recognized by the domestic laws of Pakistan.

While we fully support the resolution, my delegation will disassociate itself from the terms "women in all their diversity", in the ninth preambular paragraph, and "sexual orientation and gender identity", in operative paragraph 7, of the resolution.

Mr. Nze (Nigeria): Nigeria joined consensus on resolution 76/176 because we strongly support the resolution's goals and objectives, namely, to advance fair and free elections. However, it is unfortunate that this important resolution is being used to bring in controversial and non-consensual elements.

With regard to the terms "sexual orientation and gender identity" and "women in all their diversity", which are often interpreted to be the same, Nigeria opposes including this concept in a United Nations resolution, regardless of the context. It is on that basis that Nigeria, together with 18 other Member States called for amendments to the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 7 of the resolution, which unfortunately did not succeed.

As a member State of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, Nigeria aligned itself with its explanation of position on document A/HRC/41/L.10, which describes our views on sexual orientation and gender identity issues. Nigeria is concerned at the introduction into the work of the United Nations new concepts and notions that have no legal foundation in any traditional human rights framework. These notions contradict the fundamental universality of human rights. We are concerned by the introduction of cultural elements that are not universally agreed and represent a particular set

of values and lifestyles not accepted by the majority of societies and which directly impinge on the social, cultural and religious sensitivities of a number of Member States. While Nigeria, as a democratic State, supports the imperative of free and fair elections, it cannot accept any reference to non-consensual language and elements that are quite inimical to our national interests, values and positions.

Mr. Manalo (Philippines), Vice-President, took the Chair.

Finally, Nigeria's position should in no way be understood or interpreted to mean that Nigeria is opposing the general aims of resolution 76/176. We therefore dissociate ourselves from the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 7 of the resolution on the grounds of the introduction of language that has not been negotiated and which is even unnecessary to any consideration of the matter at hand.

I would like to reaffirm Nigeria's total commitment to granting full voting rights to all citizens of voting age without discrimination.

Mr. Ndiaye (Senegal) (*spoke in French*): Senegal reaffirms its commitment to democracy as the cornerstone for forming the basis of participation of all in political life. For Senegal, the holding of democratic, free and transparent elections contributes in large part to the democratic breathing space for and stability of our systems, while also giving an impetus for social development. This is why my country supports the contribution that international cooperation makes to reliable electoral processes.

My delegation supports the objectives of resolution 76/176 and has always done so in the past. However, my delegation joined the group that introduced the amendment in the Third Committee to express its opposition to the use of a number of non-approved terms, including "women in all their diversity", in the ninth preambular paragraph, and "sexual orientation and gender identity" in operative paragraph 7, of the resolution. Accordingly, we reiterate our desire to distance ourselves from these two paragraphs and all other terms used to carry the concepts of sexual orientation, gender identity and women "in all their diversity", which do not have widely accepted legal or scientific meaning, which in fact add nothing to the text as a whole, and which very often violate the specificities of many countries, including my own.

We do not agree with an interpretation of texts to include categories that are not yet legally accepted at the international level or that are not recognized in our national laws and policies, as that can also undermine the foundations of a nation united oriented towards harmonious development. We hope that in future the authors will show more openness and leave aside political motivations. We must also avoid falling into exclusive and useless references in all texts, because such use of language will only divide us more than it moves us towards what is essential.

Mr. Salah (Libya) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain our position on resolution 76/176, entitled "Strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections".

My country's delegation joined the consensus on the adoption of the resolution as it touches upon an important especially subject for my country, particularly at the moment, given that we are going to hold direct parliamentary and presidential elections. While my country counts a great deal on the United Nations role in this regard, that does not mean that we accept the controversial terms in the text of the resolution that do not add to its value, namely, the terms "women in their diversity" and "sexual orientation and gender identity". These terms cannot be explained in a context that fits with our cultural and religious identity or our national legislation. Accordingly, my delegation expresses its reservation with regard to the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 7 of the resolution.

Mr. Senbeta (Ethiopia): Ethiopia is committed to the principles and ideals of democratic elections. For that reason, we have joined the consensus on resolution 76/176. However, we would like to state for the record that Ethiopia dissociates itself from the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 7 of the resolution.

Ethiopia does not recognize nor is it bound by any reference made to sexual or gender diversity. Our commitment to eliminating discrimination and to ensuring equal participation is strong. Nevertheless, the language contained in the aforementioned paragraphs is non-consensual. I regret that a resolution that should have enjoyed absolute consensus has become controversial because of the use of such language. Any value imposed on our society is unacceptable, and we

expect this to be rectified in future consultations on similar resolutions.

