



General Assembly

Sixty-ninth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
19 January 2015

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 43rd meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 11 November 2014, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Davis (Jamaica)

Contents

Agenda item 66: Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

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

Agenda item 67: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

Agenda item 68: 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*)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).

14-64468 (E)



Please recycle The recycling symbol, consisting of three chasing arrows forming a triangle.



The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Agenda item 66: Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance *(continued)*

(a) Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance *(continued)*
(A/C.3/69/L.56 and A/C.3/69/L.57)

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.56: Combating glorification of Nazism and other practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

1. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation), introducing the draft resolution, said that Bangladesh, India, Niger, Rwanda, Seychelles and Sri Lanka had joined the sponsors. The sponsors would prepare an updated draft resolution on the basis of the proposals made by delegations.

2. It would soon be ten years since the Russian Federation had first introduced the initiative on combating glorification of Nazism for the consideration of the General Assembly. However, events since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 68/150 on that matter demonstrated that the initiative had unfortunately become no less relevant. Support for the resolution had increased from year to year, showing that the threat of the problems was being recognized across the globe. All sponsors of the resolution fully supported the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance.

3. The negative consequences of the global financial and economic crisis had strengthened the positions of right-wing forces, political parties and various kinds of extremist movements, which were increasingly drawn to Nazi and neo-Nazi ideology. Attacks on and violence towards national, ethnic, linguistic and religious minorities, immigrants and refugees had become more frequent. Racist slogans were becoming an increasingly common part of political platforms and parties, while aggressive nationalism was often accepted as a permanent feature of so-called democratic election campaigns.

4. The vaccination against Nazism and fascism clearly needed a boost. Recently in Europe there had been attempts to declare those who had collaborated with the fascist movement against the anti-Hitler

coalition participants in national liberation movements. Such actions, as well as the erecting of monuments for Nazis, the designation of days commemorating liberation from Nazism as days of mourning and attempting to demolish monuments erected in remembrance of those who had fought against Nazism, were not only blasphemous with regard to veterans of the anti-fascist movement, but also played into the hands of those who advocated “racial purity” and discrimination on racial or ethnic grounds, not to mention the poor example they gave to the younger generation.

5. Almost seventy years since the defeat of Nazism in the Second World War, attempts were still being made to falsify history. It was unacceptable to attempt to review or downplay the assessment of that ideology as set out in the documents of the Nuremberg Trials, which had clearly and unequivocally condemned the crimes of those who had violated the rights and dignity of persons and denied the principle of equality of persons regardless of their race, ethnicity, religion or language. It was States’ shared duty to preserve the memory of those who had given their lives for a future free from Nazism and fascism.

6. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Brazil and Myanmar had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.57: International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination

7. **Ms. Frankinet** (Belgium), speaking also on behalf of Slovenia, introduced the draft resolution. Bosnia and Herzegovina, Morocco, Turkey and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined the sponsors. The main sponsors had decided to make the text into a procedural document, and it would henceforth only deal with the four key elements for the implementation of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

8. She welcomed the fact that General Assembly resolution 68/268 on strengthening and enhancing the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system had granted the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination a week of additional meeting time to catch up with the backlog of reports. In order for the fight against racial discrimination to be effective, the Convention must have political support and be implemented in law as widely as possible. In that regard, the Secretary-General had been invited to

continue his work on the report on the status of ratification of the Convention. All member States were urged to ratify the amendment to the Convention relating to the financial situation of the Committee. It would be possible to monitor the status of payments due to the Committee more efficiently through the report of the Secretary-General on the financial situation of the Committee, in which member States that were in arrears were urged to fulfil their outstanding financial obligations. In the text of the draft resolution, the General Assembly invited the Secretary-General to present an annual report on the fight against all forms of racial discrimination.

9. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Albania, Andorra, India, Israel, Monaco, Panama and San Marino had joined the sponsors.

Agenda item 67: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*) (A/C.3/69/L.53 and A/C.3/69/L55)

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.53: Use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination.

