



# General Assembly

Sixty-first session

Official Records

Distr.: General  
29 November 2006

Original: English

---

## Third Committee

### Summary record of the 43rd meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 9 November 2006, at 3 p.m.

*Chairman:* Mr. Al Bayati ..... (Iraq)

## Contents

Agenda item 118: Programme planning

Agenda item 66: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

Agenda item 67: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

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

Agenda item 41: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 61: Advancement of women (*continued*)

- (a) Advancement of women (*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.



*The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.*

**Agenda item 118: Programme planning** (A/60/537; A/61/6 (Prog. 19); A/C.3/61/3)

1. **The Chairman** reminded the Committee that programme 19 of the proposed strategic framework for the period 2008-2009 and the revised estimates relating to the 2005 World Summit Outcome had been assigned to the Third Committee for its review and action. He had appointed Mr. Lamin Faati, Vice-Chairman of the Committee, as facilitator for consultations on that item.

2. **Mr. Faati** (Gambia), Vice-Chairman, speaking as facilitator for the informal consultations on the item, said that at the initial consultations it had been agreed that the substance of programme 19 would be considered on 13 November. He urged all delegations to watch for announcements in the Journal and to have their written proposals ready.

3. **Mr. Cumberbach Miguén** (Cuba) said that his delegation wished to stress that the consultations must be substantive in nature and must lead to an understanding. The proposals regarding programme 19 went beyond the legislative mandate established in different resolutions on human rights. His delegation had drafted some amendments which it would maintain throughout the discussions.

4. **The Chairman** noted that the Committee had concluded its general discussion of item 118 and would revert to the item in due course to take action on the outcome of the negotiations facilitated by the Vice-Chairman.

**Agenda item 66: Right of peoples to self-determination** (*continued*) (A/C.3/61/L.51)

*Draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.51: The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination*

5. **Mr. Afifi** (Egypt), introducing the draft resolution, said that Andorra, Belarus, Belize, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guyana, Jamaica, Liechtenstein, the Niger, Romania, Saint Lucia, San Marino and Slovenia had joined the sponsors.

6. The text was essentially the same as that of the resolution adopted at the previous session; it had merely been updated. Although it had been more than a

year since the Israeli occupying forces had withdrawn from the Gaza Strip and part of the West Bank, the situation of the Palestinian people had deteriorated. The Israeli Government had decided to punish the people by enforcing a severe blockade in the occupied territories and by using the result of the Palestinian elections as a means to block the peace process. The entity of the Palestinian people and their territory had to be safeguarded, and the Israeli practice of separating the Palestinian people's lands and resources must come to an end. The wall must be immediately dismantled, and with it Israel's ambition for Palestinian lands. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus and that it would further contribute towards alleviating the hardship and suffering of the Palestinian population living under Israeli occupation.

7. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the following delegations had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Ecuador, the Gambia, Moldova (Republic of), Monaco, Mozambique, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Ukraine, Uzbekistan and Viet Nam.

**Agenda item 67: Promotion and protection of human rights** (*continued*)

**(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms** (*continued*) (A/C.3/61/L.20, L.25, L.30-L.32 and L.45)

*Draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.20: Globalization and its impact on the full enjoyment of all human rights*

8. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) informed the Committee that Moldova should not have been listed as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.20; it had been included by mistake.

9. **Mr. Afifi** (Egypt), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.20, said that the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Sudan and Yemen had joined the sponsors.

10. The draft resolution was aimed at addressing the impact of globalization on humanity and drawing attention to the interdependence between changes in

modes of communication, production and technology, on the one hand, and the ways in which human beings could optimize the enjoyment of all their human rights, on the other. There were no changes compared to the text of the previous year's resolution, except for those needed to update the text. The sponsors believed that there was scope for bridging the differences in perspectives and views on the human rights aspects of globalization that had persisted over the years.

11. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Bangladesh, Barbados, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, the Comoros, the Congo, Ghana, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Swaziland and Zambia had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.25: Elimination of all forms of intolerance and of discrimination based on religion or belief*

12. **Ms. Pohjankukka** (Finland), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that Armenia, Benin, the Congo, Georgia, Madagascar, Mexico, Moldova (Republic of), New Zealand, Nigeria, Peru, the Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey had joined the sponsors.

