



General Assembly

Sixty-ninth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
15 January 2015

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 52nd meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 24 November 2014, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Ms. Mesquita Borges (Timor-Leste)

Contents

Agenda item 26: 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 64: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

- (a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

Agenda item 68: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

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

Agenda item 105: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*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>).

14-65495 (E)



Please recycle



The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

Agenda item 26: Social development (*continued*)

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family
(*continued*) (A/C.3/69/L.10/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.10/Rev.1: Realizing the Millennium Development Goals and other internationally agreed development goals for persons with disabilities towards 2015 and beyond

1. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee), presenting a statement of programme budget implications in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedures of the General Assembly, said that the request in paragraph 13 of the draft resolution would result in a reorientation of the Statistics Division's mandated programme of work. As for the methodology and subsequent decisions concerning concepts and methods of disability data collection, the Secretary-General would report to the General Assembly on any financial implications. It should be noted that the adoption of internationally agreed methods of data collection did not guarantee that the availability of disability data would increase automatically and immediately. Given the weak capacity of many developing countries to collect and produce disability statistics, the regular reporting of disability data must be viewed only from a long-term perspective.

2. **Mr. Cabactulan** (Philippines), speaking also on behalf of the United Republic of Tanzania, said that Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Comoros, Cuba, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Thailand, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors.

3. The draft resolution had been presented for discussion on the heels of the first-ever high-level meeting of the General Assembly on disability and

development. In line with the outcome document of that event, it was recognized in the draft resolution that persons with disabilities made up an estimated 15 per cent of the world's population, and that 80 per cent of persons with disabilities lived in developing countries. Their contribution to the general well-being, progress and diversity of society was recognized. To build on the momentum of the high-level meeting, it was requested that the President of the General Assembly organize, during the seventieth session of the General Assembly, a panel discussion to follow up on the status of and progress made towards the realization of the development goals for persons with disabilities. For the first time, the draft resolution included an expression of concern that persons with disabilities were disproportionately affected in disaster, emergency and conflict situations, as well as by poverty. As the issue of disability was at the nexus of development and human rights, the sponsors welcomed Human Rights Council resolution 26/20 establishing the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities.

4. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Albania, Andorra, Angola, Azerbaijan, Barbados, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Georgia, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Lebanon, Liberia, Montenegro, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, South Africa and Tunisia had joined the list of sponsors.

5. *Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.10/Rev.1 was adopted.*

6. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that she wished to clarify her delegation's understanding of the word "duty" in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. That word referred to the political commitment undertaken by Member States in the context of the outcome document of the high-level meeting on disability and development to achieve the full application and implementation of the international normative framework on disability and development.

7. **Ms. Patriota** (Brazil) said that the protection of persons with disabilities was a priority for Brazil and was reflected in its national policies and its active engagement with the Bureau of the Conference of States Parties to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The incorporation of disability concerns in the post-2015 development

agenda was of particular importance. Brazil therefore welcomed the inclusion of those concerns in the proposal of the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals. Brazil had fought especially hard to ensure that the outcome of the Open Working Group was comprehensive and that disability concerns were reflected in the goals relating to education, decent work, and the building of inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable cities. .

Agenda item 64: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*) (A/C.3/69/L.25)

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.25/Rev.1: Protecting children from bullying

8. **Ms. Diaz Gras** (Mexico) said that Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Cuba, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Lucia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America had joined the sponsors. The goal of the draft resolution was to contribute to the protection of children's rights, an aim shared by all Member States. Concerned by the growing prevalence of bullying, several United Nations mechanisms, including the World Health Organization, had acknowledged the urgent need to address that phenomenon, which unfortunately occurred throughout the world. Given the increasingly evident impact of bullying on the enjoyment of children's rights, it was crucial for States to recognize their responsibility to protect children.

9. She read out several oral revisions to the text. In the third preambular paragraph, the word "Recalling" should be replaced with "Noting" and the phrase "recalling the adoption of" should be inserted after "the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training and". In the fourth preambular paragraph, "Recalling further" should be replaced with "Noting the submission of". In the sixth preambular paragraph, the phrase "which can lead, inter alia, to an increased risk of depression and suicide" should be eliminated. The order of the eighth and ninth

preambular paragraphs should be reversed; in the eighth preambular paragraph, the words "and media should play" should be replaced with "have, and media should have". In the twelfth preambular paragraph, the phrase "members of vulnerable groups" should be replaced with "children in vulnerable situations."

