



## 人权理事会

## 第二十五届会议

## 议程项目 2 和 3

联合国人权事务高级专员的年度报告以及  
高级专员办事处的报告和秘书长的报告

增进和保护所有人权——公民权利、政治权利、  
经济、社会和文化权利，包括发展权

## 2014 年 3 月 13 日新加坡共和国常驻联合国日内瓦办事处和 瑞士其他国际组织代表团致人权理事会秘书处的普通照会

新加坡共和国常驻联合国日内瓦办事处和瑞士其他国际组织代表团向人权理事会秘书处致意，并谨提及所附人权理事会第二十五届会议期间于 2014 年 3 月 5 日在关于死刑问题的高级别小组讨论会上发表的联合声明(见附件)。

代表团谨代表巴林、孟加拉国、博茨瓦纳、文莱达鲁萨兰国、中国、朝鲜民主主义人民共和国、埃及、厄立特里亚、埃塞俄比亚、印度、伊朗伊斯兰共和国、科威特、老挝人民民主共和国、马来西亚、缅甸、阿曼、巴基斯坦、卡塔尔、沙特阿拉伯、新加坡、索马里、苏丹、乌干达、阿拉伯联合酋长国、越南和也门等国代表团请求将该联合声明\* 作为人权理事会第二十五届会议议程项目 2 和 3 下的文件予以散发。

\* 附件不译，原文照发。



## Annex

*[English only]*

### **Joint statement delivered at the high-level panel discussion on the question of death penalty on 5 March 2014, at the twenty-fifth session of the Human Rights Council**

Mr President

I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of a group of 26 countries (as indicated at the end of the statement). As reflected by the vote on the Human Rights Council's Decision 22/117 to hold the high-level panel discussion on the Question of Death Penalty, the simplistic approach to characterise death penalty as a human rights issue in the context of the right to life of the convicted prisoner is deeply flawed and controversial. Death penalty is first and foremost an issue of the criminal justice system and an important deterring element vis-à-vis the most serious crimes. It must thus be viewed from a much broader perspective and weighed against the rights of the victims and the right of the community to live in peace and security. A constructive dialogue in the Council on this issue is possible only if the legitimate interests of all States are taken duly into account.

There is no international consensus for or against death penalty imposed according to the due process of the law. This has repeatedly been confirmed by the votes on past UNGA resolutions on the moratorium on the use of death penalty, most recently in the 67th session of the General Assembly.

The United Nations Charter clearly stipulates that nothing in the Charter shall authorise the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. Every State has the inalienable right to choose its legal and criminal justice systems, without interference in any form by another State. Accordingly, the question of whether to retain or abolish death penalty and the types of crimes for which the death penalty is applied should be determined by each State. Key international instruments that apply to countries with wide divergence in cultures and values do not proscribe the use of death penalty in their texts. The issue of death penalty is a question that every State has the sovereign right, under international law, to decide, taking into account its own circumstances.

Thank you, Mr President.

#### **List of co-sponsors**

1. Kingdom of Bahrain
2. Republic of Botswana
3. Brunei Darussalam
4. People's Republic of China
5. Democratic People's Republic of Korea
6. Arab Republic of Egypt
7. Islamic Republic of Iran
8. Malaysia

9. Republic of the Union of Myanmar
  10. Sultanate of Oman
  11. State of Qatar
  12. Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
  13. Republic of Uganda
  14. Republic of Yemen
  15. Lao People's Democratic Republic
  16. United Arab Emirates
  17. India
  18. Socialist Republic of Viet Nam
  19. Republic of Singapore
  20. State of Kuwait
  21. People's Republic of Bangladesh
  22. Eritrea
  23. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
  24. Islamic Republic of Pakistan
  25. Federal Republic of Somalia
  26. Republic of the Sudan
-