



General Assembly

Seventy-seventh session

54th plenary meeting
Thursday, 15 December 2022, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

President: Mr. Kőrösi (Hungary)

In the absence of the President, Mr. Wallace (Jamaica), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

Reports of the Third Committee

The Acting President: The General Assembly will consider the reports of the Third Committee on agenda items 25, 26, 57, 63 to 68, 109 to 111, 124 and 139.

I now request the Rapporteur of the Committee, Ms. Shalini Gungaram of Mauritius, to introduce the reports of the Committee in one intervention.

Ms. Gungaram (Mauritius), Rapporteur of the Third Committee: It is an honour for me to introduce today to the General Assembly the reports of the Third Committee on the agenda items allocated to it by the Assembly at its seventy-seventh session, items 25, 26, 57, 63 to 68, 109 to 111, 124 and 139.

During the main part of the seventy-seventh session of the General Assembly, the Third Committee held 55 plenary meetings and heard introductory statements from 71 special procedures mandate-holders, chairs of treaty bodies and other experts and 13 senior United Nations officials, as well as convening interactive dialogues and general discussions on the agenda items. A total of 217 informal consultations took place in rooms allocated by the Secretariat for the negotiations of draft proposals. The Committee adopted 51 draft resolutions, 16 of them by recorded vote, and one draft decision.

I am happy to report that on the last day of the work of the Third Committee, the Chair rewarded all representatives with chocolate for good behaviour.

The reports, contained in documents A/77/455 to A/77/468, include the texts of draft proposals recommended to the General Assembly for adoption. For the convenience of delegations, the Secretariat has issued document A/C.3/77/INF/1, which contains a checklist of actions taken on the draft proposals contained in the reports before the Assembly.

Under agenda item 25, “Social development”, and its sub-items (a) to (c), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 32 of document A/77/455, the adoption of five draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 26, “Advancement of women”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 61 of document A/77/456, the adoption of four draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 57, “Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 20 of document A/77/457, the adoption of three draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 63, “Report of the Human Rights Council”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 12 of document A/77/458, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda item 64, “Promotion and protection of the rights of children”, and its sub-items (a) and

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room AB-0601 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).

22-75309 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



(b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 23 of document A/77/459, the adoption of two draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 65, “Rights of indigenous peoples”, and its sub-items (a) and (b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 10 of document A/77/460, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda item 66, “Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance”, and its sub-items (a) and (b), the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 31 of document A/77/461, the adoption of two draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 67, “Right of peoples to self-determination”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 35 of document A/77/462, the adoption of three draft resolutions.

Under the chapeau of agenda item 68, “Promotion and protection of human rights”, the Third Committee wishes to advise the Assembly that no action was required under the item.

Under sub-item (a) of agenda item 68, “Implementation of human rights instruments”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 14 of document A/77/463/Add.1, the adoption of two draft resolutions.

Under sub-item (b) of agenda item 68, “Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 87 of document A/77/463/Add.2, the adoption of 15 draft resolutions.

Under sub-item (c) of agenda item 68, “Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 29 of document A/77/463/Add.3, the adoption of five draft resolutions.

Under sub-item (d) of agenda item 68, “Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action”, the Third Committee wishes to advise the Assembly that no action was required under the sub-item.

Under agenda item 109, “Crime prevention and criminal justice”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 31 of document A/77/464, the adoption of seven draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 110, “Countering the use of information and communications technologies for criminal purposes”, the Third Committee wishes to advise the Assembly that no action was required under the item.

Under agenda item 111, “International drug control”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 12 of document A/77/466, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda item 124, “Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly”, the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 8 of document A/77/467, the adoption of one draft decision.

Finally, under agenda item 139, “Programme planning”, the Third Committee wishes to advise the Assembly that no action was required under the item.

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the commendable leadership of our Chair, His Excellency Mr. José Alfonso Blanco Conde, Permanent Representative of the Dominican Republic to the United Nations. Ambassador Blanco ensured that each member of the Bureau had an equal voice and tried his best to make sure that each of us could make the most of the opportunity that we were given to serve on the Bureau. I remember the disappointment on his face the first day we met, when he was told that the Rapporteur would not chair any of the meetings of the Committee, because that was not my role. But he would not give up. He tried again to put forward the idea that the Rapporteur could also chair one of the meetings. And he was just as disappointed when he was told for a second time that this was not the practice. He led his Bureau with just the right dose of energy and zen attitude and always made sure that he had time for us, despite his very busy schedule.

I wish to thank my fellow Bureau members, the Vice-Chairs Ms. Almaha Mubarak Al-Thani of Qatar, Ms. Marta Paulina Kaczmarek of Poland and Mr. Stefano Venancio Guerra of Portugal for being such exceptional team players. They represented their respective groups with the utmost integrity while ensuring that our discussions were always conducted with mutual respect, compassion and composure.

I would also like to thank Ms. Luz del Carmen Andújar, from the Permanent Mission of the Dominican Republic, for all the hard work she put in the work of the Bureau while she assisted the Chair. I would

further like to thank, on behalf of the Bureau, Mr. Ziad Mahmassani, the Secretary of the Committee, Ms. Jori Joergensen, Ms. Mina Nozawa, Ms. Catalina de Leon, Mr. Tomas Casas and Mr. Paolo Dua for being with us on a 24/7 basis throughout the past few months. I am very grateful to Mr. Mahmassani's able team from the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management for the support and guidance provided to the Bureau and to delegations, as well as the other offices in the Secretariat that supported the work of the Committee.

The Acting President: I thank the Rapporteur of the Committee.

The positions of delegations regarding the recommendations of the Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records. If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall therefore take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the reports of the Committee that are before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The Acting President: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote. I would like to remind members that in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote or position only once, that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee, and that explanations of vote or position are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats. When there are multiple proposals under an agenda item, statements in explanation of vote before the vote on any or all of them should be made in one intervention, followed by action on all of them, one by one. After that, there will be an opportunity for statements in explanation of vote after the vote on any or all of them in one intervention.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendations contained in the reports of the Committee, I would like to advise representatives that we will proceed to take decisions in the same manner as was done in the Committee, unless the Secretariat is notified otherwise in advance. That means that where recorded votes were taken, we will do the same. I also hope that we may proceed to adopt without a vote those recommendations that were adopted without a vote in the Committee. The results of the votes

will be uploaded on the e-deleGATE portal, under "Plenary Announcements".