Mr. Elbahi (Sudan) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation joined the consensus on resolution 76/176, entitled “Strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections”.

The Sudan stresses its support for the content of the original text of the resolution, and we would like to thank the United States delegation for introducing the draft and facilitating negotiations on it. However, my delegation disassociates itself from and expresses its reservations on the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 7 of the text, which contain controversial concepts that neither meet with consensus and nor fit with the cultural and religious values and the national legislation of my country.

Ms. Ali (Syrian Arab Republic): We take the floor in explanation of position after the adoption of resolution 76/176, entitled “Strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections”.

My delegation has always joined the consensus in the adoption of the resolution on that topic ever since its inception, based on its belief in the concepts contained therein. Unfortunately, that was not the case this year. Regardless of the objection of many countries, including my own country Syria, to the language contained in the ninth preambular paragraph and paragraph 7 of resolution 76/176, there has been an insistence on disregarding the concerns expressed by many delegations.

Both the ninth preambular paragraph and paragraph 7 of the resolution contain controversial terms of a fluid, ambiguous and subjective character, which should not be the case when seeking consensus. Furthermore, such language does not align with our national legislation. Therefore, we dissociate ourselves from the consensus on the ninth preambular paragraph and paragraph 7 of resolution 76/176.

Mr. Balobaid (Yemen) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, we would like to thank the United States delegation for proposing resolution 76/176. We joined the consensus on the resolution as a whole. However, we dissociate ourselves from the ninth preambular paragraph and paragraph 7 of resolution 76/176. We stress that the terms contained therein are not agreed

language and run counter to our national and religious legislation, traditions and culture, which is why we disassociate ourselves from them.

Mrs. Nabeta (Uganda): We would like to explain our position as follows. While Uganda supports the objectives of resolution 76/176, entitled “Strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections”, and also stresses the importance of the United Nations role in enhancing elections, Uganda has concerns over the use of non-agreed language, such as the use of the terms “in all their diversity” in the ninth preambular paragraph 7 and “sexual orientation and gender identity” in paragraph 7. Therefore, my delegation expresses its reservation and disassociates itself from the ninth preambular paragraph and paragraph 7 of resolution 76/176.

Mrs. Monica (Bangladesh): I am explaining our position on resolution 76/176, entitled “Strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections”, which was just adopted.

The delegation of Bangladesh strongly supports the objectives of resolution 76/176. As a democratic country, we recognize the importance of fair, periodic, inclusive and genuine elections in strengthening democratization and democratic transitions. We also commend the electoral assistance provided by the United Nations to Member States upon their request, while reaffirming that the responsibility to ensure transparent, free and fair elections lies with Member States themselves.

As such, our delegation has always been a consistent supporter of the resolution on this topic. However, we regret that resolution 76/176 as adopted this year contains, in its ninth preambular paragraph and paragraph 7, some language that is in conflict with our national laws.

Therefore, while we join the consensus on resolution 76/176 based on its spirit and substance, we disassociate ourselves from the terms that are contradictory to our national laws, including the terms “women in all their diversity” in the ninth preambular paragraph and “sexual orientation and gender identity” in paragraph 7.

Mr. Lungu (Zambia): Zambia supports the democratization and further deepening of all democratic values and has always remained committed to the further deepening of those values. In addition,

Zambia always supports the further deepening of all human rights and the further consolidation of human rights.

The President returned to the Chair.

However, Zambia disagrees with the language of resolution 76/176 with regard to sexual orientation as framed in its ninth preambular paragraph and paragraph 7. We wish to express our objection and our disassociation. We believe that such language does not enjoy international consensus and has no backing in legal or scientific authority. It is not in line with our constitutional provisions or norms.

Mr. Komara (Guinea) (*spoke in French*): We thank the delegation of the United States for initiating this very important resolution 76/176. We have always supported it in the past but regret that this year it includes non-agreed concepts, which could undermine our national identity and some of our international commitments, in particular within the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. For that reason, we would like to disassociate ourselves from the ninth preambular paragraph and paragraph 7 of resolution 76/176.

Ms. Charikhi (Algeria): My delegation takes the floor to provide an explanation of position on the adoption of resolution 76/176. We thank the delegation of the United States for presenting this important resolution.

