



General Assembly

Fifty-sixth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
20 December 2002
English
Original: Spanish

Third Committee

Summary record of the 53rd meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 30 November 2001, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Al-Haini. (Oman)

Contents

Agenda item 112: Advancement of women (*continued*)

Agenda item 113: Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women and of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly, entitled "Women 2000: gender equality, development and peace for the twenty-first century" (*continued*)

Agenda item 119: Human rights questions (*continued*)

- (b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)
- (c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

01-67030 (E)

* 0167030 *

The meeting was called to order 10.15 a.m.

Agenda item 112: Advancement of women (*continued*)
(A/C.3/56/L.22)

Draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.22: Improvement of the status of women in the United Nations system

1. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.22, which had no programme budget implications.

2. **Ms. Hudson** (Australia) announced that Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ghana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Samoa, Saint Lucia, Somalia, the Sudan, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu and Zimbabwe had joined the list of sponsors and that, following consultations, it had been decided to delete the sixth preambular paragraph beginning "Noting Security Council resolution ...", and replace the words "particularly in" by "particularly in the category of" in the second line of the tenth preambular paragraph. Given the large number of sponsors, she hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

3. **The Chairman** said that, since he heard no objection, he took it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.22 without a vote.

4. *Draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.22, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Agenda item 113: Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women and of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly entitled "Women 2000: gender equality, development and peace for the twenty-first century" (*continued*)
(A/C.3/56/L.80)

Draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.80: 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

5. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.80, submitted on the basis of informal consultations, and announced that it had no programme budget implications.

6. **Mr. García González** (El Salvador), Vice-Chairman, said he appreciated the flexibility displayed by all delegations in order to reach agreement on the text. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

7. **The Chairman** said that, since he heard no objection, he took it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

8. *Draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.80 was adopted.*

9. **The Chairman** announced that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 113.

Agenda item 119: Human rights questions (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/56/L.43/Rev.1, L.64, L.69/Rev.1 and L.71)

Revised draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.43/Rev.1: The right to development

10. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.43/Rev.1, which had no programme budget implications.

11. **Mr. Montwedi** (South Africa), speaking on behalf of the members of the Non-Aligned Movement and China, said that Costa Rica, Mexico and Uruguay had joined the list of sponsors. He pointed out that the original text of the draft resolution had been the same as Commission on Human Rights resolution 2001/9, adopted at its fifty-seventh session. Subsequent consultations with the European Union had resulted in the text contained in document A/C.3/56/L.43/Rev.1. He therefore looked forward to the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus.

12. **Mr. Osmane** (Algeria), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the right to development had gained greater currency, thanks to the realization that economic, social and cultural rights had the same value as civil and political rights. It was therefore incumbent upon the international community to give serious consideration to that right and create a permanent mechanism to monitor its effective enjoyment. His delegation was gratified that the Working Group on the Right to Development had held

two sessions and hoped that, through it, consensus would be reached on the full implementation of that right, realization of which called for consideration of both national and international conditions. Good governance, for instance, was meaningless without a favourable financial and economic environment at the global level.

13. **Mr. Laurin** (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of Australia, Canada and New Zealand, said that he was strongly supportive of the right to development and the link between it and the full range of rights. He welcomed the creation of the Working Group and the opportunity to continue the dialogue in that forum. He was pleased that the resolutions on the subject contained strong language on the importance of good governance, democracy, the rule of law, the fight against corruption, and the role of women and civil society. However, some of the central issues discussed in the Working Group continued to pose problems. The sponsors of the draft resolution had taken into account some of his concerns, but he still had reservations about certain paragraphs. Paragraph 10 was superfluous, referring as it did to the need for a follow-up mechanism, which would duplicate the function of the Working Group. Regarding paragraphs 21 and 22 concerning the impact of international economic and financial issues on human rights, there had been no agreement on the need for the Commission to address that issue, which was also outside the mandate of the Independent Expert and the Working Group. For those reasons, he would abstain on the draft resolution.

14. **Mr. Maertens** (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the European Union, said he was convinced that consensus was the only way to proceed in promoting the right to development. It was regrettable that the draft resolution was based on a resolution of the Commission on Human Rights which did not have the unanimous support of its members. He nevertheless acknowledged the efforts made by South Africa and the other sponsors to reach consensus. However, the negotiations had not produced a text acceptable to all Member States. While the European Union would continue its work to promote the right to development, it could not support the draft resolution currently before the Committee.

15. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.43/Rev.1.*

In favour:

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

Against:

Israel, Japan, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia.