10. **Ms. Moreno Guerra** (Cuba) said that the draft resolution drew attention to the serious problem of the use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination. It was important to prepare, present and discuss concrete proposals on potential rules or guidelines to fill existing gaps, promote greater protection of human rights, particularly the right of peoples to self-determination, and tackle current threats relating to mercenaries or mercenary-related activities, such as the actions of military and private security enterprises. Algeria, Belarus, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, El Salvador, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors.

11. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Egypt, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Myanmar, Niger, Sri Lanka and Uganda had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.55: Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination

12. **Mr. Khan** (Pakistan), introducing the draft resolution, said that Gambia, Grenada, Madagascar,

Uganda and Zambia had joined the sponsors. The text of the draft resolution remained unchanged from that of General Assembly resolution 67/157, which had been adopted by consensus in the previous year, with merely technical updates. In the text, the General Assembly reaffirmed the fundamental status of the right to self-determination as a precondition for the effective guarantee and observance of other human rights, declared its opposition to acts of foreign military intervention, aggression and occupation and deplored the plight of millions of refugees and internally displaced persons who had been uprooted as a result of such acts.

Agenda item 68: 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.3/69/L.26, A/C.3/69/L.34, A/C.3/69/L.35, A/C.3/69/L.39, A/C.3/69/L.40, A/C.3/69/L.41, A/C.3/69/L.42, A/C.3/69/L.43 and A/C.3/69/L.47)

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.26: The right to privacy in the digital age

13. **Mr. Antonio de Aguiar Patriota** (Brazil), speaking also on behalf of Germany, introduced the draft resolution, which followed up on General Assembly resolution 68/167, which had been adopted by consensus in 2013. The report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) on the right to privacy in the digital age (A/HRC/27/37), submitted in accordance with resolution 68/167, had confirmed that many States lacked adequate national legislation and had weak procedural safeguards and ineffective oversight mechanisms for their monitoring and surveillance programmes, all of which had contributed to a lack of accountability for arbitrary or unlawful interference with the right to privacy. The report had stressed the need for an in-depth analysis of those issues, practical guidance on the principles of necessity, proportionality and legitimacy in relation to surveillance practices, and effective remedies for those whose rights had been violated.

14. In September 2014, panel discussions in Geneva among Member States, OHCHR, special procedures mandate holders, academia and civil society had

established that the importance and magnitude of the issue justified the creation of a special procedures mandate. That view had been reinforced by the most recent report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism.

15. The draft resolution brought all those elements together and recalled that States should always abide by their human rights obligations when exercising power over private parties, such as when requesting data and metadata on citizens or foreigners. Collecting and analysing metadata might be more revealing of a person's private life than directly analysing the content of his or her communications and could, therefore, be an even greater violation of privacy. Accordingly, some countries had opted to specifically regulate the surveillance of metadata.

16. If States lost sight of their international human rights obligations when countering terrorism, they undermined the tenets of a free and democratic society. Human rights should prevail irrespective of medium, jurisdiction, nationality, race, gender or age. As human beings expanded their freedom of expression and private lives online, it was essential to agree formally to protect all human rights, including the right to privacy, both offline and online. Any legitimate concern States might have with respect to security should be addressed in a manner consistent with Member States' obligations under international human rights law.

17. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Bolivia (Plurinational State of) and El Salvador had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.34: International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance

18. **Mr. Hilale** (Morocco), speaking also on behalf of Argentina and France, introduced the draft resolution. Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Mali, Monaco, Nicaragua, Panama, Republic of Moldova, Samoa, Serbia and Ukraine had joined the sponsors. Universal ratification of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, recognition of the Committee on Enforced Disappearances and the ongoing work of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary

Disappearances would significantly expand protection to victims.

19. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Andorra, Canada, El Salvador, Mauritania and Senegal had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.35: International Albinism Awareness Day

20. **Mr. Bari-Bari** (Somalia) said that the draft resolution was procedural in nature. The objective of the proclamation of the proposed International Albinism Awareness Day was to tackle global discrimination, violence and stigma against persons with albinism. Misunderstanding of albinism had fostered violations of the fundamental human rights of persons with albinism and remained an impediment to safeguarding their lives and security. The draft resolution was the first initiative addressing the plight of persons with albinism to be brought to the General Assembly. His delegation hoped that the proclamation of International Albinism Awareness Day would ensure visibility, understanding and greater awareness of the human rights challenges faced by persons with albinism.

21. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Israel, Morocco, Nigeria, Norway, Turkey and United Arab Emirates had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.39: Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping, stigmatization, discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against persons, based on religion or belief.

22. **Ms. Abdulbaqi** (Saudi Arabia), speaking on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), introduced the draft resolution. Rwanda and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela had joined the sponsors. The sponsors of the draft resolution sought to continue the good work of Human Rights Council resolution 16/18 on the same topic and reiterated the eight-point plan called for by the OIC Secretary-General for States to foster a domestic environment of peace, tolerance and respect. In addition to technical updates, the draft resolution included new language regarding the ongoing situation of terrorists and armed groups using religion and belief as a scapegoat for their actions, as well as new language regarding accountability. It also contained a reference to General Assembly resolution 68/127 on a

world against violence and violent extremism. OIC, in consultation with interested parties, had agreed to revise the language in preambular paragraph 8 of the draft resolution to read as follows: “condemning the criminal acts committed by terrorists and extremist groups and movements against persons based on their religion or belief, and deeply regretting attempts to link these acts to any one specific religion or belief”.

23. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Uganda had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.40: Freedom of religion or belief

24. **Mr. Cardì** (Italy), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Union, introduced the draft resolution and said that Dominican Republic, El Salvador, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova and San Marino had joined the sponsors. Defending freedom of religion or belief as a universal human right and countering intolerance and discrimination on the basis of religion or belief were essential priorities of the European Union’s human rights policy. The promotion of religious tolerance, respect for diversity and mutual understanding were of the utmost importance for creating an environment conducive to the full enjoyment of freedom of religion or belief by all. The European Union guidelines on the promotion and protection of freedom of religion or belief sent a clear signal of the importance attached to that human right everywhere and for everyone. All States were urged to step up their efforts, including by implementing universal periodic review recommendations related to freedom of religion or belief. The adoption of the draft resolution by consensus would send a strong collective message to the world.

25. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Albania, Monaco and Serbia had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.41: Promotion of peace as a vital requirement for the full enjoyment of all human rights by all

26. **Ms. Moreno Guerra** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution, said that Algeria, Belarus, Cameroon, China, Comoros, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nigeria, Russian Federation,

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Syrian Arab Republic and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors. The resolution reaffirmed the obligation of all States to preserve and promote peace. All policies should be directed at eliminating war and promoting peaceful solutions to international disputes while upholding the principles of the Charter of the United Nations with regard to sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-intervention in what were essentially internal affairs.

27. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Congo, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Libya, Mali, Niger, Saint Lucia, Sri Lanka and Viet Nam had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.42: The right to food

28. **Ms. Moreno Guerra** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution, said that Algeria, Armenia, Barbados, Belarus, Cameroon, China, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nigeria, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors. The right to food was widely established in international instruments but still far from full implementation, and the situation of the global economy had exacerbated world hunger. She urged all States and the agencies, programmes and funds of the United Nations to take urgent measures to end the crisis and defend the rights to food and food security.

29. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Chile, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, Guyana, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Monaco, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Panama, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania and Viet Nam had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.43: Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order

30. **Ms. Moreno Guerra** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution, said that Algeria, Belarus, Cameroon, China, Comoros, Democratic People’s Republic of

Korea, El Salvador, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Syrian Arab Republic, and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors. The draft resolution affirmed the importance and necessity of promoting a democratic and equitable international order that promoted human rights for all, particularly in light of the economic and financial crisis and its effects on developing countries. She drew attention in particular to paragraph 11.

31. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Burkina Faso, Burundi, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Myanmar, Niger, Saint Lucia and Viet Nam had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.47: Extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions

32. **Mr. Pöysäri** (Finland), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, said that Lithuania, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine had joined the sponsors. The right to life and the fight against impunity were at the core of the draft resolution, and two new elements had been introduced: the recognition of the positive role that regional human rights systems could play globally in protection against the arbitrary deprivation of life and the connection between extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions and enforced disappearances. Maximum flexibility was requested from delegations, with a view to drawing up a text that could secure the broadest possible support.

33. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Albania, Andorra, Benin and Colombia had joined the sponsors.

Agenda item 68 (c): Promotion and protection of human rights: human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.31: Situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic

34. **Ms. Al-Thani** (Qatar) said that Andorra, Botswana, Libya, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Seychelles and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had joined the sponsors. There was still a need for the General Assembly to address the human

rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic, which continued to deteriorate. The draft resolution reflected the strong international condemnation of the grave violations of human rights and international humanitarian law and outrage at the continued escalation of violence. All parties should immediately put an end to all violations and abuses of international law and take all appropriate steps to protect civilians and humanitarian workers. The draft resolution also addressed the issues of accountability and the emergence of extremism and condemned terrorist acts and violence by the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), militias fighting for the regime, terrorist groups affiliated with Al-Qaida and other extremist groups. Her delegation hoped that the draft resolution would contribute to the efforts by the United Nations to achieve a political solution to the crisis that met the legitimate aspirations of the Syrian people for a civil, democratic and pluralistic State.

35. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Mauritania had joined the sponsors.

36. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that Syria had been suffering from terrorism for over four years, while other States had remained scandalously silent and supported the *takfirist* mercenaries who were carrying out acts of horrendous violence against the citizens of Syria. There had been no response from the international community, despite the indefatigable efforts of his country to bring the terrorist acts, killings, destruction of infrastructure and religious sites, child recruitment, rape and abductions of Christian and Muslim religious figures to the attention of Member States. Instead, they completely ignored all of the irrefutable facts and persisting in submitting selective, unilateral and politicized draft resolutions purportedly aimed at promoting and protecting human rights in Syria.

37. The draft resolutions were prejudicial to the human rights of Syrians, whom they misrepresented. Worse still, the draft resolutions had been submitted by States that sponsored Wahhabi *takfirist* terrorism in Syria, Iraq and elsewhere. Their sole motive was to demonize the Syrian Government, which had made tremendously constructive efforts to resolve the crisis and combat the terrorism sponsored by the Governments of France, Israel, Jordan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Turkey, among others. His delegation had distributed two notes verbales to Member States on 10 October and 23 November 2014 setting out

the fallacies and misrepresentations contained in the draft resolution.

38. The majority of Member States, including the States members of the Non-Aligned Movement, the Organization of Islamic Cooperation and the League of Arab States, had all stressed that human rights issues must not be manipulated for political purposes and that human rights should be promoted and protected by means of constructive dialogue and cooperation within the framework of the United Nations human rights mechanisms. Yet Qatar and Saudi Arabia had shown themselves determined to flagrantly violate their obligations. Furthermore, the draft resolution made baseless allegations against his Government in 25 paragraphs but mentioned terrorism in only five. When terrorism was mentioned, it was in the context of the need to put an end to such activities in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions; but Saudi Arabia and Qatar were not in a position to discuss combatting the terrorism that they had been blatantly enabling since the outbreak of the war in Afghanistan in the 1980s, including the terrorist attack in New York on September 11, 2001, and the infamous *takfirist* terrorism in Afghanistan Egypt, India, Iraq, Lebanon, Mali, Niger, Nigeria and Syria.

39. It was unfortunate that the drafters had resorted to misusing and misinterpreting Security Council resolutions 2170 (2014) and 2178 (2014) to support terrorist groups and their State sponsors. They had interpreted the reference to “foreign fighters” as referring to those fighting alongside the Syrian State against the terrorist activities of mercenaries, ISIL, the Nusrah Front and their affiliates, but not to the thousands of foreign terrorists from more than 84 States, including thousands of fighters from Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States, who were referred to in both of the resolutions. Moreover, the use of the term “regime”, in violation of the rules and procedures of the United Nations, revealed the political motives of the drafters towards the Government and people of his country. Neither Saudi Arabia nor Qatar had a parliament or constitution, citizens of those countries were deprived of their basic human rights and their Governments recruited children for terrorist operations and sent terrorists to Syria and Lebanon on the basis of extremist interpretations that brought the Arabs and Islam into disrepute.