My delegation joined the consensus on the resolution to reaffirm the commitment of Algeria to the promotion of democratic values and the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in enhancing periodic elections. Algeria supports the resolution and its objective of promoting the rule of law and international legality, based on the purposes and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Indeed, my delegation is, and will always be, committed to the promotion of the rule of law and democracy through periodic and genuine elections. That is why we supported the consensual adoption of the resolution, despite our opposition to the references to the terms “women in all their diversity” in its ninth preambular paragraph and “sexual orientation and gender identity” in its paragraph 7.

In that regard, the General Assembly may recall that the resolution was in the past adopted by consensus without reservations and that Algeria used to co-sponsor it. Unfortunately, because of the introduction for the first time of language and concepts that are not

commonly defined or agreed and that go against the religious and cultural values of many countries, including my own country, Algeria joined the list of co-sponsors of a proposed amendment to the ninth preambular paragraph and paragraph 7 of the resolution that would have deleted the non-agreed concepts related to the term “women in all their diversity” and replaced the language of paragraph 9 with the language agreed in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, in particular in target 10.2 of the Sustainable Development Goals, on the social, economic and political inclusion of all.

We believe that the use of consensual language in paragraph 7 without including a reference to sexual orientation and gender identity would have helped reach the necessary consensus and the full endorsement of resolution 76/176 by all Member States. We regret the introduction of such non-consensual references, which endangered and undermined the consensual nature of the resolution, ignoring the national laws and cultural and religious values of many countries.

For our part, we believe that a stronger and more holistic call for non-discrimination on any grounds, instead of using controversial concepts, would have achieved the objective of inclusivity without undermining the consensus on some paragraphs of the resolution.

For those reasons, my delegation expresses its reservations with regard to, and disassociates itself from, the ninth preambular paragraph and paragraph 7 of resolution 76/176, which are not in line with Algeria’s national laws and religious values. My delegation does not consider the references in those paragraphs to the terms “women in all their diversity” and “sexual orientation and gender identity”, to which my delegation is firmly opposed, as agreed language for future draft resolutions. Therefore, nothing in those paragraphs can be interpreted as tacit adherence by my country to the commitments set out in the paragraphs I mentioned. Algeria does not consider itself bound by the extensive interpretation given to those non-consensual references, which are not properly defined and are not in line with Algeria’s national law and religious and cultural values.

The President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of sub-item (b) of agenda item 74.

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

Report of the Committee (A/76/462/Add.3)

The President: The Assembly has before it five draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 34 of its report.

Before proceeding further, I should like to inform members that action on draft resolution V, entitled “Situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic”, is postponed to a later date to allow time for the review of its programme budget implications by the Fifth Committee. The Assembly will take action on draft resolution V as soon as the report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications is available.

I shall now give the floor to those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position before action is taken on draft resolutions I to IV.

Mr. Kim (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea strongly condemns and totally rejects draft resolution I, entitled “Situation of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea”, sponsored by the European Union, as a grave infringement upon the sovereignty of our State, as well as an intolerable politically motivated provocation against the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea.

Draft resolution I is nothing but a typical product of anti-Democratic People’s Republic of Korea hostile policy and double standards pursued by hostile forces, including the United States and the European Union. As such, it does not deserve any consideration at all.

Explicitly speaking, once again, the so-called “human rights issues” mentioned in the draft resolution neither exist nor can ever exist in our country, in which the people-first politics is fully embodied in State activities and all areas of social life.

The ongoing forcible adoption of draft resolution I this year clearly proves once again that there is no change in the impure schemes of the hostile forces aimed at interfering in internal affairs and overthrowing our social system under the pretext of human rights and its risk is growing more alarmingly than ever. Human rights are, after all, State rights for us.

The Democratic People’s Republic of Korea remains firmly committed to joining the international efforts

for the genuine promotion and protection of human rights in the future, too. But we will never tolerate any attempts to infringe on our sovereignty.

Furthermore, we will most sternly and resolutely respond to such hostile acts against the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea as the forcible adoption of draft resolution I.

The United States and the European Union, the worst human rights violators in the world, must give priority to addressing their horrible human rights situation at home rather than mess around with others’ non-existent human rights issues while acting as human rights judges.

In conclusion, my delegation rejects and will vote against all country-specific human rights draft resolutions against the Russian Federation, the Syrian Arab Republic and the Islamic Republic of Iran, proceeding from its principled position against politicization, selectivity and double standards on human rights.

