



General Assembly

Seventy-eighth session

50th plenary meeting
 Tuesday, 19 December 2023, 3 p.m.
 New York

Official Records

President: Mr. Francis (Trinidad and Tobago)

In the absence of the President, Mr. Valtýsson (Iceland), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

Reports of the Third Committee

The Acting President: The General Assembly will consider the reports of the Third Committee on agenda items 24, 25, 60, 66 to 71, 107, 108, 120 and 135.

I now request the Rapporteur of the Committee, Mr. Robert Alexander Poveda Brito of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, to introduce the reports of the Committee in one intervention.

Mr. Povedo Brito (Venezuela), Rapporteur of the Third Committee (*spoke in Spanish*): 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-eighth session, items 24, 25, 60, 66 to 71, 107, 108, 120 and 135.

The reports, contained in documents A/78/472 to A/78/479 and A/78/481 to A/78/485, include the texts of draft proposals recommended to the General Assembly for adoption. For the convenience of delegations, the Secretariat has issued document A/C.3/78/INF/1, published in English only, which contains a checklist of actions taken on the draft proposals contained in the reports before the Assembly.

During the main part of the seventy-eighth session of the General Assembly, the Third Committee held 56

plenary meetings and adopted 62 draft resolutions, 17 of them by recorded vote, and one draft decision.

Under agenda item 24, “Social development”, and its sub-items (a) and (b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 57 of document A/78/472, the adoption of nine draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 25, “Advancement of women”, and its sub-items (a) and (b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 24 of document A/78/473, the adoption of three draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 60, “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 26 of document A/78/474, the adoption of four draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 66, “Report of the Human Rights Council”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 12 of document A/78/475, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda item 67, “Promotion and protection of the rights of children”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 19 of document A/78/476, the adoption of two draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 68, “Rights of Indigenous Peoples”, and its sub-items (a) and (b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 11 of document A/78/477, 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 AB-0928 (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 69, “Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance”, and its sub-items (a) and (b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 33 of document A/78/478, the adoption of two draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 70, “Right of peoples to self-determination”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 34 of document A/78/479, the adoption of three draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 71, “Promotion and protection of human rights”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 72 of document A/78/481, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under sub-item (a) of agenda item 71, “Implementation of human rights instruments”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 9 of document A/78/481/Add.1, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under sub-item (b) of agenda item 71, “Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 139 of document A/78/481/Add.2, the adoption of 23 draft resolutions.

Under sub-item (c) of agenda item 71, “Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 33 of document A/78/481/Add.3, the adoption of five draft resolutions.

Under sub-item (d) of agenda item 71, “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 sub-item.

Under agenda item 107, “Crime prevention and criminal justice”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 29 of document A/78/482, the adoption of seven draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 108, “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 120, “Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly”, the Third Committee

recommends, in paragraph 7 of document A/78/484, the adoption of one draft decision.

Finally, under agenda item 135, “Programme planning”, the Third Committee wishes to advise the Assembly that no action was required under the item.

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the commendable leadership of our Chair, His Excellency Mr. Alexander Marschik, Permanent Representative of Austria to the United Nations, who steered the complex tasks of our Committee with respect, equanimity, seriousness, integrity and kindness, even as he always reminded us, with the chiming of the Austrian bell, that we are bound by causes and motives that we must strengthen and celebrate.

I also wish to thank all of my fellow Bureau members, the Vice-Chairs Ms. Nelly Banaken Elél of Cameroon, Mr. Tomáš Grünwald of Slovakia and Mrs. Mosammat Shahanara Monica of Bangladesh. Their dedication, professionalism and commitment to our Committee are exemplary. They do honour to their countries and their regions, as they are the paradigm of the public servants that our world so desperately needs.

I would also like to thank Ms. Julia Eberl of the Permanent Mission of Austria to the United Nations for her dedication, patience and unfailing sense of service in fielding all of our doubts, questions and requests, no matter what time of day, and through her, the entire team of the Permanent Mission of Austria, who, alongside the Chair, were able to steer the Committee to a successful conclusion.

I would further like to thank, on behalf of the Bureau, Mr. Ziad Mahmassani, the Secretary of the Committee, Ms. Jori Joergensen, Ms. Mina Nozawa, Ms. Catalina de Leon, Ms. Raffaella De Lia, Mr. Paolo Dua, Mr. Tomas Casas and Ms. Oksana Orlova for the dedication, professionalism and sense of service that characterized their conduct towards all delegates throughout the Committee’s work. I am deeply grateful for Mr. Mahmassani’s vast experience and ability to calmly and wisely address a myriad of questions, as well as his ongoing commitment to improving the working methods of our Committee. I extend my gratitude to the entire Secretariat team and the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, including interpreters, technicians and all those who contributed to the work of our Committee. I also wish to thank and acknowledge all my friends and colleagues from all delegations for their friendship, their high level of

professionalism, their love for their countries, histories and peoples, and their aspiration to build a genuinely better and more just world through their daily service.

Even amid the complexities of our times, which seem not to change in any era of history, diplomatic work, though seemingly slow and bureaucratic, yields effective fruits in favour of coexistence and peace. Through our experiences, dedicated efforts and incremental steps, often referred to as “the work of ants”, we witness its impact daily. Simón Bolívar, the liberator of my country, Venezuela, a distinguished fighter for equality and freedom, wisely said, “God grants victory to perseverance.” That phrase resonates deeply with me when I witness the dedication and daily work of diplomats, such as us, in connection with our peoples and States, making our small contributions towards the ideals that inspire us of better times of greater inclusion, human rights and social and economic development.

The Third Committee drafted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and for decades it has made progress in constructing political and legal frameworks in favour of human rights and social advancements benefiting everyone, and in particular those who need them most. All that progress, amid our differences and conflicts, stands as a testament to the high-level institutional standards, which we must preserve and be proud of in this era in which are entrusted to serve. I urge Member States never to lose heart in that noble endeavour. I wish members a happy holiday season and a well-deserved rest.

The Acting President: I thank the Rapporteur of the Third Committee.

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 Acting 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 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 will 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 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 e-Place”. 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.3/78/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 24

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/78/472)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it 9 draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in its report.

We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to IX, 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 78/171).

The Acting President: Draft resolution II is entitled “Inclusive policies and programmes to address homelessness, including in the aftermath of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19)”. 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 78/172).

The Acting 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 78/173).*

The Acting President: Draft resolution IV is entitled “Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly”. 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 78/174).

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

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 78/175).

The Acting President: Draft resolution VI is entitled “Preparations for and observance of the thirtieth anniversary of the International Year of the Family”. 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 78/176).

The Acting President: Draft resolution VII is entitled “Follow-up to the Second World Assembly on Ageing”. 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 78/177).*

The Acting President: Draft resolution VIII is entitled “Promoting social integration through social inclusion”. 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 78/178).*

The Acting President: Draft resolution IX is entitled “Policies and programmes involving youth”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution IX was adopted (resolution 78/179).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 24 and its sub-items (a) and (b)?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 25

Advancement of women

Report of the Third Committee (A/78/473)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it three draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 24 of its report.

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

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled “Violence against women migrant workers”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 78/180).

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

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 78/181).

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

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 78/182).

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of sub-item (b) of agenda item 25 and this stage of its consideration of agenda item 25 and its sub-item (a).

Agenda item 60

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/78/474)

The Acting President: I now give the floor to the representative of Ukraine, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mrs. Mudrenko (Ukraine): My delegation regrets Russia’s use of manipulative tactics in requesting a vote on the draft resolution entitled “Enlargement of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees” contained in document A/78/474. The draft resolution is of a technical and procedural nature and was previously approved by the Economic and Social Council. We emphasize again that such an approach creates a risk of politicizing the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in carrying out its core humanitarian mandate.

With a record 108.5 million people forcibly displaced around the world in 2022, mainly due to Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, addressing that unprecedented displacement requires the robust support and commitment of Member States. Expanding the UNHCR Executive Committee offers a unique

opportunity for unity and effective multilateral cooperation. Ukraine is fully committed to contributing meaningfully, drawing on its nine years of experience of addressing the challenges of forced displacement, which has affected more than 18 million Ukrainians. We believe that our expertise will benefit the Executive Committee in supporting the High Commissioner’s vital work. Our delegation’s request that the Executive Committee be enlarged, which has been endorsed by the Economic and Social Council, is reflected in the draft resolution. We urge Member States to vote in its favour and demonstrate their collective commitment to addressing global forced displacement challenges.