13. The draft resolution, which was based on the consensus text adopted at the sixtieth session, was an important tool for the protection of everyone's right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion or belief. The European Union had been actively engaged in discussions with a broad range of countries and hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

14. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Botswana, the Central African Republic, Ethiopia, Fiji, Haiti, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nicaragua, Timor-Leste, Togo and Uganda had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.30: Inadmissibility of human rights violations through the practice of secret detention and unlawful transfers while countering terrorism*

15. **Mr. Strigelsky** (Belarus), introducing the draft resolution, said that it was a new text addressing an urgent and serious challenge which had recently been revealed and roundly condemned by the international

community. People suspected of alleged terrorist activity were being deprived of their basic human rights, including the right to a fair trial and basic legal protection. The main purpose of the draft resolution was to prevent the practice from being extended on a global scale.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/61/31: Promotion of equitable and mutually respectful dialogue on human rights*

16. **Mr. Strigelsky** (Belarus), speaking also on behalf of Uzbekistan, introduced the draft resolution and orally revised the second preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4. He then urged all delegations to vote for the draft resolution.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.32: Regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights*

17. **Mr. Nihon** (Belgium), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that Australia, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Croatia, El Salvador, Mali, Morocco, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, Serbia, Timor-Leste and Turkey had joined the sponsors. After recalling the importance of strengthening subregional arrangements, as reaffirmed in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action adopted on 25 June 1993, and after welcoming the steps taken by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to increase cooperation for the promotion and protection of human rights, he called on the Committee to adopt the draft resolution without a vote as in previous years.

18. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Angola, Armenia, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, the Central African Republic, the Congo, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Honduras, Israel, Liberia, Moldova (Republic of), Slovakia, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Togo had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.45: Extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions*

19. **Mr. Berg** (Sweden), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that Albania, Andorra, Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador, Georgia, Iceland, Moldova (Republic of), Palau, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Serbia, Swaziland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Timor-Leste had

joined the sponsors. The draft resolution had been restructured and streamlined in keeping with ongoing efforts to reform and revitalize the work of the Third Committee. Referring in particular to the core of the draft resolution in paragraph 2, he urged Governments to take effective action to combat and eliminate all forms of extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions and to cooperate with and assist the Special Rapporteur in the fulfilment of his mandate. Negotiations on the draft resolution were ongoing. He expressed the hope that the draft resolution would be adopted with the broadest possible consensus.

20. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua and Ukraine had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution.

**(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives** (*continued*)  
(A/C.3/61/L.37-L.43)

*Draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.37: Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea*

21. **Ms. Pohjankukka** (Finland), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that Albania, Andorra, Bulgaria, Iceland, Moldova (Republic of), Palau, Serbia, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey had joined the sponsors. She expressed regret that the authorities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had resisted all attempts by the European Union to discuss the draft resolution. The developments welcomed by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in that country were recognized in the draft but, as observed in the report of the Special Rapporteur, systemic, widespread and grave violations of human rights still occurred there.

22. The sponsors called on the Government to cooperate fully with the Special Rapporteur, including granting him full, free and unimpeded access to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The international community was frustrated because the Government had shown only limited engagement with treaty bodies on the subject of human rights. For example, the report on the human rights situation compiled by Vaclav Havel, K. M. Bondevik and Elie Wiesel, stated that the Government was responsible for the egregious human rights and humanitarian situation in the country. Noting that the aim of the draft

resolution was to help improve the situation on the ground in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, she urged Member States to demonstrate their solidarity by supporting the draft resolution.

23. **Mr. Sin** Song Chol (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that the draft resolution defied the common will of the majority of United Nations Member States, which opposed politicization, selectivity and double standards in the area of human rights. His delegation categorically opposed and rejected the draft resolution because it was the European Union that was preventing cooperation on human rights by tabling such a resolution yet again, in conspiracy with the United States and Japan, which were hostile towards his country. The draft resolution obstructed dialogue and cooperation on human rights and deepened mistrust among nations. It woefully disregarded the will of the international community, which wanted the new Human Rights Council to be an authentic body that enjoyed the full trust of United Nations membership.