I would like to draw the attention of members to a note by the Secretariat entitled "List of proposals contained in the reports of the Third Committee for consideration by the General Assembly", which has been issued as document A/C.3/77/INF/1. Members are reminded that additional sponsors are no longer accepted now that draft resolutions and decisions have been adopted in the Committee. Any clarification about sponsorship of the Committee reports should be addressed to the Secretary of the Committee.

Furthermore, any corrections to the voting intentions of delegations after the voting has concluded on a proposal should be addressed directly to the Secretariat after the meeting. I count on members' cooperation in avoiding any interruptions to our proceedings in that regard.

Agenda item 25

Social development

(a) Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, persons with disabilities and the family

(c) Literacy for life: shaping future agendas

Report of the Third Committee (A/77/455)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it five draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 32 of its report.

We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to V, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled "Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly". The Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 77/188).

The Acting President: Draft resolution II is entitled “Inclusive development for and with persons with disabilities”. The Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 77/189).

The Acting President: Draft resolution III is entitled “Follow-up to the Second World Assembly on Ageing”. The Committee adopted draft resolution III without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 77/190).

The Acting President: Draft resolution IV is entitled “Preparations for and observance of the thirtieth anniversary of the International Year of the Family”. The Committee adopted draft resolution IV without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 77/191).

The Acting President: Draft resolution V is entitled “Literacy for life: shaping future agendas”. The Committee adopted draft resolution V without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 77/192).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 25 and its sub-items (a) to (c)?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 26

Advancement of women

Report of the Third Committee (A/77/456)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it four draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 61 of its report.

We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to IV, one by one.

We now turn to draft resolution I entitled “Intensification of efforts to prevent and eliminate all forms of violence against women and girls: gender stereotypes and negative social norms”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Abstaining:

Algeria, Belarus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Gabon, Libya, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution I was adopted by 170 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions (resolution 77/193).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Vanuatu informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Trafficking in women and girls". The Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 77/194).

The Acting President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Intensifying global efforts for the elimination of female genital mutilation". The Committee adopted draft resolution III without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 77/195).

The Acting President: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Intensification of efforts to end obstetric fistula". The Committee adopted draft resolution IV without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 77/196).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 26?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 57**Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions****Report of the Third Committee (A/77/457)**

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it three draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 20 of its report.

We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to III, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled "Enlargement of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees". The Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 77/197).

The Acting President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees". The Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 77/198).

The Acting President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa". The Committee adopted draft resolution III without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 77/199).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 57?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 63**Report of the Human Rights Council****Report of the Third Committee (A/77/458)**

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 12 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African

Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Belarus, Israel, Nicaragua

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The draft resolution was adopted by 115 votes to 3, with 59 abstentions (resolution 77/200).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Vanuatu informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: I shall now give the floor to those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mr. Poveda Britto (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): Aware of the growing importance of this body at the current juncture in the context of the great global challenges, including post-pandemic reconstruction, the increasing politicization of human rights and the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on human rights for more than a third of humankind, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela thanks the African Group for introducing the draft resolution on the 2022 report of the Human Rights Council.

As a State member of the Human Rights Council over the last three years, and aware of the multiple threats and interests surrounding it, and based on the need for this body to work in a balanced, truly democratic and impartial manner in a spirit of cooperation and dialogue with States, Venezuela has made a contribution that is directed towards continuing to strengthen the Council's institutional framework, as well as that of the other mechanisms of the universal system.

That is why Venezuela wishes to reiterate that it disassociates itself from and rejects the imposition of instruments and mechanisms established without the consent of the Venezuelan State, such as the one contained in document A/HRC/51/29, which manipulates and politicizes human rights and gives rise to inconsistencies without any methodological rigour and even using tertiary sources, for the purposes of building up an agenda of internal destabilization that has been clearly and widely rejected by both the Venezuelan people and the international community.

Finally, Venezuela reiterates its commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights, and reaffirms that it will continue to work towards a progressive and strong United Nations system, without distinction as to the generations, in line with the principles of universality, objectivity, non-politicization and non-selectivity, and based on transparent dialogue and cooperation, as seen in the strengthening of the relationship with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, and other bodies of the system and as part of its efforts to continue raising awareness about the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter as a guarantee of peace.

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 63?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 64

Promotion and protection of the rights of children

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children

(b) Follow-up to the outcome of the special session on children

Report of the Third Committee (A/77/459)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 23 of its report.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution I and II, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled “Protecting children from bullying”. The Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 77/201).

The Acting President: Draft resolution II entitled “Child, early and forced marriage”. The Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 77/202).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-items (a) and (b) of agenda item 64 and of agenda item 64 as a whole?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 65

Rights of Indigenous Peoples

(a) Rights of indigenous peoples

(b) Follow-up to the outcome document of the high-level plenary meeting of the General Assembly

known as the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples

Report of the Third Committee (A/77/460)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 10 of its report.

The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 77/203).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 65 and its sub-items (a) and (b)?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 66

Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

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

(b) Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action

Report of the Third Committee (A/77/461)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 31 of its report.

I now give the floor to the representative of Cuba, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. González Behmaras (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation wishes to make an explanation of vote before the voting in relation to the draft resolution I, entitled “Combating glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance”.

Cuba is fully committed to the fight against all forms and manifestations of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, and related forms of intolerance. Nazism

and neo-Nazism are no exception. They are perhaps the most extreme manifestations of supremacist theories that are empirically false, morally reprehensible and socially dangerous. They have already caused the loss of millions of lives. We must ensure that these ideas do not continue to spread, and we must delegitimize the rhetoric of hate, intolerance and discrimination that characterize such ideologies. In some countries we have seen the spread of such ideas, including inside political apparatuses and bodies, which is even more concerning.

The voice of Cuba will always be on the side of those who defend the full equality of all human beings and promote tolerance and respect for the cultural diversity of our countries. Nothing justifies the promotion of racist or xenophobic ideologies. That is why for many years my delegation has been the main cosponsor of the draft resolution entitled “Combating glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance”, and has championed it by voting for its adoption.

However, my delegation must announce that it wishes to disassociate itself from the new paragraph 3, introduced in the Third Committee as a result of an amendment that sparked division and weakens consensus in the efforts against Nazism and neo-Nazism. The amendment seeks to focus on a specific context, notwithstanding the more thematic nature of the text. Awareness of Nazism and neo-Nazism could be raised in other contexts, such as in the United States, where hate acts have occurred against ethnic and religious minorities, an expression of Nazism and neo-Nazism that endures. My delegation therefore does not consider paragraph 3 of the draft resolution as agreed language and will not be bound by it or its potential implications.