Mr. Kuzmin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The time has come to consider the series of Third Committee documents that includes blatant lies, unproven accusations and dubious appeals. We will vote against every country-specific draft resolution that is put to the vote. There will be no support for draft resolutions that are adopted without a vote. We formally declare that we dissociate ourselves from the consensus on those draft resolutions.

I would like to comment in particular on draft resolution III, on the situation of human rights in the temporarily occupied Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, Ukraine, submitted by Ukraine.

First, I will provide some background. Since Crimea returned to the Russian Federation as a result of the direct and free vote of all its inhabitants, there has been a steady growth in revenues in the regional budget of the peninsula since 2014, which has increased threefold. Housing construction and industrial output is gathering pace, and the traditionally important tourist resort sector is also strengthening its position. Accelerated development, focused on increasing the living standards of Crimeans, remains a key socioeconomic priority. In total, social projects in the areas of health care, education and culture receive about 60 per cent of the revenue of the Republic of Crimea’s budget.

In response to the energy blockade of Crimea imposed by Ukraine in 2015, temporary electricity supply schemes for the peninsula were set up. Hundreds of high-capacity mobile generators were brought in, and an energy bridge was created, while energy cables and a twin gas pipeline were laid through the Kerch Strait from Kuban; as a result, the energy supply problem for Crimea has successfully been resolved.

After the illegal water blockade of Crimea in 2014 that Kyiv introduced by closing the North Crimea Canal, the issue of water security and supply for the peninsula became a priority. To resolve that issue, approximately 100 kilometres of new pipelines have already been built and brought into operation, and in March a water intake facility at Belbek was launched with a carrying capacity of 50,000 cubic metres. By the end of the year, construction will be completed on three water intake facilities in Nezhinskoe, Prostornoe and Novogrigoryevka.

Since 2015, more than 950 kilometres of road service have been refurbished in Crimea, and by 2024 we plan to modernize a further 2,000 kilometres of road surface. In 2018, construction was completed on the Crimean bridge and motorway, and rail transport was opened on it. In 2020, the Tavrida highway, which links Kerch and Sevastopol, went into operation. In 2018, the new Aivazovsky International Airport in Simferopol became operational, with a projected maximum capacity of 10 million passengers per year.

In Russian Crimea — unlike in Ukrainian Crimea — respect for linguistic rights, equality and diversity is explicitly enshrined at the legislative level. Unlike during the period of Ukrainian rule, a public Crimean Tatar television channel known as Millet, which means “people”, and a radio station, Vetan, which means “homeland”, both financed from the budget, are in active operation today. Schools that under Ukrainian rule conducted education in Crimean Tatar have been preserved everywhere and have even been expanded. For that purpose, the publication of Crimean Tatar language textbooks was organized very quickly. The level of use of the Russian language among Ukrainians and Crimean Tartars is almost the same, at 99.4 per cent and 99.8 per cent, respectively.

In the past seven years, more than 40 new mosques have been built in Crimea, and construction is being completed on the main cathedral mosque, with a capacity of about 4,000 people.

Russian Crimea is as open as it could be to foreign visitors, and anyone who is sincerely interested in learning about the lives of Crimeans can do so at any time. The Russian Federation guarantees that human rights are respected throughout all its territory, including Crimea, and it will protect those rights.

Unfortunately, Ukraine is being very carefully transformed into a sort of anti-Russia — a rancorous, disgruntled and constantly grasping State. Kyiv, on many issues, is acting to the detriment of its own economic interests and the interests of ordinary Ukrainians, just as long as it hurts Russia in doing so. According to the latest data issued by the International Monetary Fund, the country is at the bottom of the rankings in Europe in terms of the living standards of its population. At the same time, it is consistently being pumped full of weapons, fed on false premises and incited to Russophobia. That is a threat for Ukraine. It cannot create and successfully develop only in the negative. A reflection does not exist independently.

Draft resolution III is a part of that anti-Russian campaign. Some States will now obediently fall in line and vote in favour of the draft resolution, mistakenly thinking that they can remain in the ranks unnoticed. But judging by the results of the vote in the Third Committee, a much larger number of delegations in the General Assembly will not vote in favour of that hateful draft resolution. We are grateful to them for their integrity.

Mr. Kyslytsya (Ukraine): At the outset, I would like to congratulate Ambassador Mohamed Said Doualeh on the success of his chairmanship of one of the most deliberative and human-centric Main Committees of the General Assembly.

It is of particular concern that in the seventy-sixth year of the United Nations existence, gross human rights violations still persist in different parts of the world. They are caused by deliberate disregard for international law and undermining of the rules-based order.