24. His delegation rejected the draft resolution for three reasons. First, it was drafted for dishonest political motives, for the purpose of interfering in the internal affairs of a country on the pretext of protecting human rights. Secondly, the draft resolution reflected yet another example of double standards. If the European Union applied truly fair standards, it would start by criticizing the illegal invasion of Iraq and the massive slaughter of civilians by the United States together with the armed invasion of Lebanon and the massacre of innocent civilians by Israel under the active patronage of the United States. There was no greater violation of human rights than the indiscriminate slaughter of human beings, especially women and children. Similarly, while expressing serious concern about the abduction of only a few Japanese, the European Union remained silent on the abduction and forcible drafting of 8.4 million Koreans by Japan. Thirdly, the draft resolution was based on false information contained in unsubstantiated reports fabricated by countries hostile to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, such as the United States and Japan, and organizations that plotted against his country for the sake of money.

25. Although the people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea were not materially well off, they did not know such social ills as unemployment, illiteracy, violence and prostitution and lived with

confidence and optimism in a system where everyone had free access to medical service, education and housing. From its principled position of opposition to politicization, selectivity and double standards on human rights and the adoption of country-specific resolutions, his delegation categorically rejected the draft resolution and would oppose and vote against all country-specific resolutions that targeted developing countries. He was convinced that all Member States that were opposed to confrontation and arbitrariness and that favoured dialogue and cooperation with respect to human rights would show their solidarity and support by opposing the draft resolution on its adoption.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.38: Situation of human rights in Myanmar*

26. **Ms. Pohjankukka** (Finland) introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that Albania, Andorra, Bulgaria, Iceland, Moldova (Republic of), Monaco, the Republic of Korea, Serbia, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey had joined the sponsors. She orally revised paragraph 1 (a) and said that negotiations on the draft resolution were ongoing among the sponsors and interested delegations, including that of Myanmar itself.

27. While there had been some positive developments on human rights in the country, there were still many grave concerns that troubled the international community, as duly noted in the draft resolution. It was regrettable that Myanmar had not been more cooperative, because engagement with the Organization would help the country to restore democracy and build the foundations for sustainable development and national reconciliation. While the Special Rapporteur had noted that the positive political momentum shown in the early years of his mandate had apparently stalled, there was a glimmer of hope because the United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs had been allowed to visit Myanmar in May 2006 and was scheduled to make another visit.

28. **Mr. Tin** (Myanmar), speaking on a point of order, said that the text of the draft resolution mentioned a consultative process, and the representative of Finland had spoken of negotiations with his delegation on the text. Yet, contrary to past practice, his delegation had received the text of the draft resolution just one day before its submission, which had not allowed time for meaningful negotiation. As the draft was completely

unacceptable to his delegation, he hoped that there would be an opportunity for negotiations in good faith before its adoption.

29. **The Chairman** pointed out that, under rule 113 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, a representative rising to a point of order could not speak on the substance of the matter under discussion.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.39: Situation of human rights in Uzbekistan*

30. **Mr. Miller** (United States of America), introducing the draft resolution, said that Belgium, Finland, France, Italy, Liechtenstein, Switzerland and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had joined the sponsors. The Government of Uzbekistan had failed to respond to the previous draft resolution adopted in 2005. The situation continued to deteriorate, and only limited steps had been taken to implement the recommendations of the Committee against Torture. It was also essential for all mechanisms established by the former Commission on Human Rights to be implemented fully. He therefore hoped that the draft resolution would receive broad support.

31. **Mr. Vohidov** (Uzbekistan) said that he would provide details at a later time to demonstrate that draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.39 was biased and unsubstantiated. At present, he wished to point out that the draft resolution was in breach of the confidentiality in effect within the United Nations system because it referred, in paragraph 4 (e), to matters concerning Uzbekistan that were currently being considered under the confidential 1503 procedure established by Economic and Social Council resolutions 1503 (XLVIII) and 2000/3. Such matters were meant to remain confidential until they were made public by consent of the Government in question or upon the recommendation of the Human Rights Council itself. Introducing the draft resolution against Uzbekistan clearly duplicated the consideration of human-rights issues by one of the main bodies of the General Assembly. Until early 2006, when the Human Rights Council was established, human-rights issues had been discussed simultaneously by both the Third Committee and the Commission on Human Rights on the understanding that the Commission was a subsidiary body of the Economic and Social Council.

32. In addition, the Human Rights Council had recently decided to continue examining the matter

under the confidential procedure. The introduction of the draft resolution in the Third Committee undermined that decision, and he called on the Committee members not to create conditions from the outset that would undermine the work of a basic human-rights body of the United Nations: the Human Rights Council.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.40: Situation of human rights in Belarus*

33. **Mr. Miller** (United States of America), introducing the draft resolution, said that Andorra, Croatia, Liechtenstein and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had joined the sponsors. The Government of Belarus had failed to respond to the draft resolution adopted two years earlier. As the situation had continued to deteriorate, he appealed to the international community to underscore its concern by adopting the draft resolution.