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

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

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled “Enlargement of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Niger, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint

Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Nigeria

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Namibia, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen

Draft resolution I was adopted by 128 votes to 1, with 46 abstentions (resolution 78/183A).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Nigeria informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of China informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against.]

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Enlargement of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican

Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Comoros, Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mongolia, Namibia, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen

Draft resolution II was adopted by 128 votes to 4, with 43 abstentions (resolution 78/183B).

The Acting President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees". The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 78/184).

The President took the Chair.

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

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 78/185).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 60?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 66

Report of the Human Rights Council

Report of the Third Committee (A/78/475)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in 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:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, 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, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic

of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Belarus, Israel, Nicaragua, Russian Federation

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominica, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Sudan, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Tonga, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The draft resolution was adopted by 112 votes to 4, with 64 abstentions (resolution 78/186).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 66?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 67

Promotion and protection of the rights of children

Report of the Third Committee (A/78/476)

The President: The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in its report. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I and II, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled “Rights of the child”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 78/187).

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

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 78/188).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 67?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 68

Rights of Indigenous Peoples

(a) Rights of Indigenous Peoples

(b) Follow-up to the outcome document of the high-level plenary meeting of the General Assembly known as the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples

Report of the Third Committee (A/78/477)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution.

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 78/189).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 68 and its sub-items (a) and (b)?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 69

Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

(a) Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

(b) Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action

Report of the Third Committee (A/78/478)

The President: The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in its report. Before proceeding further, I would 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 the draft resolution as soon as the report of the Fifth Committee on its programme budget implications is available.

I now give the floor to the representative of Ukraine in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mrs. Mudrenko (Ukraine): I would like to make a statement in explanation of vote before the voting 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”, as contained in document A/78/478 and as amended, to be considered by the General Assembly. I reaffirm Ukraine’s strongest condemnation of all forms of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, and reiterate our consistent and long-standing position that the draft resolution has nothing in common with the genuine fight against Nazism, neo-Nazism and other forms of intolerance. On the contrary, by submitting the draft resolution, Russia is attempting to use the pretext of combating neo-Nazism to justify its brutal war of aggression against my country, Ukraine, and its heinous war crimes and crimes against humanity.

We reiterate our gratitude to colleagues from Albania, Australia, Japan, Guatemala, Liberia, the Marshall Islands and North Macedonia for submitting an important substantive amendment that reveals the real purpose of the draft resolution, which is nothing but manipulation, a distortion of history and abuse of our common victory over Nazism, to which millions of Ukrainians made an enormous contribution by sacrificing themselves. We appreciate the support of all delegations for the amendment. Despite the positive step represented by the adoption of the amendment, the draft resolution still serves the purpose of manipulation and misuse. For almost two years, the Russian military, on the pretext of combating neo-Nazism in Ukraine, has continued its deliberate and indiscriminate attacks on civilians and critical civilian infrastructure, summary executions, torture and rape and forceful mass deportations of Ukrainians. Russian propaganda has actively promoted hatred and violence against Ukrainians, with the Kremlin regime consistently conditioning Russians to view genocide against Ukrainians as normal and acceptable.

That is evidenced by the Russian President's repeated statements about denying Ukraine's right to exist and the fact that such views are widespread throughout the Russian State media.

It is the height of hypocrisy when an aggressor State is the penholder of a draft resolution aimed at combating the ideology once used to justify the same form of aggression against sovereign States that Russia itself is now resorting to against Ukraine. I therefore encourage all Member States to vote against draft resolution I.

The President: We will now take a decision on draft resolution I.

Draft resolution I is 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, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, 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, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Bahamas, Dominica, Guinea, Myanmar, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Samoa, South Sudan, Switzerland, Tonga, Türkiye, Tuvalu

Draft resolution I was adopted by 118 votes to 49, with 14 abstentions (resolution 78/190).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Nauru informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

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

Mr. Poveda Brito (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): Venezuela thanks the Russian Federation for introducing the resolution on combating the glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (resolution 78/190).

We believe that the resolution is timely, and every year we support it as a main sponsor. In that regard and given the presentation of a hostile amendment in the Third Committee, which did not contribute to the goal of the resolution and, indeed, attempted to distort it, Venezuela would like to dissociate itself from paragraph 4 of the resolution.

Ms. Ochoa Espinales (Nicaragua) (*spoke in Spanish*): Our delegation takes the floor with regard to the resolution on combating the glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices that contribute

to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (resolution 78/190).

Nicaragua is firmly committed to combating extremist, fascist, Nazi and neo-Nazi ideologies of all kinds that promote intolerance, racism, apartheid, xenophobia, antisemitism and other forms of intolerance. With that in mind, our delegation dissociates itself from paragraph 4, which was amended and adopted during the seventy-eighth session of the Third Committee. Nicaragua's principled position is that we reject the selectivity and double standards of some countries, which are aimed at promoting agendas against specific countries, thereby undermining collective efforts to achieve a more just, harmonious, equitable and peaceful world.

Mr. González Behmaras (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba is committed to combating all forms and manifestations of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. Nazism and neo-Nazism are the most extreme forms of supremacist theories that have already led to the loss of millions of lives. The theories are scientifically false, morally condemnable and socially unjust and dangerous. They negate our common humanity and irreparably violate the principle that all human beings are equal in dignity and rights.

It is crucial that such ideas be prevented from spreading and that the hate speech and rhetoric of discrimination that characterizes them not be legitimized. In some countries, we see that the phenomenon is gaining ground, including within the political establishment and political circles, which is even more concerning.

Cuba will always be on the side of those who defend the full equality of all human beings and those who promote tolerance and respect for the cultural diversity of our countries. Nothing justifies the promotion of racial or xenophobic ideas. For that reason, my delegation has always been one of the main sponsors of the resolution (resolution 78/190) that was just adopted. My delegation's support for the resolution, as a whole, and its vote in favour of it should not be interpreted as an endorsement of paragraph 4. That paragraph is the result of an amendment presented in the Third Committee for the second year in a row, in order to introduce a divisive element that dilutes consensus as part of the efforts against Nazism and neo-Nazism. It is

a paragraph that highlights a specific context, in spite of the fact that the resolution is thematic in nature.

The issue of Nazism and neo-Nazism might be seen in other contexts. In several developed countries, such as the United States, there is a growing trend of violence against ethnic or religious minorities, which is an expression of underlying Nazism and neo-Nazism. Israel's practices of apartheid Israel against the people of Palestine could also be mentioned. However, that is not the purpose for which the resolution was adopted.

Furthermore, it is noted that many of the promoters and protractors of this paragraph within the Third Committee voted against the resolution, as a whole, which casts doubts about the real purpose of having introduced that element into the text. With that in mind, my delegation disassociates itself from paragraph 4 and would like to put on record that we do not consider it to be agreed language and do not feel bound by this language or similar language.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate my country's commitment to eliminating all forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, being guided the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action.

Mr. Pilipenko (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): We would like to clarify the following. The Republic of Belarus has always been cautious and attentive when it comes to preserving historical truth. We have been open and consistent in our opposition to all manifestations of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance.

As we have repeatedly noted, Belarus opposes attempts to politicize this important topic. That is why we would like to disassociate ourselves from an element that does not belong in the document, specifically paragraph 4, which has been introduced by the politically motivated amendment in the Third Committee. We believe that it is necessary to preserve the thematic nature of the resolution (resolution 78/190).

It is our hope that next year, both in the Third Committee and in the General Assembly, we will hear from delegations about the implementation of this resolution. We hope to hear about the success in combating Nazism and racism, instead of the most recent allotment of toxic politicized slogans against the authors of the document, which are only an attempt to conceal the unpleasant truth about the fact that these

countries are encouraging the ideologies of Nazism and racism that are flourishing in their countries.