Everyone can see the Russian so-called “peacemakers” in Syria, Georgia and Ukraine — all places where Russia set the earth on fire. Russia pretends that its troops are not in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine and that Russia is not an occupying Power there. Still, even the Russian courts, such as the court in the city of Kirov, recently decided that Russian troops are there.

Yet the reports of international organizations and their missions, which were invited by Ukraine, clearly tell the contrary. They speak the truth in facts. Since February 2014, the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol of Ukraine have been temporarily occupied by the Russian Federation as a result of armed aggression against my country. And that is a fact that is very difficult to deny. Hence Russia was recognized as an occupying Power by the General Assembly.

It is quite easy to understand the whole horror of the Russian occupation regime, despite what the Russian representative just said, as in the famous Soviet propagandistic television show *Vremya*. One has only to open two recent reports of the Secretary-General on the human rights situation in Crimea. Repression, depression and hopelessness — that is what local populations face today in the temporarily occupied Crimea.

Systemic human rights abuses and violations have turned Crimea into a land of fear, not a land of tourism as the representative of the Russian Federation just said. The Crimean Tatar people — the indigenous people of the peninsula who were expelled from their homeland in 1944 by the Stalin regime — have once again become a direct target of intimidation, harassment and terror, forcing them to leave.

Russia drives ethnic Ukrainians out of the peninsula by destroying political and civic organizations of Ukrainians, eliminating education in the Ukrainian language — despite what the Russian representative just said — persecuting leaders and activists exerting massive psychological pressure and expelling citizens of Ukraine from the occupied territory. Anyone who dares to reject the so-called “reunification with Russia” narrative becomes a victim of arbitrary detention, prosecution, extrajudicial executions, torture and inhuman treatment in Crimea.

We strongly condemn the sentencing of civic and political activists prosecuted for being loyal to their own country — Ukraine. Despite the demand expressed in General Assembly resolutions, Mr. Emin Usein Kuku still remains in a Russian prison, as does Mr. Server Mustafayev, a human rights defender who was arbitrarily sentenced to 14 years in a strict-regime correctional facility. Hundreds of citizens of Ukraine, including Halyna Dvohopola, Vladyslav Yesypenko and Nariman Dzhelyal, to name just a few, remain illegally detained by Russia under politically motivated charges.

The Orthodox Church of Ukraine is practically expelled from the occupied peninsula. Communities of Jehovah’s Witnesses and Muslims also face oppression.

Despite Russia’s forced imposition of its legal system, residents of Crimea remain Ukrainians and my country will spare no effort defending its citizens.

Meanwhile, Russia continues its aggressive illegal policy to militarize the peninsula, exploit natural resources and practice the illegal transfer and destruction of the Ukrainian cultural heritage in Crimea. The occupying Power pursues forcible demographic change in Crimea.

The de-occupation of Crimea, as well as other temporarily occupied territories, is an absolute priority for Ukraine. We are grateful to our international partners for their response to the Russian aggression against Ukraine. It is important to maintain the political and diplomatic pressure on the Kremlin until Ukraine’s territorial integrity is restored.

To increase the effectiveness of the international response to an array of problems arising from the ongoing temporary occupation of Crimea, including in the field of human rights, we established a new consultation and coordination format: the International Crimea Platform. We invite all interested parties to join the Platform — in fact, we invited Russia itself — and would like to thank our partners that already expressed their support for the initiative.

Draft resolution III, entitled “Situation of human rights in the temporarily occupied Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, Ukraine”, also calls on cooperation within the International Crimea Platform and will serve as a practical tool for the United Nations, its Secretariat and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and their respective monitoring missions in Ukraine.

I am grateful to all Member States — and I am not going to threaten any of them, like the Russian representative just did — from all regions that supported the draft resolution in the Third Committee. It is also encouraging that the text received the co-sponsorship of more than 40 Member States.

I ask Member States to vote in favour of draft resolution III.

Mr. Pilipenko (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): In the interest of time, we will comment only on the country-specific draft resolutions.

The position of the Republic of Belarus is well known. We oppose country-specific approaches in the work of the United Nations. Biased wording, imbalanced approaches and the non-transparent process of reaching agreement on such draft resolutions run contrary to every principle underlying the operations of the United Nations. The Republic of Belarus plans to dissociate itself from all draft resolutions to be adopted without a vote and will vote against all other draft resolutions that will be put to the vote.

Mrs. Arab Bafrani (Islamic Republic of Iran): I wish to deliver a statement concerning draft resolution II, on the so-called situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran.

