



General Assembly

Sixty-sixth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
7 February 2012

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 42nd meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 8 November 2011, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Haniff Hussein. (Malaysia)

Contents

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 67: Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

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

Agenda item 68: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

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

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

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

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

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

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 3.10 p.m.

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions *(continued)*

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.67: Enlargement of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

1. **Mr. Jafarov** (Azerbaijan), introducing the draft resolution and speaking also on behalf of Rwanda, said that enlargement of the Executive Committee had been requested in letters from the two delegations dated March and July 2011, and that the Economic and Social Council had expressed its position on the enlargement of the Executive Committee in its decision 263/2011.

2. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Afghanistan, Denmark, Egypt and Peru had joined the list of sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.63: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

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

4. **Ms. Rasmussen** (Denmark), introducing the draft resolution, said that its main purpose was to safeguard the rights and well-being of refugees.

5. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Albania, Argentina, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational Republic of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Honduras, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, the Niger, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay and Zambia had joined the list of sponsors.

6. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.63 was adopted without a vote.*

7. **Mr. Al-Nsour** (Jordan), speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation had joined the consensus despite deletion of the reference to Iraqi refugees being hosted by neighbouring countries and

the generosity of those countries in providing necessary services despite challenging economic conditions. While in some countries the number of Iraqi refugees had decreased, Jordan was still hosting large numbers of Iraqis and continued to require significant assistance and cooperation from the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees and other agencies.

8. **Ms. Alsaleh** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in explanation of position, said that her delegation had joined the consensus despite the absence of a reference to the efforts by the Government of Iraq to provide for the safe return and reintegration of displaced Iraqi citizens and measures taken by neighbouring countries to help Iraqi refugees. Her country was still hosting large numbers of refugees and treated them as brothers. Its resources were limited but it was rich in compassion and hospitality and was cooperating in efforts to help Iraqis return home with dignity after the complete withdrawal of foreign forces from their country or to help them settle in third countries.

9. **Mr. Al-Obaidi** (Iraq), speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation had sought to delete the reference to refugees from Iraq because it did not reflect the situation in Iraq. Statistics indicated that the number of Iraqi refugees and displaced persons had decreased significantly. Refugees and displaced persons were a priority for the Government of Iraq.

Agenda item 67: Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance *(continued)*

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

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.60: Inadmissibility of certain practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

10. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation), introducing the draft resolution, said that Mauritania and the Seychelles had joined the list of sponsors. Regrettably, the draft resolution remained highly relevant. The victory of the Allies in the Second World War had undeniably represented the victory of good over evil and resulted in the contemporary system of protection and promotion of human rights.

11. It was unacceptable to make those involved in Nazi crimes into heroes. Recently, the dedication of

monuments to Nazis had become a regular occurrence in some countries, and anniversaries of liberation from the Nazis had been declared days of mourning. In some cases, people who had spoken out against forgetting those who had fought against fascism during the Second World War had been arrested, and those who had fought alongside the fascists had been described as participating in national liberation movements. Recently a central thoroughfare in a European town had been renamed in honour of a Waffen SS battalion which had slaughtered civilians, including babies and the elderly.

12. The Nuremberg Tribunal had established unambiguously who represented the force of good and who the force of evil during the Second World War. Attempts to revisit that position were blasphemy.

13. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Côte d'Ivoire, the Niger and Uzbekistan had joined the list of sponsors.

Agenda item 68: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.61: The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination

14. **Mr. Selim** (Egypt), introducing the draft resolution, said that Albania, Andorra, Austria, Bulgaria, Cape Verde, Cyprus, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, the Gambia, Greece, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Myanmar, Norway, Oman, South Africa, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had joined the list of sponsors. Except for some technical updates, the text of the draft resolution was the same as that of the previous session.

15. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Chile, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, the Kyrgyz Republic, Latvia, Mali, Monaco, the Niger, Nigeria, the Republic of Moldova and Romania had joined the list of sponsors.