Ms. Zabolotskaya (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): In 1945, the member States of the coalition against Hitler, known as the United Nations, won a historic victory over Nazism. The contemporary system of the promotion and protection of human rights was the response of States to Nazi-perpetrated genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. The decisions of the Nuremberg Tribunal legally enshrined the conquests of the victory over Nazism, answering, once and for all, the question of who in the Second World War represented the forces of good and who represented the forces of evil. Those facts are unshakable and cannot be changed.

The resolution at hand (resolution 78/190), which was initially submitted nearly 20 years ago, is aimed at confirming that historic truth. Yet, what is more important is to draw attention to the contemporary acolytes of the ideology of racial supremacy and to explicitly state the unacceptability of racial and xenophobic rhetoric. What is more important is to call on us to combat the manifestations of Islamophobia, Christianophobia, Afrophobia and antisemitism, which have become commonplace in many countries.

There is a group of Western countries that tried to turn the Russian initiative into a political, country-based document, which is fully at odds with the status and the purpose of the resolution. The resolution seeks dialogue and cooperation and not to hang labels on people and or engage in confrontation. The problems that it highlights are cross-border in nature and address the situation in many countries. If a State sees its problems reflected in the resolution, it is important for it to address those problems instead of attempting to undermine cooperation on combating neo-Nazism, racism and xenophobia.

Putting aside recent attempts to cover up their refusal to support the resolution with ridiculous justifications referring to the freedom of assembly and the freedom of speech, those countries have openly opposed international efforts to combat aggressive manifestations of racism and xenophobia by introducing a hostile amendment and voting against the text of the resolution. Nevertheless, the results of the vote clearly demonstrated the international community's unwavering support and its dedication to eradicating the deleterious scourges mentioned.

We thank all the delegations that voted in favour of the document. We have always stressed — and we will continue to do so — that it is of fundamental importance to us and the other co-sponsors for this resolution to be a thematic resolution. We therefore dissociate ourselves from paragraph 4, which is not consensus-based.

Ms. Zhang Sisi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China would like to explain its vote with regard to resolution 78/190, on combating the glorification of Nazism.

During the deliberations on the draft resolution (A/C.3/78/L.7) in the Third Committee, China made clear its firm opposition to attempts to deny, distort or falsify the history of the Second World War; acts glorifying Nazism, fascism and militarism and fuelling their resurgence; and all forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and intolerance.

The resolution before us is a thematic one, addressing the principles of combating the glorification of Nazism and neo-Nazism and opposing racism and intolerance. The amendment in question attempts to impose country-specific content on a thematic resolution, which is clearly inconsistent with the established practice of the Third Committee. Among the sponsors of the draft amendment are certain countries that seek to falsify the history of the Second World War and that deny their own commission of war crimes, including sexual violence on a massive scale. We are deeply concerned about the practice by a small number of countries of politicizing certain agenda items in the Third Committee. In view of that, China dissociates itself from the consensus on paragraph 4 of resolution 78/190.

Ms. Rizk (Egypt): The fight against racism, racial discrimination and related forms of intolerance is a historical fight, and the historical grievances in question have not been remedied. However, we tend to face an increase in the discourse of hatred and other manifestations of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, including those that manifest as neo-Nazism. We therefore support the resolution (resolution 78/190) in its thematic focus on combating the glorification of such manifestations, which contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism.

Accordingly, we voted in favour of the resolution as adopted. However, my delegation takes note of the fact that the amendment that was introduced to the text was a voted amendment; accordingly, we reiterate our

disassociation from the amendment that appears in paragraph 4 of resolution 78/190.

Mr. Al Nahhas (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): With regard to the resolution entitled “Combating glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (resolution 78/190), my country stresses its stance of championing equality among all human beings. It rejects all forms of racial discrimination, particularly the destructive neo-Nazism.

Paragraph 4 of the resolution, which was inserted into the text, sows division and derails the resolution from its purpose. As such, that paragraph clearly embodies the double standard practiced by certain countries in advancing their narrow political agendas, which, in turn, contributes to destabilizing security and stability. My delegation therefore dissociates itself from paragraph 4 of resolution 78/190.

Mr. Kim Nam Hyok (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea): My delegation welcomes and supports the adoption of this important resolution (resolution 78/190), which will contribute to eliminating all forms of racism and related intolerance, for the promotion and protection of human rights. However, we are deeply concerned that the amended content of the resolution pretends to pursue an unjustified selective approach by targeting a specific country. Such politicized approaches are clearly contrary to the fundamental principles of impartiality, objectivity and non-selectivity and only cause distrust and confrontation between Member States, in addition to hindering and impairing constructive dialogue and cooperation in the field of human rights.

In that context, we disassociate ourselves from the amended paragraph 4 of resolution 78/190, the aim of which is to disturb the basic purposes of this resolution.

Mr. Chimbindi (Zimbabwe): Zimbabwe voted in favour of resolution 78/190, which we co-sponsored, as a noble initiative to combat Nazism, racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerances. While it voted in favour of the resolution, my delegation disassociates itself from paragraph 4 of the amended resolution. As a matter of principle, my delegation does not support country-specific resolutions or country-specific paragraphs. The fight against Nazism, racism, xenophobia and related intolerance is a global fight and should not be narrowed to address a single case, as that becomes very limited in scope and undermines

the generic nature of the fight against these forms of intolerance. In that regard, we disassociate ourselves from paragraph 4.

Mr. Belmont Roldán (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union and its member States.

We strongly condemn the politically motivated misuse of the fight against Nazism, and we reject the inaccurate and inappropriate use of the term “de-nazification” to justify Russia’s inhumane, cruel and illegal war of aggression against Ukraine, the repercussions of which are devastating not only for the people of Ukraine, but for the peoples of all the world.

Over the past year, and as the aggression against Ukraine continues, we have seen the Russian Federation continue to misuse and abuse United Nations forums to spread that false narrative regarding its illegal and unjustified war of aggression against Ukraine. Let there be no doubt: the European Union is fully committed to the global fight against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, antisemitism, anti-Muslim hatred and related intolerance.

The issues of rising global neo-Nazism, violent extremism and racism, including antisemitism and anti-Muslim hatred, deserve a meaningful and constructive discussion. The point of this resolution (resolution 78/190) is precisely not to seek compromise; it is to sow division and to use the platform of the General Assembly for disinformation purposes. For those reasons, the member States of the European Union voted against the resolution.

Ms. Korac (United States of America): I did not intend to take the floor today. My delegation, like many others in this Hall, actually respects the work of the Third Committee, and we do not repeat disassociations, explanations of vote or other statements, when its draft resolutions are put to the vote in plenary meeting. I would like to remind the Committee of that and would hope that we would avoid that practice. There are plenty of other resolutions with regard to which my own and other delegations would have taken the floor, but that has not been the practice here or in any other Committee. I hope we can return to that practice in the future. We also do not need to repeat our long-standing position on this annual resolution. We have been one of several countries to vote against it from the very beginning.

Lastly, I would like to respond briefly to the remarks made by my colleague from Egypt. Perhaps I heard wrong,

but I believe she disassociated her delegation from the amendment. I would like to note, however, that, as a matter of rule and procedure, the draft amendment (A/C.3/78/L.58) was retained; it is now paragraph 4. Once again, I would really encourage us not to repeat our statements and disassociations, which are all reflected in the reports of the Third Committee.

Mr. Luemba (Angola): My delegation welcomes the adoption of resolutions 78/190 and takes this opportunity to reaffirm its principled position on the total elimination of all forms of discrimination, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. We express serious concern about the politicization and selectivity of the issue, which may distort the purpose and scope of resolution 78/190, which is supposed to address exclusively human rights. Therefore, Angola disassociates itself from paragraph 4.

The President: Before giving the floor to speakers in exercise of the right of reply, I would recall that statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second intervention and should be made by delegations from their seats.

I now give the floor to the representative of Egypt.

Ms. Rizk (Egypt): I find myself obliged to reply to our colleague from the Permanent Mission of the United States in response to the issue that has been raised, namely, that there is an established practice. However, what delegations are doing in this Hall is an exercise of the freedom of expression, and they have the sovereign right to express their positions within the time limitation set by the Secretariat, with regard to the organizational aspect. As for my delegation, I was very clear when I mentioned that I am dissociating it from the amendment that was introduced to the text of resolution 78/190, which appears in paragraph 4.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (a) of agenda item 69?