40. The position of Qatar was particularly ironic. Qatar was funding the Nusrah Front which, acting with

direct support from Israel, had abducted personnel of the United Nations Observer Disengagement Force (UNDOF) in the occupied Syrian Golan. The policies of Qatar had caused loss of life in Iraq, Libya, Syria and elsewhere. The Syrian Government and people held the rulers of Israel, Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Turkey responsible for all of the bloodshed.

41. Member States should objectively examine the draft, the motives of its sponsors and the real intended purpose behind it. They should oppose it in order to act constructively rather than singling out any specific country. States that sponsored terrorism around the world did not have the right to present draft resolutions on the promotion and protection of human rights, in Syria or elsewhere, or to address the international community on the special issue of human rights, which had its own regulations and must not be politicized. His country was in favour of discussing the human rights situation around the world, which was why it had participated in establishing the Human Rights Council.

42. **Ms. Al-Thani** (Qatar), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the allegations made by the representative of the illegitimate Syrian regime were baseless. Since the beginning of the crisis, her country had been determined not to respond to insults whose purpose was to divert attention from the real suffering of the Syrian people. The draft resolution had been presented on behalf of over 60 Member States. Unable to address the concerns contained in the draft resolution, the representative of the Syrian regime had responded by attacking its sponsors in a futile effort to draw attention away from the regime’s war crimes, crimes against humanity and violations of international human rights law and international humanitarian law against its own people.

43. The representative of the Syrian regime levelled the charge of sponsoring terrorism against any State that sought to uphold international law. The regime’s continued use of chemical weapons against the Syrian people, as described in the report of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic, was a gross terrorist act whose perpetrators must be held to account by the international community. The regime’s repressive policies were not aimed at combating terrorism but were in fact the main reason for its spread. Her country recognized the danger of terrorist organizations and foreign fighters in the region and around the world and

would continue to cooperate with the international community to eliminate all terrorism in the region, including the state terrorism of the Syrian regime.

44. Her delegation had sponsored the draft resolution in order to address the crimes committed against the Syrian people, both by the Syrian regime and other parties, including extremist groups. The State of Qatar had clearly reiterated its opposition to terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. By supporting the draft resolution, Member States would send a message to the Syrian people that the perpetrators would not go unpunished.

45. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Qatar had exposed her country's true policies by once again referring to the "illegitimate Syrian regime" while submitting a draft resolution entitled "Situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic". In her view, was Syria a regime, or was it the Syrian Arab Republic? It was in fact Qatar that lacked legitimacy; the representative of Qatar had used the term "State of Qatar", as if to imply that there was some doubt as to its statehood. Her country was sponsoring terrorism in the occupied Syrian Golan, on the Turkey-Syria border and inside Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon and Syria, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and international law. It would be alarming if she knew of those facts, but all the more alarming if she did not.

46. The delegation of the illegitimate, *takfirist* terrorist regime of Qatar had made false claims and misinterpreted the reports of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, of which Syria was a member. The Organisation had thus far issued only interim reports, all of which acquitted the Syrian Government. The issue was technical and was being discussed in The Hague; it was not appropriate to discuss it within the Third Committee. It would, however, be right for the United Nations to discuss the fact that the Qatari regime had paid millions of dollars in ransom to the Qatari bank accounts of the Nusra Front, which had been included as a terrorist entity on the Security Council's sanctions list. The Qatari regime, which was illegitimate and thoroughly terrorist, claimed to be a mediator in order to justify the payment of ransoms, a practice that was unacceptable under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, according to Security Council resolution 2133 (2014).

47. The representative of the Qatari regime should acquaint herself with the provisions of the United Nations Charter, the Security Council resolutions and the principles of international law, before claiming to uphold human rights in Syria. Her own country was hardly an oasis of democracy in the world. Indeed, her country's treatment of migrant workers had raised doubts as to whether international sporting events should be held there.

The meeting rose at 11.35 a.m.