In conclusion, I reiterate Cuba’s commitment to the eradication of all forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, and related intolerance, using as a compass the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, which remains in full force and effect.

The Acting President: We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I and II, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled “Combating glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Ecuador, Myanmar, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Switzerland, Türkiye

Draft resolution I was adopted by 120 votes to 50, with 10 abstentions (resolution 77/204).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Vanuatu informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution II is entitled “A global call for concrete action for the elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and the comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, 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, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste,

Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Australia, Austria, Canada, Croatia, Czechia, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Netherlands, Slovakia, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland

Draft resolution II was adopted by 129 votes to 17, with 36 abstentions (resolution 77/205).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Vanuatu informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: I shall now give the floor to those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote after adoption.

Mr. Poveda Brito (Venezuela) (spoke in Spanish): Venezuela thanks the Russian Federation for presenting resolution 77/204, entitled “Combating glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance”, which my country considers timely. Venezuela therefore supports the resolution a primary cosponsor, as it does every year.

In that regard, it is our view that the amendment presented in the Third Committee does not contribute to the purpose of the resolution, but rather attempts to undermine its spirit based on interests that do not help combat the glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and extremist ideologies, which seek to consolidate bygone racial exceptionalism. Moreover, the amendment seeks to politicize the content of the resolution.

Venezuela therefore disassociates itself from paragraph 3, even as it reiterates its full support for the rest of the resolution.

Mr. Kuzmin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): First of all, I would like to sincerely thank all delegations that voted in favour of resolution 77/204, on combating neo-Nazism.

For Russia, this resolution is the blood and suffering of every family. It is a tribute to the memory of the heroism of our forebears. We are the last generation that includes living veterans of that terrifying war, and their number has dwindled to but a few throughout the world.

The outcome of the vote this year is simply shocking. For the first time in the history of the United Nations, a document that condemns Nazism and upholds the indelible outcome of the Second World War was voted against by States that were former Axis Powers. Those who voted against the resolution — mainly Germany, Japan and Italy — have openly blasphemed against the memory of the victims of German Nazism, Italian fascism, and Japanese militarism. The position of these and many other States that fought against the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition during the Second World War clearly demonstrate how premature it is to discuss excluding from the text of the Charter of the United Nations language on hostile States.

By voting against it, do they think that they have thereby condemned Russia's special military operation in Ukraine? Of course not. They have in fact revealed their true nature and the prevailing views of their ruling elites. For them, the policies of rewriting and denying history, tolerating racist and xenophobic rhetoric and believing in arrogant superiority have become the norm. The resolution is thematic, not country-specific. It is aimed at promoting dialogue and cooperation, not labelling. That is why we reject paragraph 4 of the resolution, which has been voted into it and which notes with alarm the conduct of the special military operation in Ukraine, as it says "on the purported basis of eliminating neo-Nazism". The expressions of Nazism in Ukraine that they are trying to ignore are obvious and are supported at the State level. De-Nazification is not a pretext. It is one of the goals of the special operation, and we will see it through to the end.

Ms. Xu Daizhu (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China would like to explain its vote with regard to resolution 77/204, on combating the glorification of

Nazism. During the deliberations on the draft resolution (A/C.3/77/L.5) in the Third Committee, China had already made clear its firm opposition to attempts to deny, distort or rewrite the history of the Second World War; acts glorifying Nazism, fascism and militarism and fuelling their resurgence; and all forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and intolerance. We reiterate that the resolution before us is a thematic one, based on the principles of combating the glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism, racism and intolerance. Adding country-specific content to thematic resolutions by means of amendments is clearly inconsistent with the established practice of the Third Committee. Among the sponsors of the draft amendment there are certain countries that seek to rewrite the history of the Second World War by refusing to admit the commission of war crimes such as sexual violence on a massive scale. We are deeply concerned about the practice by a small number of countries of creating division and politicizing certain agenda items in the Third Committee. In view of that, China dissociates itself from the consensus on paragraph 4 of resolution 77/204.

Ms. Ochoa Espinales (Nicaragua) (*spoke in Spanish*): We thank the delegation of the Russian Federation for co-sponsoring resolution 77/205, which encourages States to take appropriate measures to address the new threats posed by the increase in terrorist attacks incited by racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance and supremacist beliefs. Our delegation would like to reiterate that we dissociate ourselves from paragraph 4, as amended in the Third Committee, which is contained in resolution 77/204, entitled "Combating glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance".

Mr. Pilipenko (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): Belarus has always paid close attention to the issue of preserving historical memory and has always openly opposed all manifestations of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance. We have learned the lessons of history well and will always remember how the Nazis and the allies of fascist Germany, by unleashing the Second World War, planned to drag all human civilization down a path of horrific cruelty. Belarus paid with the lives of millions of its own to eradicate that brown plague. That is why Belarus has always sponsored and voted in favour of the annual draft resolution, just adopted as

resolution 77/204, against the glorification of Nazism. This year was no exception.

As we have repeatedly noted, Belarus opposes attempts to politicize such an important topic, which is why we dissociate ourselves from paragraph 4, which is alien to the rest of the document, and which was inserted through a politically motivated draft amendment (A/C.3/77/L.52). We want to reiterate that we believe it is the duty of every member of the United Nations, which was founded as a result of the Second World War, to take a responsible and thoughtful approach to combating the glorification of Nazism and neo-Nazism. The price that has already been paid because of them is too high and too much depends on their eradication for the sake of future generations.

Mr. Song Kim (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to explain its vote with regard to resolution 77/204, entitled "Combating glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance". We welcome and support this important resolution, which will help to combat Nazism and eliminate all forms of racism and related intolerance for the promotion and protection of human rights. However, we are deeply concerned about the fact that the amended content of the resolution has nothing to do with the genuine value and goal of combating Nazism, neo-Nazism and other harmful forms of racism but rather takes a selective approach by politicizing the issue and targeting an individual country. We continue to oppose such politicization, selectivity and double standards in addressing human rights issues, and in the context we dissociate ourselves from paragraph 4 of the resolution.

Mr. Weerasekara (Sri Lanka): My delegation is of the considered view that the thematic substance of resolution 77/204, entitled "Combating glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance", is of great importance. In accordance with the vision of the historic and forward-looking Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, it is incumbent on all Member States to give life to the letter and spirit of the Declaration in all human activities, with a view to achieving the total elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. Considering that, we are of the view that paragraph 4

politicizes the issue and thereby introduces a narrow and restrictive country-specific approach within a thematic resolution that should otherwise have a wider scope. We call on all parties to adhere to the principles of universality, impartiality, non-selectivity and objectivity in the promotion and protection of human rights. Accordingly, Sri Lanka dissociates itself from paragraph 4, while voting in favour of the resolution as a whole.