It was so decided.

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 69 and its sub-item (a).

Agenda item 70

Right of peoples to self-determination

Report of the Third Committee (A/78/479)

The President: The Assembly has before it three draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 34 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 "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:

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, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, 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, 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, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, 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 (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Democratic Republic of the Congo, Kiribati, Mexico, Palau, Switzerland, Tonga

Draft resolution I was adopted by 129 votes to 52, with 6 abstentions (resolution 78/191).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled “The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho,

Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, 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, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Cameroon, Guatemala, Kiribati, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, South Sudan, Togo, Tonga, Tuvalu

Draft resolution II was adopted by 172 votes to 4, with 10 abstentions (resolution 78/192).

The President: We now turn to draft resolution III, entitled “Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination”.

The Third 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 78/193).

The President: I shall now give the floor to those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position on the resolutions just adopted.

Ms. Rizk (Egypt): I have requested the floor in explanation of vote on the resolution on the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination (resolution 78/192), which has consistently been presented annually on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation and its member States. It is a call

for the exercise of the Palestinian people of their right to self-determination. It is no wonder that the country that is the occupying Power persistently requests a vote on the resolution, while we are currently witnessing the collective punishment of, and aggression against, Palestinian civilians in Gaza. The Security Council has failed time and again to uphold its responsibility for maintaining peace and security and respect of international humanitarian law. That is in addition to the Third Committee, in which we have been unable to implement the provisions of the resolution with regard to international human rights law.

Mr. González Behmaras (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My explanation of vote also pertains to resolution 78/192 under this agenda item.

Our delegation believes that this resolution, entitled “The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination”, is more relevant than ever. With the obvious complicity of the United States, Israel is committing full-fledged genocide against the Palestinian people. Two months of indiscriminate bombing and military operations against the civilian population, the destruction of housing, hospitals and civilian infrastructure, the deprivation of water, food, electricity and fuel and the forced displacement of hundreds of thousands of people in Gaza constitute collective punishment, grave violations of international humanitarian law, war crimes and crimes against humanity that Israel is committing before the eyes of the international community and that cannot be justified. The Palestinian people has been systematically wronged for decades by the illegal occupation and settlement of their land, violations of their rights and apartheid policies directed against them.

History did not begin on the 7 October. We condemn the killing of civilians and innocent people from all sides in the conflict regardless of their ethnicity, heritage, nationality or religion. resolution just adopted is clear — the Palestinian people have a right to self-determination, including the right to their own State. That promise, almost as old as the United Nations itself, which has been blocked time and again, must be fulfilled. There can be no peace when an entire people is subjugated to colonization, apartheid and genocide.

We reaffirm our support for a broad, just and lasting solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict on the basis of the creation of two States that allow the Palestinian people to exercise their right to self-determination and enable the creation of an independent and sovereign

Palestinian State along pre-1967 borders, with East Jerusalem as its capital. Such a solution must also guarantee the right of return to refugees. We once again reaffirm our solidarity with, and support for, the Palestinian people.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 70?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 71

Promotion and protection of human rights

Report of the Third Committee (A/78/481)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution, entitled “Commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted
(resolution 78/194).

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments

Report of the Third Committee (A/78/481/Add.1)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in 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: situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted
(resolution 78/195).

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

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/78/481/Add.2)**

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

Before proceeding further, I should like to inform members that action on draft resolution XXIII, entitled “Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa”, 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 the draft resolution as soon as the report of the Fifth Committee on its programme budget implications is available.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to XXII, one by one.

We first turn to draft resolution I, entitled “Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, 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 (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Chile, Costa Rica, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay

Draft resolution I was adopted by 125 votes to 54, with 6 abstentions (resolution 78/196).

The President: Draft resolution II 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 II was adopted (resolution 78/197).

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

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 78/198).

The President: Draft resolution IV 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 IV was adopted (resolution 78/199).

The President: Draft resolution V 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:

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, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, 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, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, 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 (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

None

Draft resolution V was adopted by 131 votes to 53 (resolution 78/200).

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

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), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, 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, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, 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 (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Democratic Republic of the Congo

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 132 votes to 54, with 1 abstention (resolution 78/201).

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:

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, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, 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, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, 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 (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

None

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 131 votes to 53 (resolution 78/202).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Nauru informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against.]

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

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, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, 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, 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, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Canada, Chile, Cyprus, Georgia, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway,

Palau, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Slovenia, Spain, Uruguay

Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 133 votes to 26, with 27 abstentions (resolution 78/203).

The President: Draft resolution IX is entitled "National human rights institutions". 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 78/204).

The President: Draft resolution X is entitled "Protection of and assistance to internally displaced persons". 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 78/205).

The President: Draft resolution XI is entitled "The human rights to safe drinking water and sanitation". The Committee adopted draft resolution XI without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XI was adopted (resolution 78/206).

The President: Draft resolution XII is entitled "International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance". The Committee adopted draft resolution XII without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XII was adopted (resolution 78/207).

The President: Draft resolution XIII is entitled "Strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros,

Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Niger, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Bahrain, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, Guinea-Bissau, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Mali, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tonga, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution XIII was adopted by 155 votes to none, with 25 abstentions (resolution 78/208).

[Subsequently the delegation of the Niger informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The President: Draft resolution XIV is 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:

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, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, 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, 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 (Kingdom of the), 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, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic

of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Iran (Islamic Republic of), Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution XIV was adopted by 185 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 78/209).

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

Draft resolution XV was adopted (resolution 78/210).

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

Draft resolution XVI was adopted (resolution 78/211).

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

Draft resolution XVII was adopted (resolution 78/212).

The President: Draft resolution XVIII is entitled “Promotion and protection of human rights in the context of digital technologies”. The Committee adopted draft resolution XVIII without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XVIII was adopted (resolution 78/213).

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

Draft resolution XIX was adopted (resolution 78/214).

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

Draft resolution XX was adopted (resolution 78/215).

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

Draft resolution XXI was adopted (resolution 78/216).

The President: Draft resolution XXII 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 XXII was adopted (resolution 78/217).

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

Mr. Rizal (Malaysia): Malaysia remains committed to the promotion and protection of democratic institutions, democratic principles and the rule of law with regard to the electoral process. Those principles are enshrined in our federal Constitution. We continue to undertake efforts to improve and strengthen our governance system. As a young nation of 66 years of age, Malaysia continuously introduces democratic reforms. We fully recognize the need for and value of inclusive and participatory governance. Recent initiatives to that end include automatic voter registration, effective two years ago, and the lowering of the voting age of citizens from 21 years old to 18 years old. Those efforts have resulted in more than 1.3 million youths between 18 and 20 years of age being eligible to cast their votes for the first time during the recent fifteenth general election, which took place last year.

Regarding the resolution just adopted (resolution 78/208), Malaysia supported since it was first introduced and had co-sponsored the resolution in previous sessions. However, since the previous iteration of this text (resolution 76/176), adopted two years ago, the resolution began featuring non-consensus-based

terminology that is inconsistent with our position, thus preventing us from maintaining our co-sponsorship of the text. We regret that this continued to be the case this year. Malaysia had supported the amendments proposed for the draft resolution in the Third Committee. Those amendments, which were drawn from agreed language within United Nations forums and from existing international instruments, were a genuine attempt to reach a resolution that could be supported by all Member States, as had been the case prior to 2021. The amendments are not hostile, as the paragraphs of concern were not open for discussions. We reject the careless and malicious assertions that supporters of the amendments support discrimination.

In line with its earnest belief in democratic principles, Malaysia voted in favour of the resolution as a whole. However, we wish to put on record our reservations on and disassociation from the terms “in all their diversity” in the tenth preambular paragraph and “sexual orientation and gender identity” in operative paragraph 7.

Mrs. Mudrenko (Ukraine): I take the floor to thank the delegation of Spain for facilitating, on behalf of the European Union, resolution 78/212, entitled “Freedom of religion and belief”, which we strongly support. Regrettably, due to a technical issue, Ukraine was unable to co-sponsor the resolution.

Ms. Almaha Mubarak Al-Thani (Qatar) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, I am honoured to deliver this statement on behalf of the delegations of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf (GCC), namely, the United Arab Emirates, the Kingdom of Bahrain, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the Sultanate of Oman, the State of Kuwait and my country, the State of Qatar.