10. In paragraph 3, the word "Urges" should be replaced with "Encourages." Paragraph 3 (b) should be revised to read: "to continue to promote and invest in education, including as a long-term and lifelong process by which everyone learns tolerance and respect for the dignity of others and the means and methods of ensuring that respect in all societies". In paragraph 3 (c), the phrase "at the national level" should be moved and reinserted after the words "other relevant variables".

11. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Bahamas, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Israel, Kazakhstan, Montenegro, Norway, San Marino, Serbia, Turkmenistan and Ukraine had joined the list of sponsors of the draft resolution, as orally revised. Referring to the revision to the third preambular paragraph introduced by the representative of Mexico, he noted that the suggested replacement of the word "Recalling" with "Noting" would be inconsistent with editorial convention, as the resulting formulation would put the General Assembly in the position of noting an instrument that it had already adopted. He suggested that the word "Recalling" should be retained in the relevant paragraph.

12. **Ms. Kadra Ahmed Hassan** (Djibouti) said that she wished to clarify the revision to the third preambular paragraph. According to the wording agreed upon during informal consultations, the revised third preambular paragraph should read: "Recalling also the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training and noting the adoption of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Declaration of Principles on Tolerance". That formulation would be consistent with editorial convention, as the General Assembly had only adopted the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training by resolution 66/137 and had not adopted the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Declaration of Principles on Tolerance.

13. **Ms. Diaz Gras** (Mexico) confirmed that the revised third preambular paragraph read out by the representative of Djibouti would be the version

reflected in the final draft resolution, should the latter be adopted.

14. *Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.25/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

15. **Mr. Sfregola** (Italy), speaking on behalf of the member States of the European Union, said that the draft resolution raised international awareness of bullying, a challenge encountered daily by children and youth in a variety of contexts. Research had shown that young people throughout the world were bullied on the basis of, inter alia, economic situation, disability, physical appearance, ethnic background or failure to conform to gender stereotypes and that bullying had an adverse impact on instigators, victims and witnesses alike. For victims in particular, bullying often resulted in emotional problems, depression, loneliness, aggression and even suicide. It was imperative for the international community to shed light on that important phenomenon and to tackle its root causes.

16. At the high-level meeting of the General Assembly on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, many high-level officials had noted the widespread nature of bullying and its impact on young people's enjoyment of their rights. Surveys conducted in different regions had shown that many children, especially youth, were bullied on the basis of their actual or perceived sexual orientation and gender identity, or even that of their parents. Unfortunately, that situation had not been adequately addressed in the draft resolution, despite attempts by many delegations to incorporate it; the European Union had nevertheless decided to co-sponsor the draft resolution in recognition of a phenomenon that was frequently overlooked.

17. The European Union particularly looked forward to the report of the Secretary-General, which it hoped would accurately reflect the situation on the ground in different parts of the world and contain suggestions on how to tackle the issue of bullying through education, awareness-raising and rehabilitation. The Secretariat should ensure greater transparency with respect to budget implications for current and upcoming cycles, including the provision of relevant information during negotiation processes. The important topic of protecting children from bullying should be included in the annual omnibus resolution on the rights of the child.

18. **Ms. Kadra Ahmed Hassan** (Djibouti), speaking on behalf of the African Group, said that the commitment of the African Group to the promotion and protection of the rights of children was an imperative, given the youthful populations of African States. Although the Group did not dispute the importance of the issue of bullying, it would be more appropriately handled under the resolution on the rights of the child.

19. During negotiations, the African Group had sought to achieve a text that reflected a consensus view and refrained from making substantive declarations or authoritative statements that generalized the experiences of only a few countries. While some cases of bullying led to violence among children, it did not always assume violent forms and could therefore not be treated as a subset of violence against children. Furthermore, although the Group recognized the value of the reports of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children, they did not systematically address bullying among children and could not be considered the main reference documents on bullying.

20. In the light of those concerns, the African Group had difficulty understanding why Member States had not been afforded the opportunity to engage in a process conducive to a common understanding on the issue prior to establishing a substantive resolution. A procedural resolution would have afforded them such an opportunity, and would have also allowed time for the preparation of a report by the Secretary-General on bullying that would have informed substantive discussions at a later stage.