Mr. Kyslytsya (Ukraine): Ukraine fought against fascism and Nazism during the Second World War. Millions of Ukrainians sacrificed their lives to stop Nazism during that war. In response to the statement by the representative of Russia, I would like to cite Volker Türk, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, who, in presenting his report in Geneva today, said,

"Russian soldiers executed civilians in makeshift places of detention. Others were summarily executed on the spot following security checks — in their houses, yards and doorways, even where the victims had shown clearly that they were not a threat, for example, by holding their hands in the air. There are strong indications that the summary executions documented in the report may constitute the war crime of wilful killing".

That is the fascism of today. That is what we have to stop. That is the glorification of fascism and Nazism, executed by the Russians.

Finally, paragraph 4 does not speak about the special operation. It speaks about how the Russian Federation has sought to justify its military invasion and territorial aggression in Ukraine on the purported basis of eliminating neo-Nazism. And that is why we do not allow rapists to lecture us about how to fight rape.

Mrs. Aldorf (Czechia): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union.

For many European countries, the end of the Second World War did not bring freedom but further occupation and more repression, and in some cases even crimes against humanity by other totalitarian regimes. Indeed, the most devastating parts of Europe's history have been the result of totalitarian ideologies, including Nazism. Today, under a false pretence of fighting Nazism, Russia has brought the horrors of war back to Europe, along with a reminder that peace cannot be taken for granted. We strongly condemn the

abuse of the argument of the fight against Nazism and reject the inaccurate and inappropriate use of the term “de-Nazification” by Russia to justify its inhumane, cruel and illegal war of aggression against Ukraine, the continued impacts of which are dire not only for the people of Ukraine but for people around the world. Such distortion erodes our understanding of the Holocaust and disrespects its legacy, in addition to undermining democratic principles.

With regard to resolution 77/204, which the General Assembly has just adopted, the European Union has pleaded for years for ensuring that the fight against extremism and the condemnation of the despicable ideology of Nazism are not misused or co-opted for politically motivated purposes that seek to excuse new violations and abuses of human rights. We would like to stress again that the tragic legacy of the Second World War should continue to serve as a moral and political inspiration to face the challenges of today’s world. The European Union is unequivocal in its commitment to the global fight against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, antisemitism and related intolerance. Our joint fight against contemporary forms of all extremist and totalitarian ideologies, including neo-Nazism, must be a collective priority for the whole international community. For all of those reasons, the member States of the European Union decided to vote against the resolution.

Ms. Korac (United States of America): Before I begin my explanation of vote, I do want to note a process point. As you said at the beginning of this meeting, Sir, explanations of vote are meant only for those who change their votes. As I have heard today, many delegations did not in fact change their votes but utilized this platform yet again to relitigate issues that we had in the Third Committee.

With that being said, the United States is proud to have fought with our Second World War allies, including the Soviet Union, and to have made decisive contributions to the victory over Nazi Germany in 1945. We categorically condemn the glorification of Nazism and all modern forms of violent extremism, anti-Semitism, racism, xenophobia, discrimination and related intolerance. Once again, as we did in November, the United States expresses its concern about and opposition to resolution 77/204, a document most notable for its thinly veiled attempts to legitimize long-standing Russian disinformation narratives, smearing neighbouring nations under the cynical guise of halting

the glorification of Nazism. The Russian Federation’s resolution is not a serious effort to combat Nazism, anti-Semitism, racism or xenophobia, all of which are abhorrent and unacceptable. Instead, it is a shameful ploy. It is a thinly veiled effort to justify Russia’s war of aggression in Ukraine, as we heard yet again today in Russia’s statement.

The United States and 62 other countries fully supported the draft amendment (A/C.3/77/L.52) that was adopted and became part of the resolution that the General Assembly has just adopted today. I also wanted to counter some of the narratives saying that the draft amendment, which is now part of the text, has turned it into a country-specific resolution. It is not. It does in fact bring in a paragraph from the Special Rapporteur’s report that has been in the resolution time and time again, and it is taken note of. It is merely bringing, factually, a paragraph from that report. We therefore categorically reject the notion that the resolution has been turned into a country-specific resolution when the report was in fact mandated by the resolution.

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-items (a) and (b) of agenda item 66?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 66.

Agenda item 67

Right of peoples to self-determination

Report of the Third Committee (A/77/462)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it three draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 35 of its report. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to III, one by one.

We first turn to draft resolution I, entitled “Use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, 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, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, 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, Somalia, South Africa, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, 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, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Liberia, Mexico, Palau, Switzerland

Draft resolution I was adopted by 130 votes to 52, with 4 abstentions (resolution 77/206).

The Acting President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 77/207).

The Acting President: We now turn to draft resolution III, entitled "The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania,

Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Chad, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, United States of America

Abstaining:

Cameroon, Guatemala, Kiribati, Malawi, Palau, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, Togo, Tuvalu

Draft resolution III was adopted by 167 votes to 6, with 9 abstentions (resolution 77/208).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Costa Rica informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Chad informed the Secretariat that it had intended not to participate.]

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 67?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 68

Promotion and protection of human rights

Report of the Third Committee (A/77/463)

The Acting President: May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to take note of the report of the Third Committee?

It was so decided (decision 77/541).

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments

Report of the Third Committee (A/77/463/Add.1)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 14 of its report.

We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I and II, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled “Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 77/209).

The Acting President: Draft resolution II is entitled “Human rights treaty body system”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 77/210).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (a) of agenda item 68?

It was so decided.

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

Report of the Third Committee (A/77/463/Add.2)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it 15 draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 87 of its report.

I shall now give the floor to those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position before action is taken on draft resolutions I to XV.

Mr. Zuhuree (Maldives): I am taking the floor to explain our vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.44/Rev.1, entitled “Moratorium on the use of the death penalty”.