The GCC States express their thanks and gratitude to the United States for its efforts during the negotiations as the coordinator of resolution 78/208, entitled “Strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections”. We emphasize the importance of the issues addressed in the resolution.

The delegations of the GCC States have abstained in the voting on the resolution. We note that operative paragraph 7 contains controversial language that is not in line with our national legislation, cultural and social values. Our States express their reservation about that paragraph and any other controversial language in the resolution.

Mr. Moussa (Djibouti): Let me at the outset make it perfectly clear that my delegation only supported resolution 78/208 with the clear intention of reaffirming the principles of fair, periodic, inclusive and genuine elections. Indeed, Djibouti is a peace-loving and stable country in which free and fair elections are conducted periodically in accordance with our Constitution. Djibouti is also committed to enhancing its national institutions and ensuring successful and free and fair elections that are perceived as such and are substantially accepted by all. We particularly support operative paragraphs 6, 16 and 17 of the resolution on supporting the Electoral Assistance Division of the Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and other United Nations departments and agencies.

It is, however, disheartening to witness the wide chasm emanating from today’s vote on the resolution. We all know only full well that it is difficult to be optimistic as long as we are not witnessing any successful steps to bridge that chasm. The General Assembly faces multifaceted and high-level challenges, including but not limited to the excessive inclusion of non-agreed and controversial language in important resolutions. We also believe that the Assembly, our fortress of consensus, must not remain impervious and immune to the progressive withering away of the agreed and consensus-based language, a vital resource that is so essential for its work. In our view, the Assembly must take the steps necessary to drastically mitigate and reduce those challenges and to promote the use of agreed and consensus-based language. The process of adoption of the resolution today is an excellent case in point.

We join other delegations in sharing our concerns that this text is undoubtedly another outward expression of the persistent divisions and disagreements that have unfortunately once again resulted in the inclusion of controversial elements with no widely accepted legal or scientific meaning and defying internationally accepted consensus. In as much as we always support the agreed language, my delegation disassociates itself from the tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 7, which contain chunks of controversial references.

Ms. Rizk (Egypt): My statement is in explanation of vote on resolution 78/208, entitled “Strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections”.

It is to be noted that Egypt, on behalf of the Member States of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, except for Albania, Suriname and Guyana, submitted amendments to the text in order to preserve consensus on this important resolution. In that connection, my delegation reiterates its rejection of the undemocratic imposition of non-consensus-based language in the text, expresses its persistent objection to the references made to “in all their diversity” and to “sexual orientation and gender identity” and accordingly reaffirms its disassociation from the tenth and twelfth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 7 of the text.

In addition, we regret that the resolution failed to reflect the legal parameters governing the exercise of the right to freedom of expression as stipulated in articles 19 and 20 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, producing an imbalanced resolution. The United Nations represents the collective will of the membership, and it should be guided by what is agreed upon by Member States — not by imposition of undefined and unagreed-upon references and concepts.

Mr. González Behmaras (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My statement relates to resolution 78/205, entitled “Protection of and assistance to internally displaced persons”.

Cuba supports the noble purpose of this resolution, which is why our delegation has joined the consensus. However, my delegation does not align itself with the references, in the twenty-eighth preambular paragraph of the adopted text, to the Rome Statute, to which Cuba is not a party, or to the International Criminal Court, the jurisdiction of which we do not recognize. My delegation therefore disassociates itself from that paragraph and would note that it does not consider it to be agreed language, nor does it feel obligated to adhere to it or its potential implications.

Mrs. Mozgovaya (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): The delegation of Belarus would like to make a statement in explanation of vote on resolution 78/208, “Strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections”.

Belarus acknowledges the importance of the topic of this resolution, and we share its high goals and principles, which is why we voted in favour of its adoption. At the same time, we are compelled to disassociate ourselves from the tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 7, as the text of the

document contains language that does not enjoy the universal support of Member States.

Mrs. El Guera (Mauritania) (*spoke in Arabic*): My country’s delegation thanks the United States delegation for submitting the draft text of resolution 78/208 and for its efforts in facilitating the relevant negotiations.

The Islamic Republic of Mauritania reaffirms its commitment to the rule of law, democracy and the participation of all in political life. We also commend the role of the United Nations in promoting the convening of periodic and fair elections.

My country’s delegation regrets that the amendments introduced did not include consensus-based language in the tenth preambular paragraph, which would have helped to achieve consensus and garner the support of all Member States, as was the case with the proposed amendment to operative paragraph 7 of the resolution related to replacing the terms “sexual orientation” and “gender identity” with agreed-upon language from the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. We therefore express our reservation with regard to inserting non-consensus-based terms. For all those reasons, we abstained in the voting. My country also expresses its reservation regarding the reference to any previous resolutions that included such terms that are not in line with the national legislation and laws of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania as well as the religious and cultural values of our society.

Ms. Al-Mashehari (Yemen) (*spoke in Arabic*): I deliver this statement in explanation of vote on resolution 78/208, entitled “Strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections”.

We thank the delegation of the United States for its role in facilitating the relevant negotiations. My country’s delegation voted in favour of the resolution, affirming the Republic of Yemen’s committed position to promoting the rule of law and democratic values. We commend the role of the United Nations in enhancing the convening of periodic and fair elections. My country also voted in favour of adopting the resolution on the basis of our established belief in the principles and values of democracy.

My country’s delegation would like to disassociate itself from the wording “women in all their diversity” in the tenth preambular paragraph and “sexual orientation and gender identity” in operative paragraph 7. Those terms are not consensus-based and were voted upon

in the Third Committee this year as in previous years. That language has no connection to the content of the resolution. My country also expresses its reservation about references to any previous resolutions in which those non-consensus-based terms were included, as they are not in line with the national laws and legislation of the Republic of Yemen or the religious and cultural values of our society. We emphasize that although my country voted in favour of the resolution, we disassociate ourselves from the non-consensus-based language, as mentioned, and my country's voting in favour should not be construed as acceptance to include those non-consensual terms in United Nations documents.

Mrs. Dabo N'diaye (Mali) (*spoke in French*): The delegation of Mali, like the majority of the member States of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, would like to speak in explanation of vote after the voting on the resolution entitled "Strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections" (resolution 78/208), in which we abstained.

Elections are recognized as a pillar of the rule of law, which my country supports. However, we must agree on the content of the resolution on those elections and focus our efforts on topics that are universally and legally recognized, while respecting our social, societal and cultural values. My delegation therefore remains concerned about the retention of controversial topics such as sexual orientation. We therefore disassociate ourselves from the tenth and twelfth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 7. Allow me to stress that any controversial topics will be interpreted in compliance with Mali's legislation and our cultural and societal values.

Mrs. Asaju (Nigeria): My delegation's explanation of vote is regarding the resolution entitled "Strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections" (resolution 78/208).

I wish to note that Nigeria remains unwavering in its commitment to promoting and upholding processes of governance that are firmly anchored on strong democratic principles and rule of law. While my country ensures inclusiveness at every stage of its electoral process without discrimination, we find deeply concerning the attempt by some Member States to introduce the notion of sexual orientation and gender identity, which is neither universally accepted nor

legally accurate under any international law. There is no obligation relating to the concept of sexual orientation and gender identity under any binding international instrument negotiated and ratified by sovereign States.

The fluidity and undefined character of the concept of sexual orientation and gender identity make it unacceptable to my delegation, as the definition of gender — otherwise known as sex — as supported by the Constitution of Nigeria remains the binary and biological design of male and female. It is more concerning and quite exhausting that such language continues to weaken consensus, undermine the significance of this resolution and invalidate our collective assiduous effort to strengthen the pillars of democratization and election processes.

My delegation therefore dissociates itself from operative paragraph 7 of the resolution.

Ms. Korac (United States of America): I would like to underscore the point that I made after an earlier adoption, that we do not find it particularly fruitful to repeat the statements and positions from the Third Committee.

The United States would like to thank the additional nine Member States that voted in favour here in the plenary. With that, more than 80 per cent of this membership supports resolution 78/208.