16. *Draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.43/Rev.1 was adopted by 116 votes to 3, with 42 abstentions.*

17. **Mr. Foley** (United States of America) said that there had clearly not been a consensus at the end of the Working Group's session, and the draft resolution still contained a number of conclusions on which there was no agreement.

18. **Mr. Roshdy** (Egypt) said it was regrettable that the right to development, which was a prerequisite for the exercise of all other rights, had not commanded a consensus.

19. **Mr. Elisha** (Benin) said it was unfortunate that a consensus had not been achieved. He had understood that the voting would be on those paragraphs on which there had been no consensus, not on the draft resolution as a whole.

Draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.64: Globalization and its impact on the full enjoyment of all human rights

20. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.64, which had no programme budget implications.

21. **Mr. Roshdy** (Egypt) announced that Jordan, Lesotho, Mauritius and Somalia had joined the sponsors. Unfortunately, despite consultations, there were still some conceptual differences.

22. **Mr. Maertens** (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the European Union, said that a series of amendments had been proposed with a view to maintaining the dialogue and regrettably none of them had been adopted. The European Union did not believe that globalization had an impact on all human rights or that its possible negative effects should be used to justify violating of any of those rights. The suggestion that the title of the draft resolution should be amended accordingly had not been implemented, except in the case of the French version, which should therefore be corrected.

23. It was regrettable that the draft resolution highlighted only the negative aspects of globalization, suggesting that the sponsors had failed to grasp the complexity of the phenomenon or the fact that responsibility for human rights lay first and foremost with Governments. Moreover, it would have been better if the problem of deepening poverty had not been automatically linked to globalization, and if a reference had been made to the non-governmental agents of the phenomenon. For those reasons, he would vote against the draft resolution.

24. *At the request of the representative of Belgium, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.64.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, 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, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, 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, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining:

Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Guatemala, Micronesia (Federated States of), Panama, Peru, Republic of Korea, Singapore, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

25. *Draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.64 was adopted by 109 votes to 44, with 10 abstentions.*

26. **Mr. Laurin** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, New Zealand and Norway, said that they had voted against the draft resolution because it recognized neither the complexities of the issues involved in globalization nor the benefits that globalization could bring. At the same time, some of the issues it addressed would be better considered in other forums. It did not fully recognize the priority and importance of the domestic measures that must be taken to address the challenges of globalization.

27. **Mr. McCamman** (United States of America) said the United States did not accept that the net effect of globalization had been an increase in poverty, since the countries which had embraced freer markets, freer trade and technological change had been the most successful. National policies promoting participation in globalization's opportunities were vital for helping those who found it difficult to adapt to it. He did not accept that globalization had had a negative impact on the exercise of human rights, since increased information flows had drawn greater international attention than ever before to abuses of those rights.

28. **Mr. Roshdy** (Egypt), supported by **Mr. Barg** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) and **Ms. Ahmed** (Sudan), said that the purpose of the draft resolution was neither to condemn nor to defend globalization, but to make it a just force for the benefit of all countries. He might accept the claim that the sponsors did not support globalization, but not that they failed to understand it or its dimensions.

29. **Ms. Elisha** (Benin), supported by **Ms. Ahmed** (Sudan), said that development partners did not recognize the adverse effects of globalization. It was a fact that all least-developed countries were vulnerable, since all their development indicators were negative. She hoped that dialogue would make for understanding.

Draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.69/Rev.1: Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa

30. **The Chairman** informed the Committee that the statement submitted by the Secretary-General in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and contained in document A/C.3/56/L.81 applied to draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.69/Rev.1.

31. **Mr. Ileka** (Democratic Republic of the Congo) thanked Japan, the European Union and the United States of America for their contributions to revised draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.69, which he hoped would be adopted without a vote.

32. **The Chairman** announced that Sierra Leone had joined the sponsors. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.69/Rev.1 without a vote.

33. *Draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.69/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.71: Protection of migrants

34. **The Chairman** informed the Committee that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

35. **Ms. Monroy** (Mexico), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that, as a result of further consultations aimed at reaching a consensus, the following amendments had been agreed: the third preambular paragraph would end with the phrase "Fourth World Conference on Women" and would be followed by a new preambular paragraph to read: "*Taking note of the positive treatment of the issue of migrants at the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, and recognizing the economic, social and cultural contributions of migrants to the countries of destination and origin*". The final preambular paragraph should be replaced by a new text, which read: "*Taking note of Advisory Opinion OC-16/99, issued by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights on 1 October 1999, regarding The Right to Information on Consular Assistance in the Framework of the Guarantees of the Due Process of Law, in the case of foreign nationals detained by the authorities of a receiving State,*". She reminded members that during the introduction of the draft resolution, the Secretariat's attention had been called to

a few editorial corrections to be made to both the English and Spanish versions, and requested that they should be noted. She hoped that, with those changes, the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

36. **The Chairman** announced that Lesotho and Swaziland had joined the list of sponsors of the draft resolution. Since he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt revised draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.71 without a vote.