While the death penalty is a form of punishment that can be prescribed in limited circumstances under the law of the Maldives, the Maldives has maintained an informal moratorium on the death penalty for more than half a century and will continue to do so. Article 10 of the Constitution of the Republic of Maldives stipulates that Islam shall be the basis for all laws in the country. The penal code, enacted in 2014, prescribes the use of the death penalty only in cases of premeditated murder or deliberate manslaughter, stating that punishment for crimes for which retribution or the restoration of

justice is required must be carried out according to the principles of Islamic sharia. We fully maintain that legal measures in Islamic sharia relating to the use of that punishment must be rigorously and meticulously examined within the wider judicial framework to ensure that the enforcement of sentences is not arbitrary and adheres to the Maldives' commitments under international law. The Government continues to take substantial steps to implement positive and meaningful changes to our judiciary and to align our domestic legal instruments with our international obligations. The Government understands that our criminal justice system in its entirety must be reformed, strengthened and institutionalized to create an independent and impartial judiciary that commands the trust and confidence of the general public.

The reality is that the death penalty remains on the books. To favour its abolition would undermine our Constitution and domestic law. It is therefore against that backdrop that we must make our decision today. While the Government is committed to maintaining the moratorium for the legal reasons I have outlined, the Maldives will maintain its position and vote against the draft resolution entitled "Moratorium on the use of the death penalty".

Ms. Al Nabhani (Oman) (*spoke in Arabic*): It is my honour to make this statement in explanation of vote before the voting on the draft resolution entitled "Moratorium on the use of the death penalty" (A/C.3/77/L.44.Rev.1) on behalf of the delegations of the Gulf Cooperation Council countries, that is, Bahrain, Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and my own country, Oman.

Our countries stress the importance of respecting the sovereignty of States, as stipulated in the Charter of the United Nations. The death penalty constitutes part of the national legislation and sovereign practices of our countries aimed at maintaining our societies and their stability and security. In that spirit, our countries have sponsored and supported the amendment submitted by the delegation of Singapore on the draft resolution of the Third Committee in order to reinstate paragraph 1 of the resolution, on the sovereign right of all countries to draft their own legislation, including by stating the proper legal punishments as per their obligations under international law. That paragraph has been adopted by a majority a number of times in previous sessions. It has the support of an unprecedented majority in the current

session, and we thank the delegations of Australia and Costa Rica for facilitating the negotiations on it.

We hope that the draft resolution on a moratorium on the use of the death penalty will include paragraph 1 in future in order to ensure that it reflects the point of view of most Member States and that constructive negotiations can be held that take into account their desire for a consensus-based text.

In conclusion, paragraph 1 of the resolution is a cornerstone for any discussions about the death penalty. We stress that all countries have the right to implement their own domestic laws to ensure their security and stability, and that right must be respected and preserved by the States Members of the United Nations.

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to XV, one by one.

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "The right to privacy in the digital age". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 77/211).

The Acting President: Draft resolution II is entitled "The right to development". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco,

Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, 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, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Cyprus, Georgia, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovenia, Spain, Uruguay

Draft resolution II was adopted by 132 votes to 25, with 28 abstentions (resolution 77/212).

The Acting President: Draft resolution III is entitled “Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 77/213).

The Acting President: Draft resolution IV is entitled “Human rights and unilateral coercive measures”. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan,

Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, 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, Somalia, South Africa, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, 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, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Brazil

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 130 votes to 53, with 1 abstention (resolution 77/214).

The Acting President: Draft resolution V is entitled “Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order”. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, 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, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, 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, Somalia, South Africa, 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, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, 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, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Liberia, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Uruguay

Draft resolution V was adopted by 122 votes to 54, with 10 abstentions (resolution 77/215).

The Acting President: Draft resolution VI is entitled “Promotion of peace as a vital requirement for the full enjoyment of all human rights by all”. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, 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, Somalia, South Africa, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, 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, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Brazil

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 131 votes to 53, with 1 abstention (resolution 77/216).

The Acting President: Draft resolution VII is entitled “The right to food”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 77/217).

The Acting President: Draft resolution VIII is entitled “Extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions”. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau,

Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, China, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 44 abstentions (resolution 77/218).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Uganda informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution IX is entitled “Human rights in the administration of justice”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution IX was adopted (resolution 77/219).

The Acting President: Draft resolution X is entitled “Missing persons”. The Third Committee adopted it

without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution X was adopted (resolution 77/220).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XI is entitled “Freedom of religion or belief”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XI was adopted (resolution 77/221).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XII is entitled “Moratorium on the use of the death penalty”. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Uzbekistan

Against:

Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Botswana, Brunei

Darussalam, China, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominica, Egypt, Ethiopia, Grenada, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Libya, Maldives, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, United States of America, Yemen

Abstaining:

Belarus, Burundi, Cameroon, Cuba, Eswatini, Gabon, Guyana, Indonesia, Kenya, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution XII was adopted by 125 votes to 37, with 22 abstentions (resolution 77/222).

[Subsequently, the delegations of Vanuatu and Zambia informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegations of Pakistan and Uganda informed the Secretariat that they had intended to abstain.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution XIII is entitled “Human rights and extreme poverty”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XIII was adopted (resolution 77/223).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XIV is entitled “The role of Ombudsman and mediator institutions in the promotion and protection of human rights, good governance and the rule of law”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XIV was adopted (resolution 77/224).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XV is entitled “Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping, stigmatization, discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against persons, based on religion or belief”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XV was adopted (resolution 77/225).

The Acting President: I shall now give the floor to those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position on the resolutions just adopted.

Ms. DeSuza (Saint Kitts and Nevis): Saint Kitts and Nevis underscores the significance of a comprehensive and just criminal system. We understand first-hand the importance of sovereign decisions on various legislative aspects, including determining appropriate legal penalties to address worrisome levels of crime and violence.

Saint Kitts and Nevis has maintained the death penalty in its penal code, where it is applied only as punishment for the most heinous crimes and only after extensive due process of law has been completed, to ensure against any possible miscarriage of justice. Our national laws are therefore in line with international law provisions. Furthermore, Saint Kitts and Nevis firmly believes that the application of the death penalty remains solely a criminal justice issue in our jurisdiction. We would like to remind the Assembly that in situations of abuse of the application of the death penalty, those situations can be treated as a human rights issue in the appropriate tribunals already established within the international system, rather than being politicized in the Third Committee. Furthermore, resolution 77/222, which we just adopted a few minutes ago, already deals with such situations.

Saint Kitts and Nevis engaged in discussions on the resolution with the hope of clarifying and correcting some of the inaccurate and misleading assertions that it contains, most of which are not in line with our national legal system. While we are pleased that the Third Committee voted to include the resolution's current paragraph 1, which reaffirms the sovereign right of States to develop their own legal systems, we remain extremely concerned about some of the assertions that remain within the resolution and voted against it for that reason. We hope that in the coming years there can be greater flexibility in addressing some of the problematic issues that remain in the text.