We would also like to take this opportunity to correct the record on some of the statements that we heard. We note that some of the language in question was introduced two years ago, when it was adopted by consensus. This year again, those who introduced the amendments related to the language, as we are hearing, did not put the resolution to a vote. The resolution was not put to a vote over those amendments by those delegations.

Finally, some of the language, including "in all their diversity", enjoys long-standing consensus, even beyond this resolution. Even among the delegations that have taken the floor to disassociate themselves from that language, many of them had voted in favour of this resolution previously. We think that more than 80 per cent speaks for itself, so we still consider that to be consensus.

Mr. Reichwein (Kingdom of the Netherlands): While we also fully support the practice not to repeat positions in a General Assembly meeting after having stated them during a Third Committee meeting, I think

it is important to take the floor on the resolution on elections (resolution 78/208).

The Kingdom of the Netherlands, as co-Chair of the LGBTI Core Group, consisting of a cross-regional group of 42 Member States, wants to emphasize its support for the references to the important language on sexual orientation, gender identity and women in all their diversity. United Nations human rights treaty bodies have consistently reaffirmed that international human rights law applies equally to all persons and that sexual orientation and gender identity are protected from discrimination under international human rights law — just to set the record straight.

Mr. Mahamadou Seydou (Niger) (*spoke in French*): I thank you, Mr. President, for giving the delegation of the Niger another opportunity to explain its vote on the important resolution entitled “Strengthening the role of the United Nations in the promotion of democratization and enhancing periodic and genuine elections” (resolution 78/208).

My delegation would like to reiterate its explanation of vote on that resolution, which was just adopted by the General Assembly. Our explanation of vote was made following the adoption of the relevant draft resolution in the Third Committee, specifically with regard to the provisions of the tenth and twelfth preambular paragraphs and paragraph 7 related to sexual orientation and women in all their diversity.

Ms. Saleem (Pakistan): My delegation would like to make a statement in explanation of vote on resolution 78/208 on periodic and genuine elections.

At the outset, let me reiterate my country’s commitment to genuine and democratic elections. Democratic elections in my country will be held on 8 February 2024. Having said that, my delegation is compelled to reiterate its position to disassociate itself from the tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 7 of the resolution, which contains non-consensus-based language.

With regard to the statement made by our colleague from the United States, I would like to reiterate that delegations that voted in favour of this resolution voted in favour because we fully support democracy, but not those concepts that are not consensually agreed and that are not part and parcel of the domestic laws of numerous countries, as has been demonstrated with the tabling of amendments and their adoption. With regard to considering these concepts as consensus-

based language, I would also like to highlight that any concept that has been voted upon is never considered consensus-based language.

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of sub-item (b) of agenda item 71.

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

Report of the Third Committee (A/78/481/Add.3)

The President: The Assembly has before it five draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 33 of its report.

I shall now give the floor to those delegations that wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Kyslytsya (Ukraine) (*spoke in Spanish*): For almost a decade, Russia’s control over the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine, including the Crimean peninsula, has involved arbitrary and incommunicado detentions, reprisals, persecution, torture, intimidation, killings, forced disappearance, mass movement of Russian citizens to the area, illegal recruitment by the army, and forced transfers and deportations, including of children. With the start of Russia’s illegal unjustified and unprovoked war of aggression against Ukraine, those flagrant violations and abuses have increased in the recently occupied territories, both in severity and in geographical extent, on a shocking scale. The dire human rights situation in those areas demands continued attention and protection on the part of the General Assembly and the United Nations as a whole.

To that end, the scope of the annual draft resolution has been expanded to cover all territories occupied temporarily by the Russian Federation. Draft resolution IV is entitled “Situation of human rights in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine, including the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol”.

The recent report of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on Ukraine confirms widespread and systematic torture by Russian authorities. According to Ukrainian authorities, more than 28,000 Ukrainian civilians are illegally detained in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine and in Russia, often incommunicado and in inhumane conditions. There are numerous cases of death by torture and lack of medical assistance. Political persecution, specifically in Crimea, against Ukrainian

citizens, including the Crimean Tatars, an indigenous people of Ukraine and the largest Muslim community, and the followers of the Orthodox Church of Ukraine, underscores Russia's brazen disregard for human rights and international humanitarian law. Currently, more than 180 political prisoners languish in Russian captivity, in inhumane conditions and with inadequate medical assistance.

The difficult situation faced by Ukrainian children who have been illegally deported or forcefully displaced by the Russian Federation continues to be a very serious problem. Russia's deceptive tactics prevent the return of these children, including orphans and those who are not under the care of their parents. Thousands of Ukrainian children are experiencing indescribable suffering every day, being kept against their will, thousands of kilometres from their homes and families. They desperately await our help. Ukraine is fighting for the return of all those children.

That is why it is crucial that, in the resolution, the General Assembly urges the Russian Federation to ensure the immediate and unconditional return of all children, including those who are not in the care of their parents and were adopted and transferred to host families.

The forced imposition of the Russian legal system on the temporarily occupied territories is considered null and void. Ukraine remains firmly committed to upholding the rights of its citizens that reside in these areas. Ukraine has therefore introduced this draft resolution since 2016, aimed at protecting the rights of Ukrainians who are forced to live under Russian occupation. The draft resolution serves as a practical tool to enable the United Nations to monitor and report continuously on the human rights situation in the temporarily occupied territories.

The only way to guarantee full respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the residents of those territories is their de-occupation by Russia. The restoration of Ukraine's territorial integrity within its internationally recognized borders will also be the most effective way to achieve a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in Ukraine and guarantee European and global security.

We demand that Russia immediately stop its war of aggression against Ukraine and completely and unconditionally withdraw all its forces and military equipment from the entire territory of Ukraine within

its internationally recognized borders, extending to its territorial waters.

I extend my gratitude to all 50 Member States that have co-sponsored the draft resolution and call upon all others to stand with Ukraine by voting in favour of draft resolution IV.

Mrs. Arab Bafrani (Islamic Republic of Iran): I deliver this statement before the adoption of draft resolution III, under sub-item (c) of agenda item 71, entitled "Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran.

There is profound politicization in the international human rights regime, meaning that principled neutrality is sacrificed in favour of political discretion. Decisions to name and shame human-rights shortcomings do not reflect the principles of impartiality and objectivity, but rather the political interests of certain States. Supposedly, such universal principles are not principles at all, but rather vested interests masquerading as principles.

My delegation vehemently rejects the so-called draft resolution on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran. Such a draft resolution is a fake plot intending to interfere in the internal affairs of an independent State under the pretense of promoting and protecting human rights. This lopsided draft resolution, which endorses the so-called fact-finding mission and the Special Rapporteur, is not recognized by my delegation, and it must be the highest priority of the Third Committee to get rid of it in any probable dialogue on the revitalization of its work. The penholder on the draft resolution and its allies force Member States to take sides against one another, and such division, led by Canada, is very dangerous to the cause of human rights.

What we are witnessing now is tampering with delicate international human rights platforms in a dangerous manner. There are two simple questions before the General Assembly. Has this draft resolution contributed to the promotion of human rights in the country since it was first adopted? What kind of impact does a draft resolution that is not even circulated for negotiation have on the target country? The answer is none. Everything must have an objective. The objective of this draft resolution is, in essence, nothing, with no relevance to the promotion and protection of human rights. Therefore, it will not lead to any results.

Regrettably, an intergovernmental body, compromising all Member State representatives, is acting at the political behest of those specific States. Such extreme politicization may cause entities to lose credibility, become ineffective or even delegitimize their own process. In view of the fact that their supporters come from a European, anti-sovereign-State union, they cannot even reconsider such a political decision. They digest what is cooked in the kitchen of the European Union, with no autonomy to voice their opinions — an obvious dictatorship in the modern world.

As of yet, Canada and its allies have not decided whether to raise their valid concerns with Iran respectfully and constructively. Over any given violation, those specific countries condemn adversaries while coddling friends, as we have witnessed in the case of another day of ground incursions and intense bombardment and invasion by the Israeli forces against civilians and civil and humanitarian infrastructure in Gaza. They see attacks against homes, hospitals, schools, shelters for the displaced, mosques, churches and even people who have no place but the open streets to live, but still try to shield that regime from accountability and shamelessly recognize Israel's murderous campaign against Palestinian people under the guise of self-defence. History will record such neglect and selectivity.