34. **Mr. Taranda** (Belarus), reminded the Third Committee members that a draft resolution on the same subject introduced at the fifty-ninth session of the General Assembly (A/C.3/59/L.55) had not been adopted, and he called on the United States delegation not to mislead the international community. Draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.40 did not reflect the actual human-rights situation in Belarus. It amounted to an attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of a sovereign State on the pretext of imagined human-rights violations, and his delegation would not attempt to justify itself in the face of slander and misinformation.

35. The sponsors had refused to eschew their former approach to human-rights issues, which was based on force, political pressure and a failure to respect the historical, cultural and religious specificity of other States. Such methods had led to the collapse of the Commission on Human Rights and threatened the future of the Human Rights Council. In General Assembly resolution 60/251 creating the Council, the Member States had confirmed their resolve to ensure universality, objectivity and non-selectivity in the consideration of human-rights issues. The draft resolution undermined those principles and demonstrated that its sponsors had no desire to engage in true dialogue or improve understanding between States but rather had chosen a course that would lead to a renewed atmosphere of distrust and confrontation. He called on the sponsors not to use the subject of human rights to pursue their own political interests.

36. The Third Committee must work towards the universal protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms on the basis of respect and equality. His delegation, for its part, would engage in constructive dialogue and cooperation on human rights using the methods and initiatives it had proposed in draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.31.

37. Country-specific resolutions undermined the efforts of Member States to create an effective and trusted human-rights mechanism for the United Nations. He called on delegations to remain firm and consistent in defending the principles confirmed during the creation of the Human Rights Council and at the 2006 summit of the Non-Aligned Movement.

38. **Mr. Nikiforov** (Russian Federation) said he was concerned because there were no strict criteria governing the discussion of the human-rights situations in specific countries. It was counterproductive to introduce country-specific resolutions when the Human Rights Council was creating a mechanism for universal periodic review. Draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.40 did not, therefore, merit consideration by the Third Committee. Its introduction was a political step that was unacceptable when the Government of Belarus was in the process of setting up a dialogue on human rights with international human-rights organizations.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.41: Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran*

39. **Mr. Normandin** (Canada), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the original sponsors and Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova (Republic of), New Zealand, Palau and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, said that the human-rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran had continued to deteriorate since 2005. Positive developments were sporadic and the lack of action by the Government was a cause for serious concern.

40. The draft resolution highlighted a range of human-rights issues from widespread denial of basic freedoms to inhumane treatment and punishment (para. 2), and called on the Government of Iran to remedy that situation (para. 3). Iranians had few opportunities to express themselves and advance human rights, and those who did speak out risked further human-rights violations. When a Government was not cooperating, did not acknowledge that it faced serious human-rights issues and showed no

commitment to making progress, the international community had a duty to address the situation. The sponsors hoped to encourage progress and looked forward to the day when the Government would abide by its international obligations and respect the basic rights of citizens, so that such a resolution would no longer be necessary.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.42: Situation of democracy and human rights in the United States of America*

41. **Mr. Dapkiunas** (Belarus), introducing the draft resolution, said that it was an honour to introduce a draft resolution that stated the truth and drew the attention of the General Assembly to human-rights abuses in one of the most self-confident democracies in the world. The text indicated to the United States Government the work it should do to remedy grave misdeeds that endangered human rights and democratic principles everywhere.

42. It was a tainted honour, however, to introduce a resolution that was wrong in terms of both method and tone. No self-respecting country would heed such a document. As always with country-specific resolutions, finger-pointing and name-calling would not promote trust and cooperation. His delegation was introducing the draft resolution as a warning sign that the international community was still taking the wrong approach to the sensitive matter of engaging Governments in human-rights promotion.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.43: Situation of indigenous peoples and immigrants in Canada*

43. **Ms. Hastaie** (Islamic Republic of Iran), said that she was introducing the draft resolution in response to systematic violations of human rights — particularly those of aboriginals and immigrants — in Canada. Despite its long-standing opposition to country-specific resolutions, her delegation had felt it imperative to bring the case to the attention of the international community.