Mr. Gafoor (Singapore): I take the floor to explain Singapore's vote on resolution 77/222, which was just adopted under sub-item (b) of agenda item 68, entitled "Moratorium on the use of the death penalty". Singapore voted against the moratorium resolution, and I want to place the position of my delegation on record in the General Assembly.

First, the resolution is not consistent with the provisions of international law. It is a well-known fact that article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights expressly allows for the use of the death penalty for the most serious crimes and in accordance with due process of law. The moratorium resolution has unfortunately not acknowledged that important and relevant point. The letter and spirit of the moratorium resolution is not only one-sided but is also not at all consistent with the provisions of international law.

Secondly, the resolution makes no reference to the rights of victims and their families. It ignores the reality faced by many countries around the world in dealing with rising rates of violent crimes, including crimes related to gangs, gun violence, drug trafficking and drug cartels. We regard the omission of the rights of victims and the rights of their families to be a serious flaw in the resolution.

Thirdly, the resolution seeks to impose the views and values of one group of countries on the rest of the world. To put it plainly, it seeks to export a particular model of society to the rest of the world. It does not acknowledge or respect the diversity of legal and criminal justice systems around the world and takes a one-size-fits-all approach by seeking to impose a moratorium on the rest of the international community.

What is most unfortunate about the resolution is that it betrays an attitude of arrogance and cultural superiority. In the course of informal negotiations, the proponents of the resolution adopted a take-it-or-leave-it approach. It is not surprising that many countries from different regions of the world voted against the resolution today, which sent a clear and unmistakable message that there is no international consensus on the notion of a moratorium on the use of the death penalty.

I take this opportunity to place on record the deep disappointment of many delegations with the approach taken by the proponents in disregarding and disrespecting the working methods of the United Nations. For many years now, the proponents have continued the approach of arbitrarily deleting the paragraph on sovereignty from the draft resolution submitted to the Third Committee, even though that paragraph has been adopted by a majority of Member States since 2016. This year, paragraph 1 was adopted once again by the Third Committee with the highest-ever number of votes. The message to the proponents was very clear: paragraph 1 has a clear place in the

moratorium resolution, and it is absolutely necessary to reaffirm the sovereign right of all countries to determine their own legal systems when one is advocating the notion of a moratorium. That is a principle that must be acknowledged and accepted by the proponents; it is not something they should dismiss, deny or delete.

Given the history of disregard and disrespect that the proponents have shown for the views of the majority, the question legitimately arises: Will the proponents once again delete paragraph 1, on sovereignty, when the draft resolution on this topic is considered in 2024? Will they once again disregard and dismiss the views of a majority of Member States? We really do not understand why the proponents insist on deleting a paragraph that has been repeatedly adopted by a majority of Member States. I must say that that approach shows no respect at all for the multilateral rules-based system and the working methods of the United Nations. I call on the proponents of the resolution to reflect carefully on the approach they adopted to its negotiation. I ask them to abandon their attitude of arrogance and cultural superiority. We are present in the General Assembly Hall as representatives of sovereign equals. I ask them to show respect for the principle of sovereignty, which is the basis of everything that we do at the United Nations. Most important, I ask the proponents to listen carefully to the diversity of positions and views of Member States on this issue, and I urge them not to export their model and not to impose their views on the rest of the international community.

In these challenging times, we should seek to reinforce the multilateral system by working together to strengthen the rule of international law and the principle of sovereignty. We should promote dialogue, not division; unity, not uniformity; respect, not recrimination. The resolution misses the mark on every one of those counts. That is why Singapore voted against the legally flawed and misguided resolution. But let me end with an expression of hope. It is my hope that the proponents will change their approach to the resolution. The ball is in their court.

Mrs. Fangco (Philippines): The Philippines takes the floor to dissociate itself from the paragraphs referring to the International Criminal Court in resolution 77/218, entitled “Extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions”. In the interest of time, the Philippines also takes this opportunity to dissociate itself from all paragraphs referencing the International Criminal

Court in all other draft resolutions under agenda item 68 on which action will be taken this afternoon.

The Philippines withdrew from the Rome Statute in 2019 in keeping with its principled stand against those who politicize human rights and disregard its independent and well-functioning organs and agencies. Notwithstanding that withdrawal, the Philippines reaffirms its commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights and the fight against impunity for atrocity crimes.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote or position on the resolutions just adopted. May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (b) of agenda item 68?

It was so decided.

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives

Report of the Third Committee (A/77/463/Add.3)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it five draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 29 of its report.

I shall now give the floor to those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position before action is taken on draft resolutions I to V.

Mr. Kuzmin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We will vote against draft resolution III, on the situation of human rights in Iran, and draft resolution V, on the situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic. We dissociate ourselves from the consensus on draft resolution I, on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, and draft resolution II, on the situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar.

Country-specific resolutions have little to do with the reality of the situation in the countries concerned. Their purpose is to further a political agenda, exert pressure and wage an information war. They are characterized by unsubstantiated accusations, lies and empty appeals. Negotiations were not held on those draft resolutions, and their content has become increasingly divorced from reality every year, all of which simply discredits the United Nations human rights system based on the principle of the sovereign equality of States.

With regard to draft resolution IV, on the situation of human rights in the temporarily occupied Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, Ukraine, the resolution on that topic has over the past few years been viewed by Kyiv as an endorsement and encouragement of its hate-based policy against its own Russian-speaking population. It has strengthened the belief on the part of the Kyiv authorities that they have a licence to do anything they want with impunity and has given them free rein to commit the most brutal and massive violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms — torture, killings and propagation of neo-Nazi traditions and order. It is clear that, under the current circumstances, a vote in favour of draft resolution IV does not mean supporting human rights at all, but rather supporting armed escalation. The adoption of yet another anti-Russian document would only embolden those who seek to further fan the flames of the Ukraine crisis. Russia will vote against draft resolution IV — against the escalation of the crisis, the impunity of the Kyiv regime and the continuation of mass human rights violations in Ukraine — and we call on other delegations to do the same.

Mrs. Arab Bafrani (Islamic Republic of Iran): I deliver this statement in relation to draft resolution III, on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran.

At the outset, my delegation reiterates its principled position of categorically rejecting the draft resolution, which is supported by those with a dark history of weaponizing human rights and instrumentalizing United Nations mechanisms. Adopting such a draft resolution would serve as part of the attempts by some countries to marginalize Iran through the manipulation and exploitation of United Nations mechanisms. The Iran-phobic scenario demonstrated yesterday by the United States in the Economic and Social Council by denying Iranian women the opportunity to exchange views and collaborate in the Commission on the Status of Women is based on fabricated allegations.