Resorting to two-State narratives must end. Negative clichés and accusations in addressing the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran must end. The overgeneralization of a few cases while ignoring Iran's outstanding human rights achievements must end. Iran will continue its engagement with other international human rights mechanisms, such as the Universal Periodic Review, thematic Special Rapporteurs, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and treaty bodies. In that regard, a number of programmes are on our agenda for the new year, including the visits of relevant human rights officials to Iran.

Taking into account the clarification made, we urge Member States to oppose any kind of politicization and double standards by voting against the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran. Furthermore, while I have the floor, I would like to highlight a few points.

Iran adheres to the principles of impartiality, objectivity and non-selectivity when it comes to considering human rights issues. In that vein, it is

our firm belief that the continuation of the practice of selectively adopting country-specific mandates, particularly in the Third Committee, and the exploitation of that platform for political ends contravenes those principles. My delegation will therefore disassociate itself from the consensus regarding the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and will vote against the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic (draft resolution V).

Mr. Kim Nam Hyok (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea strongly condemns and totally rejects draft resolution I, on the human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, submitted by the European Union, as a grave infringement upon the sovereignty of our State and a politically motivated, reckless provocation by hostile forces that aim to destroy our social system.

The draft resolution is nothing but a document of political confrontation and fraud cooked up by the United States and its vassal forces, which persistently cling to the hostile policy of isolating and stifling the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, with their inveterate repugnance towards our ideas and system. As such, we do not see any merit in considering the draft resolution.

Speaking explicitly once again, in our country there are none of the human rights issues touted by the United States and its vassal forces, or can such issues exist in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, where the people-first policy is thoroughly implemented in overall State activities and social life and where the people actually enjoy their independent rights. Putting pressure on independent sovereign States that oppose the imperialists' high-handedness and arbitrariness and violently interfering in the internal affairs of and overthrow the systems of those States under the pretext of human rights constitute the stereotypical method of the United States and its vassal forces.

It is also clear that the aim of the forcible annual adoption of the anti-Democratic People's Republic of Korea human rights draft resolution under the banner of the United Nations, pursued by the United States and hostile forces, is to politicize the non-existent human rights issues to the extreme and abuse the draft resolution as a mechanism for invading our State and as an instrument for interfering in our internal affairs in order to overthrow our system. The Democratic

People's Republic of Korea's will is strong and clear: it will counter with the most powerful means the anti-Democratic People's Republic of Korea human rights racket by the United States and the hostile forces, which totally deny the sovereignty of our State and its socialist system and grossly distort our people's genuine enjoyment of human rights.

To us, human rights mean precisely State sovereignty. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea will do its utmost to defend its sovereignty and the genuine rights of the people against all despicable hostile acts by the United States and its vassal forces and will take the toughest counteraction to such anti-Democratic People's Republic of Korea human rights smear campaigns as the forcible adoption of this draft resolution.

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 the politicization, selectivity and double standards vis-à-vis human rights.

Ms. Zabolotskaya (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We would like to reiterate our position on the country-specific draft resolutions submitted at this meeting. Russia does not support the practice of considering selective and unilateral draft resolutions on human rights situations in individual countries. Such draft resolutions have little to do with the reality of the situation in the countries concerned and spread unsubstantiated and false accusations. We believe that such working methods are ineffective, create confrontation among Member States and delegitimize the United Nations as a platform for advocating human rights, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of States. We will vote against the draft resolutions III and V, on the human rights situation in Iran and Syria, respectively, and we will disassociate ourselves from the consensus on draft resolutions I and II, human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Myanmar, respectively.

As for draft resolution IV, purportedly on the human rights in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine, it has nothing to do with either human rights or a grounding in reality. The geographical scope of the annual draft resolution has been broadened this year. It mentions various Russian regions — the Republic of Crimea, the Donetsk People's Republic, the Luhansk

People's Republic and the Kherson and Zaporizhzhya regions. But there can be no talk of any human rights violations in those regions, because they are part of the political, legal and economic sphere of the Russian Federation. All those living in the Donetsk People's Republic, the Luhansk People's Republic and the Kherson and Zaporizhzhya regions are guaranteed the enjoyment of their human rights under the Constitution of the Russian Federation. Russia protects the people residing in those territories. Kyiv and its Western sponsors see the draft resolution as giving licence to engage in armed escalation and fratricidal conflict, while encouraging the commission of further crimes and fuelling crises. Ukraine attempts to appear as though it cares about human rights in those territories. However, the truth is that the Ukraine is trying to pass off the evacuation of children from the line of fire as crimes, while escalating the attacks against the Donetsk and Luhansk People's Republics and the Zaporizhzhya and Kherson regions, as a result of which children and others are being killed. The Ukrainian armed forces carry out attacks on civilians on a daily basis, resulting in death and injury of civilians.

Of course, the Kyiv regime is also silent about the fact that they have attempted to impose a water and food blockade of Crimea. They have recently turned to striking the peninsula and have attempted to destroy the Crimean bridge. Such inexplicable cruelty towards their compatriots is emblematic of the Kyiv regime, the ideology of which is a combination of hatred and racism. Kyiv's goal is to continue its misanthropic policy aimed at destroying everything Russian in Ukraine, oppressing the Russian-speaking population and erasing all traces of Russian identity in the country. As an illustration of the latter, the representative of Ukraine will speak in any language other than Russian at the General Assembly, as he is afraid to use the Russian language out of fear of his own Government's reprisals.

Draft resolution IV is an obstacle to the peaceful resolution of the conflict. Russia will vote against the draft resolution, which serves to escalate the crisis, against impunity for the Kyiv regime and the continued mass-scale human rights violations in Ukraine. We call on everyone to do the same.

Mr. Al Nahhas (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): Draft resolution I, entitled "Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea", targets a sovereign State under the pretext of defending human rights, which has become a

politicized tool employed by certain States to attack and change political regimes throughout the world. Any Government that exercises its rights and defends the rights of its people to sovereignty, independence and dignity in a way that displeases certain well-known Western countries will automatically be placed into the group of countries that violate human rights. That is why my country dissociates itself from the consensus on that draft resolution and will vote against all draft resolutions that target specific countries. We reiterate our position of rejecting politicizing human rights issues with the aim to interfere in the internal affairs of countries.

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

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

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 78/218).

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

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 78/219).

The President: Draft resolution III 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, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru,

Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen

Against:

Algeria, Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, China, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Eritrea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Lebanon, Mali, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nigeria, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Zambia

Draft resolution III was adopted by 78 votes to 30, with 68 abstentions (resolution 78/220).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Tuvalu informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: Draft resolution IV is entitled “Situation of human rights in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine, including the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Myanmar, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu

Against:

Belarus, Burundi, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Nicaragua, Niger, Russian Federation, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 78 votes to 15, with 79 abstentions (resolution 78/221).

The President: Draft resolution V is entitled "Situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nauru, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu

Against:

Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uzbekistan, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Comoros, Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay,

Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Draft resolution V was adopted by 88 votes to 16, with 73 abstentions (resolution 78/222).

The President: I shall now give the floor to those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote after the voting.

Ms. Ochoa Espinales (Nicaragua) (*spoke in Spanish*): Nicaragua would like to reiterate its position with regard to the reports and resolutions on the human rights situations in specific countries that are presented every year in the Third Committee. We reaffirm our rejection of reports and resolutions based on considerations of selectivity, which are politicized and lack objectivity. They do not enjoy the consent of the country concerned.

My delegation therefore dissociates itself from the consensus on resolution 78/218, entitled “Situation of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea”.

Mr. Poveda Brito (Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): With regard to the resolutions under sub-item (c) of agenda item 71, on the human rights situation in specific countries, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, as a principled position, reiterates its alignment with the statement made on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and with the principled position set forth in multiple forums by the Group of Friends in Defence of the Charter of the United Nations.

Specifically, we reject the creation of mechanisms and mandates on human rights situation in specific countries in the Human Rights Council, because such actions lead to confrontation and do not contribute to constructive dialogue with those countries, which runs counter to the spirit in which the United Nations was established.