My delegation fully rejects draft resolution II, which was sponsored by Canada, as a grave and politically motivated provocation against the Islamic Republic of Iran. All the elements contained in the draft resolution are of the most fabricated information, put together to mislead others and thereby realize specific political objectives.

My delegation believes that genuine international cooperation and strict adherence to the principles of objectivity, impartiality and non-selectivity are the best way forward for the effective promotion and protection of all human rights. As for other countries, deficiencies may exist, which we are determined to address. However, those who have traditionally, historically and practically supported colonialism, slavery, racism, apartheid, torture, pre-emptive wars and interventions are in no position to lecture others, specifically Iranians, on human rights.

The greatest threat to human rights comes from hypocrisy, politicization and double standards. That is clearly reflected in the behaviour of the main proponents of draft resolution II. Stealing indigenous people's lands, killing them and destroying their culture and identity have become the usual practice of the Canadian Government. Systematic racism, racial discrimination, hate speech, xenophobia, including through the detention of immigrant children, and denying the rights of people of African descent, Asians and ethnic minorities come from toxic residues of Britain's dark history of colonialism.

The United States withdrawal from international human rights institutions and its long history of racial discrimination, especially against the Black and Asian-American people, demonstrate how terrible the United States human rights record is.

Draft resolution II is also sponsored by the Zionist regime, which is committing horrendous crimes against Palestinians on a daily basis.

The continuation of the counterproductive and confrontational practice of adopting country-specific draft resolutions, in particular in the General Assembly, and the exploitation of this platform for political ends undermine cooperation and dialogue, which are the essential principles required for the promotion and protection of human rights. My delegation strongly rejects the so-called situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran. The politically motivated move comes at a time when many innocent Iranian civilians are struggling with the hardships imposed by the United States inhumane, illegal, unilateral and coercive measures, including sanctions during the coronavirus disease pandemic.

The Islamic Republic of Iran, however, remains firmly committed to helping international efforts for the genuine promotion and protection of human rights. We continue to cooperate with the relevant human rights mechanisms, including the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. The Universal Periodic Review is an opportunity to foster non-politicized debates and encourage respectful cooperation with the country concerned. I would like to therefore ask for a recorded vote on draft resolution II, in the hope that the representatives here today will choose the right path by saying no to the politicization of human rights.

With regard to draft resolution I, on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Islamic Republic of Iran reiterates its principled position concerning the counterproductive practice of considering country-specific draft resolutions in the General Assembly. My delegation believes that the exploitation of this platform for political ends is in breach of the Charter of the United Nations as well as the principles of universality, non-selectivity and objectivity in addressing human rights issues, and undermines cooperation and dialogue, which are the essential principles for promoting and protecting all universally recognized human rights. Therefore, the

Islamic Republic of Iran disassociates itself from any consensus on draft resolution II.

Mr. Al-Mouallimi (Saudi Arabia) (*spoke in Arabic*): Members should not believe those who say that the war is over in Syria and that therefore there is no need for United Nations resolutions on that matter. Do not believe them, because the war has not ended, with the toll of 2,000 martyrs for this year and more than 350,000 martyrs all together to date.

Do not believe them, as their leader stands on a pyramid of innocent skulls and claims great victory. How can victory be claimed amid the remains of innocent victims and the ruins of houses? What kind of victory is it when a leader stands on the remains of his people and citizens?

Do not believe them when they say that they are interested in reconstruction. The reconstruction of buildings cannot take precedence over the rehabilitation of human beings.

Do not believe them when they say that security prevails; instead, ask the 1.5 million Syrians who have been added this year to the list of those threatened by food insecurity, raising the number of needy people to nearly 10 million Syrians.

Do not believe them when they say that they are combating terrorism in the region. They were the first ones to open the doors wide to terrorism when they brought to their country the terrorist group Hizbullah, which is the leader of terrorism in the region, while also bringing in sectarian organizations from the east.

Do not believe them when they say that they seek peace, because they are the ones who allowed waves of extremists to invade Syria and kill Khalid Bin Al-Walid and Salah Eddine and other heroes of Arab and Islamic history.

Do not believe them when they attribute the reasons underlying their failure to other parties without blaming themselves, like the proverb which says: she threw it at me and slipped away.

Successive United Nations reports have clearly shown that the responsibility for most of the human rights violations in Syria rests with the Syrian Government and that the Syrian authorities have not created the necessary environment and conditions for the voluntary return of Syrian displaced persons to their

homes, who instead have fallen prey to cold, darkness and racism at European borders or have perished at sea.