The draft resolution does not pertain to the protection of human rights, just as yesterday's full-fledged campaign did not. Among its key sponsors are those who stand for racism, apartheid, colonialism, foreign occupation, unilateralism, autocracy and the genocide of indigenous peoples. The campaigns led by Canada, the United States and Germany in the Economic and Social Council and the Human Rights Council in Geneva all aim to exert political pressure

on Iran. If those countries conclude that human rights tools can be easily manipulated to apply political pressure, they will surely exploit them, surrendering the Organization's core value of multilateralism to achieve their exclusivist and unilateralist aims. In doing so, they force countries to march against each other. The message they are sending to the United Nations is "you are either with us or against us". That message is also conveyed in their imposition of illegal, unilateral coercive measures against independent countries such as mine.

Some may view Canada as a country free from its troubled past, both remorseful and willing to make amends. However, it cannot play the role of a saint with regard to human rights while the indigenous people within its borders are faced simultaneously with a multitude of hardships and discrimination. Similarly, Canada's unwavering support for the Israeli regime, which is also among the co-sponsors of its proposed draft resolution, contradicts its stance on human rights entirely. The Israeli regime has carried out and continues the practice of forced evictions, arbitrary detentions, torture, other ill treatment and violating the human rights of Palestinian women and girls with total impunity. When Israel labels Palestinian civil society organizations as terrorist groups, it is impossible to regard it among the so-called supporters of human rights.

The draft resolution did not enjoy any transparency in its negotiation process but was supported blindly by specific European countries, which were dictated to be among its supporters. Ironically, those countries intend to lead us on what they deem to be the correct path while failing to follow that path themselves. Throughout the four months of the Third Committee's session, we were forced to repeatedly deal with their arbitrary and domineering policies, accept non-consensual and contentious language and adapt to their self-made concepts of human rights, which vigorously ignore the diversity of Member States in terms of laws, culture and values. They advocated confrontation rather than cooperation. Even today, countries are forced to take sides under pressure, despite the clear and principled position of independent countries to safeguard the United Nations human rights machinery against political biases and adhere to the fundamental principles of universality, impartiality, objectivity and selectivity.

Finally, the Islamic Republic of Iran is genuinely committed to the promotion and protection of human

rights and dignity. We continue to place the highest value on our cooperative and interactive approach in relation to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, as well as the human rights non-discriminatory mechanisms of our Organization, such as the Universal Periodic Review.

Taking into account everything I just said, the Islamic Republic of Iran strongly opposes draft resolution III and asks other Member States to do the same. In that regard, it is our firm belief that the continuation of the practice of the selective adoption of country-specific mandates, particularly in the Third Committee, as well as the exploitation of that platform for political ends, contravenes the principles I mentioned. My delegation therefore disassociates itself from the consensus on draft resolution I, on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and will vote against draft resolution V, on the situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic.

Mr. Kim Song (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea condemns and rejects in the strongest terms draft resolution I, on the situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of Korea, which was submitted by the member countries of the European Union, among others, as a grave politically motivated provocation aimed at undermining our social system. The draft resolution, which is a product of the hostile policy of the United States and its followers against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, has nothing to do with the genuine promotion and protection of human rights. As such, it is nothing but a means for realizing an impure political attempt.

The so-called human rights violation mentioned in the draft resolution cannot exist in our country, in which the "people first" principle is fully embodied in all social life in order to formally and systematically guarantee the rights and interests of the people in legal and political terms. The annual forcible adoption of the draft resolution on this topic proves clearly that there is no change in the impure scheme by hostile forces aimed at tarnishing our image and putting down our social system. The United States and its followers are mistaken in expecting that they can overthrow our political and social system with a reckless human rights campaign against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

All Member States should adhere to the key principle of the rejection of politicization, selectivity

and double standards, as well as the principle of ensuring impartiality and objectivity in all activities for the protection and promotion of human rights. But today the United States and Western countries are abusing human rights issues as a political tool for interfering in the internal affairs of other countries, overthrowing their systems and using United Nations as a stage for realizing their ulterior objectives. It is our firm position to make a positive contribution to global efforts for the protection and promotion of human rights. However, we will never tolerate the slightest attempt by any forces to slander the socialist system that our people value so much.

In conclusion, my delegation once again strongly condemns and rejects draft resolution I as a grave infringement on the sovereignty of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. We also reject and will vote against the country-specific draft resolutions on the situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic (draft resolution V), the Islamic Republic of Iran (draft resolution III) and the temporarily occupied Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, Ukraine (draft resolution IV), based on our principled position against politicization, selectivity and double standards in human rights.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote or position before action is taken on the draft resolutions. We will now take a decision on draft resolutions I to V, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled "Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea". The Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 77/226).

The Acting President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar". The Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 77/227).

The Acting President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen

Against:

Armenia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Mali, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Belize, Bhutan, Brazil, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia

Draft resolution III was adopted by 80 votes to 29, with 65 abstentions (resolution 77/228).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Vanuatu informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Situation of human rights in the temporarily occupied Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, Ukraine".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Myanmar, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu

Against:

Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Mali, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Eswatini, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan,

Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 82 votes to 14, with 80 abstentions (resolution 77/229).

The Acting President: Draft resolution V is entitled "Situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen

Against:

Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic

of), Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Uzbekistan, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eswatini, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zambia

Draft resolution V was adopted by 92 votes to 14, with 71 abstentions (resolution 77/230).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Vanuatu informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: I shall now give the floor to those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote after adoption.

Mr. Kyslytsya (Ukraine): Just five days ago, the world commemorated the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. More than 190 countries have endorsed this important document. For almost nine years, the criminal Moscow regime has committed crimes of every nature against the Ukrainian people on Ukrainian territory, in blatant disregard for the ideas and values enshrined in the Declaration. Those crimes include forcible deportation, "filtration" camps, illegal detention, torture, executions and attacks on civilians and civilian infrastructure with missiles and drones. These are massive crimes against humanity committed by the Russian Federation.

Thousands of Ukrainian prisoners of war and civilians are being detained in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine or in Russia and remain in terrible conditions. The mass forced deportation of Ukrainian children to Russia remains an extremely acute issue.

Hundreds of orphans or children without parental care were given to Russian families for adoption, in violation of international humanitarian law. Those war crimes will inevitably bring everyone, including the top authorities of the Moscow regime, before an international tribunal.