37. *Draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.71 was adopted, as orally revised, without a vote.*

38. **Ms. Kok Li Peng** (Singapore), referring to paragraph 4, said that immigration policies were conditioned by each country's particular circumstances and reaffirmed the view that those policies fell within each State's sovereign jurisdiction. Despite her delegation's concerns regarding that paragraph and other provisions of the draft resolution, it had joined the consensus, but reserved the right to reconsider its position at future sessions.

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)
(A/C.3/56/L.50)

Draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.50: The situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

39. **The Chairman** informed the Committee that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

40. **Ms. Stevens** (Belgium) said that Albania had joined the list of sponsors.

41. **Mr. Al-Ethary** (Yemen) said that his country's position on the reports of the special representatives for human rights was, in principle, to abstain from voting on related draft resolutions, since human rights were indivisible and Yemen applied the pertinent international instruments. His delegation reaffirmed its condemnation of any human rights violation. However, it utterly rejected the politicization of human rights, to the detriment of specific peoples, for the purpose of interfering in their internal affairs and undermining their national values. That practice constituted a grave danger for the principles and values of human rights. For that reason, his delegation would abstain from the vote on all draft resolutions pertaining to the human rights situation in specific countries.

42. **Ms. Tobing-Klein** (Suriname) said that her country's position regarding human rights should be interpreted in the context of its own bitter experience of past human rights violations. Its approach to human-rights issues was founded on its responsibility to fulfil its promises and commitments. As a member of the Group of 77, her country was aware of the efficiency and dedication with which the Islamic Republic of Iran discharged its duties in regard to that Group, various members of which had sent signals regarding her country's sponsorship of the draft resolution under consideration. The draft resolution itself referred to the improvements in human rights in Iran. For those reasons, her country was withdrawing as a sponsor of the draft resolution and would act as it saw fit when the recorded vote was taken.

43. **Mr. Fadaifard** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the United Nations human rights system, as a universal mechanism, should cover all individuals and peoples. No part of the world was free from human rights violations and no individual should believe himself or herself immune from them. Thus, if the human rights system was to serve the cherished and noble causes enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it must keep an eye on all parts of the world. Building on that assumption, it behoved everyone, individually and collectively, to contribute to fair, just and constructive engagement in the United Nations human rights activities.

44. It was hardly necessary to emphasize that the traditional sponsors of the draft resolution had invariably pursued a policy of defamation and finger-pointing on specific human rights situations. The European Union had vividly revealed its political agenda in that area when, in a statement before the Committee, it had identified a large number of developing countries as violators of human rights. Applying a similar logic, one of the sponsors of the draft resolution had suggested, in the context of another draft resolution, that the term "developing countries" should be replaced by the term "undemocratic regimes".

45. The process including the essence and the very basis of the draft resolution had been initiated two decades earlier, founded on the strategy of defamation and distortion of the image of the Islamic Republic of Iran on the international scene for purposes best encompassed by the term "realpolitik". That process

had involved submitting draft resolutions as its key instrument for misleading world opinion on the situation of human rights in his country by reproducing hollow, biased information and hurling accusations. In that regard, it should be pointed out that, following the Special Representative's oral presentation on 12 November 2001, the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran had provided the Committee with the latest information and official figures on the situation of women, freedom of expression, and minorities in Iran. In so doing, it was endeavouring to stimulate a meaningful and action-oriented dialogue on the entire process, to which it had expected a favourable response from the sponsors of the draft resolution. Regrettably, however, there had been no indication of their willingness to keep pace with the living reality in Iran. The sponsors were so ill-informed about developments there that they had failed to realize that the Iranian Parliament had already ratified International Labour Organization Convention No. 182 concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour, a measure his Government was called upon to consider in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

46. The United Nations system and its various mechanisms must not be held hostage to the whims and wishes of a few who would not hesitate to undermine its credibility. It was only through adherence to the principles of impartiality and non-selectivity that it could make a meaningful contribution to the global promotion and protection of human rights. A resolution founded on political interests, supported by a limited number of countries, was not a wise or fair response, nor was it a plan capable of making the difference in the Islamic Republic of Iran in that domain. His country invited delegations to reject the continuation of that unhealthy and irrational practice by voting against the draft resolution.