16. **Ms. Morgan-Moss** (Panama) noted that her country's name had been included in the list of sponsors on the draft resolution in error. Panama was not a sponsor of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.62: Use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination

17. **Ms. Acosta** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution, said that Algeria, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Russian Federation and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines had joined the list of sponsors.

18. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the Comoros, Egypt, Madagascar, Mali, Namibia, the Niger, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe had joined the list of sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.30: Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination

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

20. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Timor-Leste had been erroneously listed as a sponsor.

21. **Mr. Tarar** (Pakistan), introducing the draft resolution, said that Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, Lesotho, Mali and Mozambique had joined the sponsors. The adoption of the resolution by acclamation since its introduction in the 1980s clearly communicated the opposition of the international community to all acts of foreign aggression and occupation.

22. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.30 was adopted without a vote.*

23. **Mr. Herczyński** (Poland), speaking on behalf of the European Union in explanation of position, said that the thrust of the draft resolution was too narrow. It should have reflected more clearly the practice of self-determination under international law. The text contained inaccuracies; the right to self-determination as stated in the international covenants attached only to peoples, not to nations. Moreover, self-determination was closely associated with respect for all human rights. It was not correct to suggest that self-determination was a precondition for enjoyment of other human rights.

24. The right to return should have been reflected in accordance with article 13, paragraph 2, of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. It was hoped that in future years, the text would be a more effective instrument for encouraging all States to respect their obligations in that area.

25. **Ms. Robles** (Spain), speaking in explanation of position, said that there were cases of colonized territories where the rights of the people in the territory were not violated. The principle of self-determination was not the only principle relevant to decolonization of territories which were not independent. There were cases, as had been established in various General Assembly resolutions, where the principle of territorial integrity applied. Gibraltar was one such case. The original population of the colony had been forced to abandon the territory, so there could be no claim to the right of self-determination by the colonizing people. The right to self-determination applied to colonized people.

26. **Mr. Díaz Bartolomé** (Argentina), speaking in explanation of position, said that his Government fully supported the right to self-determination of peoples under colonial domination or foreign occupation. However, that right must be understood in the light of successive United Nations resolutions on the subject, including those that expressly recognized the question of the Malvinas Islands as a special and particular colonial situation involving a sovereignty dispute between Argentina and the United Kingdom. The Malvinas Islands, South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas were illegitimately occupied by the United Kingdom, which had expelled the Argentine people and authorities peacefully residing there and replaced them with their own subjects. Thus, self-determination was not applicable, and the principle of territorial integrity must be applied.

27. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that the draft resolution contained many misstatements of international law and was inconsistent with current State practice.

28. **Mr. Preston** (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of position, said that his Government had no doubts about its sovereignty over Gibraltar and the territorial waters surrounding it and did not accept that the principle of territorial integrity had ever been applicable to the decolonization of Gibraltar. The existence of a sovereignty dispute did not imply that the people of Gibraltar did not have the right of self-determination. The United Kingdom would never enter into arrangements whereby the people of Gibraltar would pass under the sovereignty of another State against their wishes.

29. The United Kingdom had no doubt about its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas. The principle of self-determination as set out in Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations and article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights underlay its position on the Falkland Islands. There could be no negotiations on the sovereignty of the Falkland Islands unless and until the islanders so wished.

30. **Mr. Díaz Bartolomé** (Argentina), speaking in explanation of position, said that the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas had been illegally occupied by the United Kingdom. Several international organizations had recognized that they were the subject of a sovereignty dispute, and numerous General Assembly resolutions had urged the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to resume negotiations to find a peaceful and lasting solution without delay. Argentina reaffirmed its legitimate right to sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas, which were part and parcel of Argentine national territory.

Agenda item 69: 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*)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.31: The universal, indivisible, interrelated, interdependent and mutually reinforcing nature of all human rights and fundamental freedoms

31. **Mr. Mashabane** (South Africa), speaking also on behalf of Brazil and India, introduced the draft resolution.

32. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Côte d'Ivoire and Nigeria had joined the list of sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.37: 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

33. **Ms. Acosta** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution, said that Algeria, China, Côte d'Ivoire, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Myanmar, Namibia, the Niger, the Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Turkmenistan, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe had joined the list of sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.38: The right to food

34. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) made an editorial correction to paragraph 39 of the draft resolution.