The practices of voluntary reporting and the creation of mechanisms and politically motivated resolutions on specific countries violate the principles of impartiality, objectivity, transparency, non-selectivity, non-politicization, non-confrontation, equality and mutual respect, and hinder the ongoing

promotion of the principles of political independence, respect for national sovereignty, non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the self-determination of peoples — all of which are purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

Finally, Venezuela dissociates itself from resolution 78/218, on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea.

Mr. González Behmaras (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation does not support mandates or resolutions that are the result of selective, discriminatory and politically motivated exercises and that do not have the support of the country concerned.

Such resolutions do not contribute to improving the human rights situation on the ground. On the contrary, they encourage confrontation and mistrust, and they delegitimize the United Nations human rights mechanisms. Such practices target only developing countries against which unilateral coercive measures are also imposed.

My delegation therefore dissociates itself from resolution 78/218, entitled “Situation of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea”. That approach insists on the path of punishment and sanctions, attacking the very rights that supposedly justify the resolution. Moreover, the resolution chooses the dangerous involvement of the Security Council in matters that do not fall under its remit. Cuba will not be complicit in the attempt to deny the people of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea their right to peace, self-determination and development. My delegation therefore cannot join consensus on a resolution of that nature.

We are convinced that only international cooperation, respectful dialogue and strict adherence to the principles of objectivity, impartiality and non-selectivity will make it possible to advance in the effective promotion and protection of all rights for all people — a matter that presents challenges for every country.

The Universal Periodic Review should be given an opportunity to promote a non-politicized debate and encourage respectful cooperation with the country concerned.

At the same time, my delegation wishes to point out that our opposition to this selective and politicized mandate in no way prejudices the other outstanding

issues mentioned in the twenty-third preambular paragraph, which require a fair and honourable solution, with the agreement of all parties concerned.

With regard to resolution 78/220, entitled “Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran”, my delegation notes that it is very disturbing, discriminatory and unacceptable to promote a punitive approach against developing countries, singling them out, while remaining silent and complicit in the face of human rights violations committed in or by highly developed countries. History has shown that any mandate based on politicization and double standards is bound to fail.

Keeping the resolution against the Islamic Republic of Iran on the agenda has not been motivated by genuine concern or interest in cooperation with that country. We will not support the manipulation of the human rights issue to advance geopolitical interests, discredit legitimate Governments, undermine their constitutional orders and justify destabilization agendas. That is why my delegation voted against the resolution on the Islamic Republic of Iran.

We insistently call for the discontinuation of that practice. Instead, respectful and constructive dialogue must be promoted, on the basis of collaboration and the sharing of best practices, which is the only way to address human rights challenges.

With regard to resolution 78/222, adopted against the Syrian Arab Republic, my delegation notes that its selective and politicized nature is evident. The fact that its main sponsor is the United States, a country responsible for several of the most serious and well-documented human rights violations, clearly demonstrates that. My delegation therefore voted against the resolution.

That the United States has once again submitted this resolution against Syria in the current context, while providing a blanket of impunity for Israel’s ongoing genocide against the civilian population in Gaza, is further evidence of the selectivity of the United States and that it does not care about human rights. One cannot be concerned about human rights in one room of the United Nations and not be concerned in another, by vetoing Security Council resolutions.

Resolution 78/222 reflects a punitive and condemnatory approach that does not take into account the interests and positions of the country concerned. Resolutions such as this one do not contribute to

a political solution to the conflict that takes into account the genuine interests and aspirations of the Syrian people.

Mr. Valtýsson (Iceland), Vice-President, took the Chair.

We reaffirm our full support for the search for a peaceful and negotiated solution to the conflict in the Syrian Arab Republic. We trust in the wisdom of the Syrian people and authorities to achieve that goal. We urge the General Assembly to contribute to that effort by promoting cooperation and dialogue with full respect for the Syrian State. If there is genuine willingness to contribute to resolving the conflict in that country, we should refrain from selective and politically motivated exercises such as the one just adopted in this resolution.

Mr. Pilipenko (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): The Republic of Belarus supports effective cooperation in the area of human rights, based on in the principles of universality, impartiality, objectivity, non-selectivity, constructive international dialogue and cooperation, and consistently opposes the selective consideration of country-specific human rights issues at the United Nations. We believe that the instrumentalization of human rights issues through country-specific resolutions does not resolve in practice human rights issues, but only exacerbates the atmosphere of confrontation among United Nations Member States.

In that regard, we would like to take the opportunity to explain the vote of Belarus in further detail. Guided by the aforementioned approaches, Belarus voted against all the country-specific resolutions that were voted on (resolutions 78/220, 78/221 and 78/222).

Furthermore, we would like to note separately that the Republic of Belarus disassociates itself from the consensus on resolution 78/218 on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and resolution 78/219 on the situation of human rights in Myanmar.

Ms. Zhang Sisi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China is taking the floor in explanation of vote on the resolutions concerning country-specific human rights resolutions.

China always advocates the Third Committee conduct its work on the basis of equality and mutual respect, so as to properly address differences in the field of human rights through constructive dialogue and cooperation.

China stands against politicization, selectivity, double standards and the provocation of confrontation. We oppose the practice of exerting pressure on other countries under the pretext of human rights issues, as well as the setup of country-specific human rights mechanisms without the consent of the countries concerned. Given its consistent position on country-specific human rights resolutions, China voted against the three resolutions that were voted upon (resolutions 78/220, 78/221 and 78/222).

With regard to resolution 78/218 on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and resolution 78/219 on the situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar, China dissociates itself from the consensus.

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (c) of agenda item 71?

It was so decided.

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

Report of the Third Committee (A/78/481/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 78/537).

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 71?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 71.

Agenda item 107

Crime prevention and criminal justice

Report of the Third Committee (A/78/482)

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

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

Draft resolution I is entitled "Follow-up to the Fourteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and preparations for the Fifteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice". The Third 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 78/223).

The Acting President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Reducing reoffending through rehabilitation and reintegration". The Third 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 78/224).

The Acting President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Enhancing the contributions of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice to the accelerated implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development". The Third 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 78/225).

The Acting President: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Technical assistance provided by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime related to counter-terrorism". The Third 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 78/226).

The Acting President: Draft resolution V is entitled "Equal access to justice for all". The Third Committee adopted draft resolution V without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 78/227).

The Acting President: Draft resolution VI is entitled "Improving the coordination of efforts against trafficking in persons". The Third 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 78/228).

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

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 78/229).

The Acting President: I give the floor to the delegation of the Russian Federation in explanation of vote or position after the voting.

Mr. Kuzmenkov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian delegation wishes to say that it disassociates itself from the consensus on a number of paragraphs in resolution 78/229 on strengthening the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme, in particular its technical cooperation capacity. I am referring to the fifty-seventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 30, which, together with the term “victims” of human trafficking, uses the ambiguous term “survivors”.

We also disassociate ourselves from operative paragraph 13, in which the General Assembly abused its mandate by calling upon countries to ensure the timely conclusion the second cycle of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption.

Finally, we disassociate ourselves from operative paragraph 43, which calls for a follow-up on only one of the five resolutions adopted this year. The reasons for our position were already outlined by us in the debate in the Third Committee.

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 107?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 108

Countering the use of information and communications technologies for criminal purposes

Report of the Third Committee (A/78/483)

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 78/538).

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 108.

Agenda item 120 (continued)

Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

Report of the Third Committee (A/78/484)

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

We will now take action on the draft decision, entitled “Draft programme of work of the Third Committee for the seventy-ninth session of the General Assembly”.

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

The draft decision was adopted (decision 78/539).

The Acting President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 120.

Agenda item 135 (continued)

Programme planning

Report of the Third Committee (A/78/485)

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

It was so decided (decision 78/540).

The Acting President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 135.

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

On behalf of the Assembly, I would like to thank His Excellency Mr. Alexander Marschik of Austria, Chair of the Third Committee, the members of the Bureau, representatives and the Secretary of the Committee for a job well done.

Before suspending the meeting, I would like to inform members that this meeting will be resumed on Wednesday, 20 December at 10 a.m. to pay tribute to His Highness Sheikh Nawaf Al-Ahmad Al-Jaber Al-Sabah, Amir of the State of Kuwait, and to consider the reports of the Fifth Committee.

The meeting was suspended at 5.45 p.m.