47. **Mr. Barg** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the draft resolution was a political draft that showed bias against the Islamic Republic of Iran. Its adoption would divert international action towards a negative path by hindering the country's progress in respect of human rights, rather than encouraging it to continue. His country maintained dialogue with the Islamic Republic of Iran instead of subjecting it to political pressure. At the same time, he was unclear as to the sponsors'

objective and the message they wished to send. He would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

48. **Mr. Shen** Guofang (China) said that the Islamic Republic of Iran had made laudable efforts to defend and protect human rights and had helped to promote dialogue among civilizations and international cooperation on human rights. Those efforts deserved recognition, which the draft resolution did not provide. China would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

49. *At the request of the Islamic Republic of Iran, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.50.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Tuvalu, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu, Yugoslavia.

Against:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Gambia, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Angola, Argentina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Georgia, Ghana, Guinea, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mexico, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Singapore, South Africa, Swaziland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Zambia.

50. *Draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.50 was adopted by 71 votes to 53, with 41 abstentions.**

51. **Ms. Leyton** (Chile) said that her delegation had abstained for the second consecutive year in the voting on the draft resolution deploring the human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran. Owing to the repeated human rights violations that Chile had experienced during a long period of its history, it could not be indifferent to similar situations elsewhere in the world. It was therefore dismayed at the human rights violations mentioned in the report of the Special Rapporteur and at the fact that the latter had been unable to visit Iran, and it called on the Iranian authorities to reconsider their refusal to authorize the visit.

52. However, her country's anxiety was not limited to the case under discussion but rather extended to the region as a whole. What was alarming was that the established selection criteria might lead the United Nations to observe human rights violations in some cases and ignore them in others. In that context, President Khatami and his Government deserved credit for their sterling efforts to change the situation currently prevailing in the country, the extreme complexity of which involved not only the domestic scene, but also the very serious developments in the region. Her delegation appreciated at its full worth the sweeping condemnation of terrorism which the President of the Islamic Republic of Iran had pronounced, terrorism being the worst form of human rights violation, and deemed it to be of capital importance for countering a scourge that flew in the face of all civilizations and all religious beliefs. Her delegation would like the Islamic Republic of Iran,

* The delegation of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines informed the Chairman that it had intended to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.50.

which had made such a valuable contribution to developing the dialogue between civilizations, to create the conditions that would permit the full exercise of human rights in its territory, and it would closely follow developments in that regard.

53. **Ms. Austria-Garcia** (Philippines) said that her delegation had decided to abstain rather than vote against the draft resolution, because the provisions reflected the positive developments in the situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran. She supported the Government's endeavours to promote human rights in the country and urged it to continue them.

54. **Ms. Archer** (Bahamas) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it felt that the human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran had improved. However, that vote was without prejudice to its position on the death penalty, which was a matter for domestic legislation.

55. **Mr. Belli** (Brazil) encouraged the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to pursue its reforms, and trusted that his abstention would be interpreted as an incentive to promote human rights.

56. **Ms. Tobing-Klein** (Suriname) said that her country's position was not based on any kind of political pressure. She applauded the positive developments in the human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.58/Rev.1: The situation of human rights in the Sudan

57. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.58/Rev.1, which had no programme budget implications.

58. **Mr. Erwa** (Sudan) said that his delegation had reservations about many of the paragraphs of the draft resolution, which did not follow the lines of previous years, was broader in scope and did not address the core issue. During the consultations, his delegation's suggestion to trim the text so that it would deal only with the essentials and not be open to misinterpretation had been ignored.

59. The draft resolution reflected prejudice against the Government of the Sudan; it contained references that undermined the country's sovereignty and impugned its right to use its natural resources. For example, concern was expressed at forced displacement of populations, in particular in areas

surrounding the oilfields, while aerial photographs taken by international oil companies and satellite pictures obtained by the United States of America showed, quite to the contrary, that the population in those areas had increased, and the Sudanese Government had received representatives of the European Union who were able to verify those assertions. Moreover, references to the exercise of the sovereign right to utilize natural resources were unacceptable and jeopardized the right of peoples to development.

60. At the same time, the draft resolution referred to indiscriminate aerial bombardment without identification of the real perpetrators, thereby favouring the Sudanese People's Liberation Army/Movement which was notorious for its terrorist activities. That was a lamentable state of affairs at a time when collective measures were being taken to fight terrorism.