44. The draft resolution was based on facts already reflected in the reports and observations of many international bodies. It expressed concern at the disparities between aboriginal peoples and the rest of the population (para. 3), the situation of women prisoners (para. 7), several aspects of the immigration law (para. 8) and the Government's failure to address

the specific needs of aboriginal women and attendant social issues (para. 6).

45. Her delegation called on the Government of Canada to change certain provisions of the immigration law and their application (para. 9), to improve health care, housing, education, welfare and social services for aboriginal people (para. 10), to amend its human-rights legislation, to enhance its legal system so that victims of discrimination had an effective remedy (para. 11) and to abide by its obligations under human-rights conventions and other international instruments (para. 12).

46. The Government of Canada had long tried to cast itself as a human-rights defender, but it had a poor human-rights record at home, particularly with regard to indigenous people and immigrants. The international community should therefore reflect on that situation in a spirit of impartiality and non-discrimination. Her delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be a step towards helping Canada to improve its human-rights record and invited all Member States to lend their support.

**Agenda item 41: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions** (*continued*) (A/C.3/61/L.52)

*Draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.52: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees*

47. **Mr. Enarsson** (Sweden), introducing the draft resolution, said that Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Djibouti, Madagascar, Paraguay, Serbia, Slovakia, the Sudan, Thailand, Togo and the United Republic of Tanzania had joined the sponsors. It was his hope that the draft resolution could be adopted by consensus, which would be in line with the humanitarian nature of the work of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees.

48. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Belize, Bolivia, the Central African Republic, Ghana, Jamaica, Senegal, Timor-Leste, Uganda, Ukraine and Zambia also wished to join the sponsors.

**Agenda item 61: Advancement of women** (*continued*)**(a) Advancement of women** (*continued*)

(A/C.3/61/L.11/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.11/Rev.1: Trafficking in women and girls*

49. **Ms. Hizon** (Philippines), introducing the draft resolution, said that the following countries had joined the original sponsors: Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Kenya, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Moldova (Republic of), Mongolia, Namibia, the Netherlands, the Niger, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, the Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Slovenia, Serbia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Ukraine, Uruguay and Viet Nam. In the nineteenth preambular paragraph, the fourth line, the word “their” should be replaced by “the victims”. The primary objective of the draft resolution was to highlight the gender dimension of trafficking and to strengthen a victim-centred approach.

50. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Albania, Australia, Bangladesh, Barbados, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, the Comoros, the Congo, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Georgia, Iceland, Jamaica, Lesotho, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Uganda, Ukraine and the United Republic of Tanzania had also joined the sponsors.

51. *Draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.11/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

52. **Mr. Meyer** (Observer for the Holy See) said that his delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution. The trade in persons was a shocking offence against human dignity and a grave violation of fundamental human rights. Slavery, prostitution, sale of women and children and disgraceful working conditions, where people were treated as instruments of gain rather than free and responsible persons, poisoned human society. It was an affront to fundamental shared values that were rooted in the very

nature of the human person and shared by all cultures and peoples. The victims were often the poorest and most vulnerable, and his delegation encouraged all States to take seriously the obligation contained in the draft resolution to prevent, investigate and punish the perpetrators and to rescue and care for the victims. The disturbing tendency to treat prostitution and forced labour as an industry detached freedom from moral law and reduced humans to mere commodities.

53. **Mr. Taranda** (Belarus) thanked the delegation of the Philippines for its work in producing a balanced resolution. In that connection, he wished to stress two points in particular. First, Governments must take appropriate measures to shut down the lucrative black market in human trafficking, child pornography and prostitution. Secondly, girls and women who had been forced into illegal work must be protected and reintegrated into society, instead of being prosecuted as was unfortunately sometimes the case. His delegation therefore welcomed the measures proposed to bring the perpetrators of such crimes to justice and hoped that all Governments would make efforts to fully implement draft resolution A/C.3/61/L.11/Rev.1.

54. **Ms. Escobar** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution. She wished to clarify, however, that recognition of the commitments made at the 2005 World Summit did not imply recognition of its Outcome. Trafficking could not be resolved by one country alone; it was a shared responsibility of countries of origin, transit and destination.

55. **Mr. Suarez** (Colombia) said that the international community must combat the transnational crime of trafficking through joint actions to combat both supply and demand. He hoped that, at the sixty-third session of the General Assembly, it would be possible, in the draft resolution, to deal with repatriation on terms that would ensure the protection of the rights of victims of trafficking.

*The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.*