Draft resolution V stresses that there can only be a political solution to resolving the crisis in Syria, through a comprehensive political process that will fulfil the legitimate aspirations of the Syrian people in accordance with resolution 2254 (2015) and the Geneva communiqué (S/2012/522, annex).

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia supports the efforts of the United Nations and its Special Envoy, Geir Pedersen. We also support the resumption of work by the Constitutional Committee. The Kingdom has always contributed to achieving a political solution and facilitating efforts to unify the Syrian opposition to speak with one voice without foreign intervention from any side.

Lastly, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia welcomes the return of Syria to the Arab community and the League of Arab States. The road towards achieving that goal is open to Syria if it can get rid of the foreign intervention that controls the country.

In co-sponsoring draft resolution V along with more than 50 countries and supporting its adoption, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia feels the suffering of the brotherly Syrian people and seek to assist them in realizing their hopes, ambitions and legitimate aspirations for justice, freedom, prosperity and stability.

The President: We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to IV, one by one.

We first turn to draft resolution I, entitled "Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 76/177).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica,

Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Myanmar, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu, Yemen

Against:

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia And Herzegovina, Brazil, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia

Draft resolution II was adopted by 78 votes to 31, with 69 abstentions (resolution 76/178).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Situation of human rights in the temporarily occupied Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, Ukraine".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States Of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu

Against:

Armenia, Belarus, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mali, Nicaragua, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia And Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Republic

Of Korea, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Suriname, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic Of Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Draft resolution III was adopted by 65 votes to 25, with 85 abstentions (resolution 76/179).

The President: Draft resolution IV is entitled “Situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 76/180).

The President: I shall now give the floor to those delegations that wish to speak in explanation of vote or position after adoption.

Mrs. Fernández Palacios (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba does not support mandates or draft resolutions that are the result of selective, discriminatory and politically motivated practices that do not enjoy the support of the countries concerned. My delegation therefore disassociates itself from resolution 76/177, entitled “Situation of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea”.

We remain concerned that such resolutions and practices, which do nothing to improve the human rights situation on the ground, are directed only against developing countries, on which unilateral coercive measures are also imposed. In the case of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, the path of punishment and sanctions has been chosen, thereby undermining the very human rights that supposedly justify that practice. In addition, the resolution dangerously involves the Security Council in matters that are not within its purview.

Mr. Manalo (Philippines), Vice-President, took the Chair.

Cuba is unable to join the consensus for adopting a resolution of that kind and will not be complicit in an attempt to deny the people of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea their right to peace, self-determination and development. We reiterate that only international cooperation, dialogue that is respectful

of differences and strict adherence to the principles of objectivity, impartiality and non-selectivity will enable progress in the promotion and effective protection of all human rights for all people, an area in which no country is immune to challenges. We urge that the Universal Periodic Review be given the chance to foster a non-politicized debate and encourage respectful cooperation with the country concerned.

Mr. Poveda Brito (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): With regard to resolutions 76/177, 76/178, 76/179 and 76/180, on the human rights situation in specific countries, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela reaffirms its principled position concerning the adoption of draft resolutions, special draft resolutions or any other mechanism on the human rights situation in specific countries, as we reject selectivity in addressing matters for politically motivated reasons. Such draft resolutions violate the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. In that regard, Venezuela disassociates itself from resolutions 76/177, on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, and 76/180, on the situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar, which were adopted by consensus.

Mrs. Xu Daizhu (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China consistently stands for appropriately handling differences in the area of human rights through constructive dialogue and cooperation on the basis of equality and mutual respect. China opposes politicization, selectivity, double standards and provocation leading to confrontation. China opposes pressuring other countries under the pretext of human rights, establishing country-specific human rights mechanisms without the consent of the country in question and adopting country-specific human rights draft resolutions.

Consequently, China disassociates itself from the consensus on human rights resolutions 76/177, on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, and 76/180, on the situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar, and it voted against country-specific human rights resolutions 76/178 and 76/179.

Ms. Ali (Syria) (*spoke in Arabic*): My country’s delegation continues to strongly oppose the adoption of country-specific draft resolutions that target certain countries. My delegation believes that practice is

based on double standards emanating from political considerations related to the human rights agenda. We believe that issue must be addressed by the Human Rights Council, especially after the establishment of a group of institutions that led to the Universal Periodic Review mechanism, through which all human rights issues in every Member State are addressed.