61. The draft resolution also claimed that the Government of the Sudan continued its indiscriminate aerial bombardment of civil targets, although it had declared a ceasefire a year earlier and the terrorist activities of the Sudanese People's Liberation Army/Movement had triggered the evacuation of thousands. Another point to be borne in mind was that the international community had no unanimous position on capital punishment.

62. It should be pointed out that the report of the Special Rapporteur showed that the human rights situation had improved in the Sudan, a fact also reflected in the dialogue between the Sudan and the European Community, and that progress should have been reflected in the draft resolution. The Sudan, which would vote against it, urged delegations not to submit to political pressure or abide by principles that encouraged selectivity and politicization.

63. **Mr. Foley** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that there was irrefutable evidence of the tragic human rights situation in the Sudan, which portrayed a persistent image of violations of the rights of the civilian population, especially women and children. Also, the Special Representative in the Sudan had yet to evaluate whether the Government had taken the necessary steps to combat the practice of slavery. The United States assigned major importance to that issue and preferred to abstain from voting.

64. **Mr. Shen** Guofang (China) said that, given the situation in the Sudan, the protection of human rights called for the country's urgent development. The international community should therefore welcome with satisfaction all steps taken to that end. For that reason, China would vote against the draft resolution.

65. **Ms. Khalil** (Egypt) reiterated that human rights must not be politicized or used to exert pressure on States or interfere in their domestic affairs. Furthermore, cultural diversity and the sovereign right of States to enact legislation founded on their own values had to be borne in mind. It was important to respect the Charter of the United Nations without undermining the political independence or territorial integrity of States, a consideration that also applied to the Sudan. The draft resolution and the report of the Special Rapporteur took none of those points into account, nor did they reflect the positive developments in the country's situation. Egypt would vote against the draft resolution.

66. **Mr. Barg** (Libyan People's Jamahiriya) said that human rights should not be politicized or used to undermine the territorial integrity of States. The draft resolution before the Committee was vitiated by those defects. The European Union's consultations had, unfortunately, not borne fruit, which was why the final text was not politically balanced; nor did it reflect the Sudan's efforts to improve the human rights situation and cooperate with the United Nations bodies. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya utterly rejected the attempt to politicize human rights and would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

67. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba) said that cooperation in the area of human rights called for impartiality. The draft resolution was biased, made no mention of the positive elements and did not acknowledge the progress achieved by the Government. Moreover, it undermined the sovereignty of the State. Cuba would vote against draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.58/Rev.1.

68. *At the request of the United States of America and the Sudan, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.58/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic,

Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Algeria, Bahrain, Benin, Burkina Faso, Chad, China, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Gambia, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Viet Nam.

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Israel, Jamaica, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Philippines, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Zambia.

69. *Draft resolution A/C.3/56/L.58/Rev.1 was adopted by 82 votes to 34, with 45 abstentions.*

70. **Ms. Tobing-Klein** (Suriname) said she had abstained because she recognized the improvement in the Sudan's situation and wished to encourage the country to continue its progress in that direction.

71. **Ms. Archer** (Bahamas) said she had voted in favour because she deemed that international action such as that described in the draft resolution could improve the country's situation. Support for the draft resolution did not mean, however, that she was not perfectly aware of what was going on in the country.

72. **Mr. Laurin** (Canada), making a general statement, said that Canada had sponsored the draft resolution because of its concern over the continued human-rights violations by both parties to the conflict. In any event, it had strong reservations regarding some of the amendments to the original text of the revised draft. In particular, it did not agree with the manner in which the issue of the ceasefire had been handled. Canada considered that the parties to the conflict should implement the Declaration of Principles, especially point 6, which referred to a negotiated ceasefire agreement. It was already evident that unilateral ceasefire commitments were of no avail. Consequently, there was no sense in welcoming unilateral declarations of that type or calling on those concerned to make them. A ceasefire agreement needed to be negotiated. He therefore appealed to the parties to take steps in that direction.

73. His delegation reiterated its support for the role of Sudanese civil society in laying the groundwork for tolerance and the rule of law, as envisaged in the Declaration of Principles, and expressed its concern at the continued state of emergency and the restrictions imposed on freedom of association and assembly. Also, it welcomed with satisfaction the formation of the Committee for the Eradication of Abduction of Women and Children and noted that its activities had been limited by a lack of resources. Canada urged all parties to the conflict to cooperate with that Committee and looked forward to concrete practical results from its activities.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.