35. **Ms. Acosta** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution, said that Algeria, Australia, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mexico, the Russian Federation, Turkmenistan and Ukraine had joined the list of sponsors.

36. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Cameroon, the Comoros, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, the Kyrgyz Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Morocco, Namibia, the Niger, Paraguay, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zambia and Zimbabwe had joined the list of sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.39: Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order

37. **Ms. Acosta** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution, said that Algeria, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, the Lao Democratic People's Republic, Myanmar and the Russian Federation had joined the list of sponsors. The draft resolution had been updated to include a mention of the creation of a new mandate in the Human Rights Council for an independent expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order.

38. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Bangladesh, Botswana, the Comoros,

Egypt, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, the Niger, Senegal, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe had joined the list of sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.41: Globalization and its impact on the full enjoyment of all human rights

39. **Mr. Selim** (Egypt), introducing the draft resolution, said that Cape Verde, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Grenada, the Gambia, the Philippines, Rwanda, South Africa, Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam had joined the list of sponsors.

40. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Azerbaijan, Cuba, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti and Mali had joined the list of sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.47: Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping, stigmatization, discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against persons, based on religion or belief

41. **Mr. Al-Yafei** (United Arab Emirates), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), said that the Organization welcomed Human Rights Council resolution 16/18 of the same name, recently adopted by consensus in Geneva. That resolution was a landmark.

42. The draft resolution was based on the resolution recommended by the Human Rights Council in its annual report. It complemented the traditional resolution presented by the Organization of Islamic Cooperation and adopted by the General Assembly since 1999.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.48: Elimination of all forms of intolerance and of discrimination based on religion or belief

43. **Mr. Herczyński** (Poland), introducing the draft resolution and speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that defending freedom of religion or belief and countering such intolerance was a priority of European Union human rights policy. The resolution was in line with that commitment, which had been confirmed at the highest political level.

44. He announced an editorial correction to the fourth line of operative paragraph 16.

45. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the United Republic of Tanzania had joined the list of sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.49: National institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights

46. **Mr. Schroeer** (Germany), introducing the draft resolution, said that the Republic of Korea and the United States of America had joined the list of sponsors. National human rights institutions existed in some 80 countries, and 67 of those had A status, which meant that they were in compliance with the Paris Principles. Compliance with the Paris Principles was vetted by a peer review mechanism consisting of elected representatives of other national human rights institutions. Updates to the resolution, contained in paragraphs 10 and 16, reflected the enhanced participatory rights of national human rights institutions in the Human Rights Council. Inputs of such institutions to the universal periodic review were now reflected in a separate section of the summary of stakeholder information. The national human rights institutions could make statements immediately after the State under review at the universal periodic review and after the States concerned during the presentation of country mission reports under special procedures.

47. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Andorra, Armenia, Bangladesh, Chile, Guatemala, Iceland, Madagascar, Mongolia, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia and Turkey had joined the list of sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.50: International Day of the Girl

48. **Mr. Rishchynski** (Canada), introducing the draft resolution and speaking also on behalf of Peru and Turkey, said that an International Day of the Girl would raise awareness of girls' daily struggles, including discrimination, violence and barriers in access to education and health care and would help girls improve the lives of their communities and societies. It would ensure that girls received recognition as key actors in achieving equality and empowerment. It would help raise girls' awareness of their rights, making their achievement more likely.

49. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Belgium, Georgia, Hungary, Iceland,

Jamaica, Liechtenstein and the Maldives had joined the list of sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.51: Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

50. **Mr. De León Huerta** (Mexico), introducing the draft resolution, said that Colombia, Liechtenstein and Peru had joined the list of sponsors. The obligation of States to respect human rights in combating terrorism was, in addition to being a position of principle, the only way to assure the efficacy and legitimacy of counter-terrorism measures. An area of major importance was ensuring respect for the rights of persons deprived of their liberty and ensuring that people were never beyond the protection of the law.

51. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Armenia, Benin, Iceland, Mali, Monaco and Paraguay had joined the list of sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.53: Follow-up to the International Year of Human Rights Learning

52. **Mr. Babadoudou** (Benin), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of African States and the other sponsors, in particular Brazil, the Republic of Korea and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, said that the draft resolution contained a new preambular paragraph reaffirming the universality of all human rights and stating that human rights learning could contribute to an understanding of the relation of human rights to people's daily lives. The goal of human rights learning was to form responsible citizens who knew their rights and the limits of those rights.

53. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Belize and Turkey had joined the list of sponsors.

Agenda item 27: Social development (continued)

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

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.7/Rev.1: Policies and programmes involving youth

54. **The Chair** said that he had been advised that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

55. **Ms. Vaz Patto** (Portugal), introducing the draft resolution and speaking also on behalf of the Republic of Moldova and Senegal, said that Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Grenada, India, Latvia, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mexico, the Netherlands, Peru, Poland, San Marino, Spain, Sri Lanka, Uruguay, Thailand, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had joined the list of sponsors. She made editorial corrections to the sixth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 10, 13 and 16.

56. The draft focused on how various difficulties currently facing young people around the world compromised their autonomy at a crucial phase of transition to adult life.

57. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Albania, Armenia, Australia, the Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Belarus, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational Republic of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, the Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Eritrea, El Salvador, Georgia, Honduras, Iceland, Jamaica, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Nicaragua, the Niger, Nigeria, Paraguay, the Philippines, Sierra Leone, South Africa and Togo had joined the list of sponsors.

58. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.7 Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.*

59. **Ms. Abubakar** (Libya), speaking in explanation of position, expressed regret that certain parties had taken the extreme and unjustified step of rejecting a paragraph proposed by Egypt, Libya and Tunisia mentioning the role of youth in those countries' transitional periods. The young people of the countries referred to had exercised their right to freedom of expression and demonstrated for justice, peace, social equality and decent employment opportunities, housing and education. Because the former regimes had been unresponsive, their ouster had become necessary. The young people who had rid Libya of a dictatorship were a source of pride.

60. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, expressed deep disappointment with the insistence of some Member States on inclusion of a paragraph on young people living under foreign occupation, which politicized the draft resolution and detracted from its central theme. Most disturbing was the fact that those same countries had blocked references to the role of young people in

bringing about transformational change in their own societies through exercise of freedom of expression, assembly and association.

61. The compelling experiences of the Arab Spring were a reminder that inclusive political processes addressing the legitimate aspirations and concerns of the population, including youth, were the only solution to political crises.

62. **Ms. Dali** (Tunisia), speaking in explanation of position, referred to the paragraph proposed by her delegation. Its purpose had been to pay tribute to the young people of her country who had taken their destiny in hand to establish genuine democracy. Some young people had sacrificed their lives so that that value would prevail. Young people had been the motor and catalyst of the revolution, and they deserved a special tribute.

63. **Ms. Fahmy** (Egypt), speaking in explanation of position, said that the proposal presented jointly by the delegations of Egypt, Libya and Tunisia had been carefully drafted to avoid raising concerns for any delegation. Opposition voiced by a few delegations out of concern that the call for support to youth and mention of those three countries might encourage youth to work to achieve transformational change in their societies was groundless. Young people would continue to work for those changes whether or not that paragraph was adopted.

64. **Ms. Alsaleh** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in explanation of position, said that introducing the suffering of youth under foreign occupation into draft resolutions had always been and would always be one of her delegation's main concerns. Her delegation failed to understand why some had objected to the agreed language in the draft resolution, especially as youth under foreign occupation suffered doubly, due to occupation and the economic and social crises. The countries that had objected to the agreed language wanted to eliminate all references in the draft resolution to the economic and financial crises.

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

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

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.59: 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

65. **Ms. Critchlow** (Guyana), introducing the draft resolution, said that it built on the strong momentum generated in 2010 and focused on strengthening institutional arrangements in light of the establishment of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women).

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

67. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.59 was adopted without a vote.*

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.