Such resolutions run contrary to the principles of non-discrimination, universality and objectivity, which should prevail in considering human rights issues. Cooperation, dialogue with the country concerned and respecting the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of States constitute the best solution for advancing and protecting human rights, rather than internationalization and causing clashes through politicization and propagating baseless lies, such as those contained in the statement delivered earlier by the Permanent Representative of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

In that context, we voted against the country-specific draft resolutions that were put to the vote. We also disassociate ourselves from the consensus on resolution 76/177, on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Mr. Manyanga (Zimbabwe): I take the floor to restate Zimbabwe's established, principled position against any country-specific resolutions. Zimbabwe is strongly committed to the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations with regard to the principles of solidarity, cooperation, equality, non-selectivity, objectivity and genuine dialogue in the work of the United Nations. Unfortunately, country-specific resolutions do not pass the test on any of those principles. Zimbabwe therefore aligns itself with all delegations that continue to express concern about country-specific resolutions, owing to their selective and divisive nature.

Country-specific resolutions also politicize human rights issues and cause and create unnecessary acrimony. Because of the atmosphere of confrontation that they create, they do not provide any sustainable solution or assist in the protection of human rights concerns. Country-specific resolutions create a false divide between those that purport to be paragons of human rights, on the one hand, and others who are labelled as not like them, on the other.

It is a fact that no country has reached the envisioned ideal in the realm of human rights. We

are all endeavouring to get to the desired destination. We therefore need to work together to move forward. My delegation remains committed to upholding and promoting the fundamental and inalienable rights of all people and acknowledges the important role of the United Nations through the Human Rights Council.

Multilateralism is synonymous with dialogue and mutual respect for the sovereignty of Member States. We remain convinced that, should there be a genuine desire to address issues of human rights gaps, where they exist, dialogue should be given pride of place, because it will achieve the desired results.

For those reasons, my delegation voted against country-specific resolutions 76/178 and 76/179 purely on principle. We will remain committed to genuine cooperative efforts on a mutually respectful basis to discuss all human rights, including the right to development on an equal basis.

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of sub-item (c) of agenda item 74.

(d) Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

Report of the Third Committee (A/76/462/Add.4)

The Acting President: May I take it that the Assembly wishes to take note of the report of the Third Committee?

It was so decided (decision 76/535).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (d) of agenda item 74?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: The General Assembly has concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 74.

Agenda item 108 (continued)

Crime prevention and criminal justice

Report of the Third Committee (A/76/463)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it seven draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 26 of its report.

We will now take decisions on draft resolutions I to VII, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled “Fourteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 76/181).

The Acting President: Draft resolution II is entitled “Reducing reoffending through rehabilitation and reintegration”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 76/182).

The Acting President: Draft resolution III is entitled “Integrating sport into youth crime prevention and criminal justice strategies”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 76/183).

The Acting President: Draft resolution IV is entitled “Strengthening criminal justice systems during and after the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 76/184).

The Acting President: Draft resolution V is entitled “Preventing and combating crimes that affect the environment”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 76/185).

The Acting President: Draft resolution VI is entitled “Improving the coordination of efforts against trafficking in persons”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 76/186).

The Acting President: Draft resolution VII is entitled “Strengthening the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme, in particular its technical cooperation capacity”. The

Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 76/187).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 108?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 109

Countering the use of information and communications technologies for criminal purposes

Report of the Third Committee (A/76/464)

The Acting President: May I take it that the Assembly wishes to take note of the report of the Third Committee?

It was so decided (decision 76/536).

The Acting President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 109.

Agenda item 110

International drug control

Report of the Third Committee (A/76/465)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 10 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution, entitled “International cooperation to address and counter the world drug problem”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 76/188).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 110?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 122 *(continued)***Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly****Report of the Third Committee (A/76/468)**

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 6 of its report.

We will now take action on the draft decision, entitled “Draft programme of work of the Third Committee for the seventy-seventh session of the General Assembly”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 76/537).

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 122.

Agenda item 139 *(continued)***Programme planning****Report of the Third Committee (A/76/469)**

The Acting President: May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to take note of the report of the Third Committee?

It was so decided (decision 76/538).

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 139.

The General Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of all the reports of the Third Committee before it for this meeting.

The decisions and resolutions adopted by the General Assembly address the most important global issues, including the impact and consequences of the global pandemic. Continued focus and tireless efforts of each and every one of us on their implementation is key to inspire hope and deliver for the peoples of the world.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.