21. The African Group regretted that its fundamental concern, which was also shared by a number of other delegations, had not been considered by the facilitator of the resolution. The main sponsors should seriously consider addressing the subject of bullying within the context of the resolution on the rights of the child.

22. **Ms. Cedeño Rengifo** (Panama), speaking also on behalf of Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay, said that the prolonged impact of bullying on children had been recognized in reports of the United Nations Children's Fund and the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Children. Adoption of the resolution was a further step towards protecting the

rights of children. However, it should have included greater detail on the vulnerabilities experienced by children exposed to bullying, which was an issue that affected persons of African descent, those living with HIV/AIDS or those in impoverished or rural areas. It was important to address the issue from a human rights perspective.

23. **Ms. Rahlaga** (South Africa) said that the issue of protecting children from bullying should be included in the resolution on the rights of the child, thereby contributing to the strengthening of the protection of children. The draft resolution had omitted any reference to several critical texts, in particular the 2013 report entitled “Toward a World Free From Violence - Global Survey on Violence against Children”. To promote the prevention and elimination of all forms of violence against children in all regions and to advance the implementation of the recommendations of the United Nations study on violence against children, the resolution should also have welcomed the work of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children. In addition, the resolution failed to address the root causes of bullying, in particular social issues such as substance abuse. Her delegation expected that a more comprehensive resolution would be drafted after publication of the report requested therein.

24. **Mr. Barros Melet** (Chile), speaking also on behalf of Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, France, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, Sweden, Uruguay, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America, said that he deplored bullying in all its manifestations. Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth were among the individuals who faced an increased risk for experiencing bullying due to pervasive negative attitudes, stereotyping and discrimination regarding their perceived or actual sexual orientation and gender identity. Progress on that front had been made, in particular, through the adoption of Human Rights Council resolution 27/32 on human rights, sexual orientation and gender identity. He hoped that the report of the Secretary-General on that issue would incorporate the experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth.

25. **Ms. Hewanpola** (Australia) said that her Government recognized the potentially damaging

consequences of bullying for children and had placed great importance on combating bullying and other forms of violence against children, including by establishing a 12-year national plan to reduce violence against women and children. The effectiveness of global efforts to protect children from bullying would depend on the international community’s acknowledgement of its various forms and impacts. International efforts should also recognize the increased risk faced by children that were marginalized, including for reasons based on gender, gender identity, or actual or perceived sexual orientation. School retention rates, motivation and engagement all suffered when children felt unsafe in their learning environment. Children should be protected from bullying from all sources, including from adults. Her delegation looked forward to receiving the report of the Secretary-General on that matter.

26. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that her delegation was pleased to sponsor the resolution and believed that all groups in society should engage in the efforts to combat bullying of children. The report requested in the resolution should highlight the various consequences of bullying on boys and girls, including bullying based on gender, gender identity and sexual orientation.

27. **Ms. Abdulbaqi** (Saudi Arabia) said that her delegation, which had participated in the negotiations on the resolution just adopted, believed that children should be protected from all forms of violence. The issue of bullying was best tackled by focusing on the role of the family, education, media and other influential entities. Saudi Arabia fully supported the protection and promotion of the rights of children, including the efforts to combat bullying, and understood international cooperation to be valuable in that respect. However, the draft resolution still lacked clarity, as had been apparent from the statements delivered following its adoption. Bullying was not a national phenomenon restricted to Mexico, but a matter of international concern. In future, the cultural and religious specificities of Member States should be taken into account. Her Government looked forward to cooperation with Mexico in that regard.

28. **The Chair** suggested that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 55/488, the Committee should take note of the following documents: under agenda item 64 (a), the report of the Secretary-General

on the status of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (A/69/260), the report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict (A/69/212), the report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children (A/69/264), the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography (A/69/262), the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the summary report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the panel discussion on preventing and eliminating child, early and forced marriage (A/69/165) and the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on preventing and eliminating child, early and forced marriage (A/69/166); and under agenda item 64 (b), the report of the Secretary-General on the follow-up to the special session of the General Assembly on children (A/69/258).

29. *It was so decided.*

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.45 and A/C.3/69/L.48 Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.45: Human rights and unilateral coercive measures

30. **The Chair** recalled that Cuba, the main sponsor, had orally revised the draft at the Committee's 51st meeting.

31. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

32. **The Chair** said that, at the request of the delegation of the United States of America, a recorded vote had been requested on the draft resolution.

33. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that her delegation would vote against the draft resolution because it had no basis in international law and did not serve to advance the cause of human rights. States bore the responsibility to protect and promote the human

rights and fundamental freedoms of their citizens. The text of the draft resolution challenged the sovereign right of States to conduct their economic relations freely and to protect legitimate national interests, including by taking actions in response to national security concerns. The draft resolution also attempted to undermine the ability of the international community to respond to acts that were offensive to international norms. Unilateral and multilateral sanctions were a legitimate means to achieve foreign policy, security, and other national and international objectives. The United States was not alone in that view or practice.

34. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.45, as orally revised.*

In favour:

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

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Central African Republic, Chad.

35. *Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.45, as orally revised, was adopted by 124 votes to 52, with 2 abstentions.*

36. **Ms. Murillo** (Costa Rica) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the resolution due to the importance of its key message. She thanked Cuba for meeting the concerns of her delegation; however her Government had reservations with regard to paragraph 16 and the recently created mandate, as well as paragraph 2, which in future should be more clearly defined.

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.48 Rev.1: Human rights and extreme poverty

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

38. **Mr. Meza-Cuadra** (Peru) said that Algeria, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, Maldives, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had joined the sponsors.

39. It was important that States took a human rights-based approach to poverty eradication. The

implementation of social protection measures based on such principles as equality, non-discrimination, participation, transparency and respect for international legal frameworks would provide a framework capable of eradicating poverty over the long term. The draft resolution sought to advance efforts to fight extreme poverty, and all Member States were invited to sponsor the resolution.

40. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Côte d'Ivoire, Haiti, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Uganda and Ukraine had joined the sponsors.

41. *Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.48 Rev.1 was adopted.*

42. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that the United States of America had a long-standing commitment to international development, and had invested substantial resources in that area. Although the Guiding Principles on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights referenced in the resolution gave States useful guidelines to formulate and implement poverty reduction and eradication programmes, not all of its aspects were appropriate in all circumstances, and her delegation disagreed with some of its interpretations of human rights law.

43. Her delegation had joined the consensus on the resolution on the understanding that States were not obligated to become a party to instruments to which they had not acceded; nor were they obligated to implement commitments under human rights instruments to which they were not a party. Her Government did not recognize any change in the current state of treaty or customary international law. Furthermore, the reaffirmation of prior documents contained in the resolution was understood to apply to those who had affirmed them initially. The United States of America anticipated continued collaboration with fellow Member States in efforts to eliminate poverty.

Agenda item 105: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.18 Rev.1: Preventing and combating corrupt practices and the transfer of proceeds of corruption, facilitating asset recovery and returning such assets to legitimate owners, in particular to countries of origin, in accordance with the United Nations Convention against Corruption

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

45. **Mr. Calderón** (Colombia), introducing the resolution, said that Argentina, Australia, Chile, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Honduras, India, Mongolia, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Senegal, Spain, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States of America and Uruguay had joined the sponsors. The international community had made a commitment to eliminating the transnational problem of corruption. The United Nations Convention against Corruption, which was the most comprehensive legally binding instrument in that regard, enjoyed near universal support. International cooperation, confidence-building and the promotion of best practices were needed to recover assets acquired through corrupt or illicit activities. Such activities should be recognized as socially unacceptable, and perpetrators should be held accountable. All Member States were invited to sponsor the draft resolution.

46. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Côte d'Ivoire, Eritrea, France, Lebanon, Madagascar, Montenegro, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Uganda and Ukraine had joined the sponsors.

47. *Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.18 Rev.1 was adopted.*

48. **Ms. Strachwitz** (Liechtenstein), speaking also on behalf of Iceland and Switzerland, said that the 2014 version of the resolution demonstrated a continued lack of balance. She noted that the resolution established the link between corruption and human rights, and she welcomed the language on the inclusion of groups outside of the public sector, such as civil society and non-governmental organizations, in the fight against corruption. However, the resolution still focused too heavily on technical aspects better left to entities with the necessary expertise.

49. Biennial submission of the text had been crucial to achieving consensus, and she welcomed the compromise made by the delegation of Colombia on that issue. As a result, the Committee would consider the issue on the same cycle as the Conference of States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption. Careful preparation and consultation in advance of the consideration of the subsequent text would make it possible to increase its relevance. She hoped that the process would serve as an example for other texts and contribute to alleviating the ever-increasing workload of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.