In occupied Crimea, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights has received credible information for years concerning alleged killings, arbitrary detentions, enforced disappearances, as well as torture and ill-treatment. Journalists, human rights defenders and defence lawyers face interference and persecution. Russia continues the illegal conscription of protected persons and uses them in its hostilities against Ukraine.

As stated in resolution 77/229, the temporary occupation of Crimea became a blueprint for a grave human rights crisis in other territories of Ukraine under the temporary military control of Russia. Crimea was also used by Russia as a military base and a springboard for its attack on other southern parts of Ukraine, in particular the Kherson and Zaporizhzhya regions, as reflected in the Secretary-General's most recent report (A/77/220).

Ukraine wants peace more than anyone else. Peace means restoring respect for the Charter of the United Nations. Peace means the liberation of our people from the horrors of Russia's terror machine. The only way to do so is through the full restoration of Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity. That is also the only effective solution to guarantee European and global security. That is why President Zelenskyy has put forward his 10-point peace plan, and we invite the membership to take a careful look at his proposal.

Crimea and all temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine will be liberated. Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms will be restored on those territories the very day they are back under Ukrainian control. In the meantime, human rights and fundamental freedoms in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine need our constant attention and protection. The voice of the General Assembly in their support and in condemnation of all the crimes committed by the aggressor State must be louder and stronger than ever, and we just witnessed it.

That is why this year's resolution, just adopted, entitled "Situation of human rights in the temporarily occupied Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of

Sevastopol, Ukraine", was substantially updated on the basis of the extensive findings and recommendations of the Secretary-General in his two reports on the matter, and that is why the resolution refers to the ongoing Russian war of aggression against Ukraine.

Resolution 77/229 will remain a practical tool in the hands of the United Nations, its Secretariat and the United Nations Human Rights Monitoring Mission in Ukraine in providing credible information about the human rights violations and abuses in temporarily occupied Crimea.

I would like to conclude by expressing my gratitude to all Member States that supported the resolution.

Ms. Xu Daizhu (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China has always held the view that the Third Committee should conduct its work in the field of human rights on the basis of equality and mutual respect and properly address differences through constructive dialogue and cooperation. China is opposed to politicization, selectivity, double standards, provoking confrontation and exerting pressure on other countries with the pretext of safeguarding human rights. China objects to the establishment of country-specific human rights mechanisms without the consent of the countries concerned.

In keeping with China's consistent position on the issue of country-specific human rights resolutions, China voted against the three country-specific human rights resolutions that were put to the vote and adopted just now. With regard to resolution 77/226, on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and resolution 77/227, on the situation of human rights of the Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar, we did not join the consensus on those two resolutions.

Ms. DeSuza (Saint Kitts and Nevis): Saint Kitts and Nevis wishes to make a statement in explanation of vote after the voting on all three resolutions — 77/228, 77/229 and 77/230 — adopted by a vote under sub-item (c) of agenda item 68.

Saint Kitts and Nevis prioritizes the promotion of universal human rights and fundamental freedoms. However, in principle, we believe that the presentation of the resolutions under this agenda item goes against the principles of impartiality, objectivity, transparency, non-selectivity and non-politicization, all of which we underscore as States Members of the United Nations.

Having undergone three cycles, Saint Kitts and Nevis maintains that the Universal Periodic Review within the Human Rights Council is the best place for the examination of human rights situations in all jurisdictions. That presents the basis for all assessments to be conducted in a manner that is fair and respectful of the sovereign rights of all States.

For the reasons that I just mentioned, Saint Kitts and Nevis abstained in the voting on the resolutions adopted by a vote under this agenda item. However, we wish to convey that our votes should not be misconstrued as opposition to the substance contained in those resolutions. We call on all countries to protect all human rights for all at all times. We believe that, with solidarity and effective international cooperation, we can work together to promote and protect all human rights for all people everywhere.

Mr. González Behmaras (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba does not support mandates or resolutions that are the result of selective, discriminatory and politically motivated practices that do not enjoy the support of the countries concerned. My delegation therefore disassociates itself from resolution 77/226, entitled “Situation of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea”.

Such resolutions, which do nothing to improve the human rights situation on the ground, but instead promote confrontation and mistrust, are directed only against developing countries on which unilateral coercive measures are also imposed. In the case of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, the path of punishment and sanctions has been chosen, thereby undermining the very human rights that supposedly justify that practice. In addition, the resolution dangerously involves the Security Council in matters that are not within its purview.

Cuba is unable to join the consensus for adopting a resolution of that kind and will not be complicit in an attempt to deny the people of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea their right to peace, self-determination and development. Only international cooperation, respectful dialogue and strict adherence to the principles of objectivity, impartiality and non-selectivity will enable progress in the promotion and effective protection of all human rights for all people, an area in which no country is immune to challenges. The Universal Periodic Review mechanism should be used as a platform for fostering

debate, without politicization, and for encouraging respectful cooperation with the country concerned.

My delegation also wishes to point out that opposition to that politicized and selective mandate in no way makes a value judgement regarding other outstanding matters mentioned in the twenty-third preambular paragraph, which require a fair and acceptable solution with the agreement of all the relevant parties.

Mr. Morales Dávila (Nicaragua) (*spoke in Spanish*): Our delegation reiterates its position with regard to the reports and draft resolutions on the situation of human rights in particular countries that are introduced in the Third Committee every year. We reaffirm our rejection of reports and resolutions that are based on selectivity and are politicized, lack objectivity and do not have the consent of the country concerned.

For Nicaragua, dialogue and cooperation are the best solution to any situation and to demonstrating solidarity and strengthening multilateralism. We therefore disassociate ourselves from resolution 77/226, entitled “Situation of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea”.

In conclusion, my delegation once again reaffirms its commitment to the promotion and protection of all human rights. As a principled position, we continue to firmly oppose the politicization of the issue of human rights.

Mr. Pilipenko (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): Belarus advocates effective cooperation in the area of human rights based on the principles of universality, impartiality, objectivity, non-selectivity, constructive international dialogue and cooperation. We consistently opposes the selective consideration of country-specific human rights issues at the United Nations. We believe that the instrumentalization of human rights issues through country-specific resolutions does not resolve human rights issues in practice, but only heightens the climate of confrontation among States Members of the United Nations.

Guided by such approaches, the Republic of Belarus voted against all country-specific resolutions. We also disassociate ourselves from the consensus on resolutions 77/226 and 77/227, on the human rights situation in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and in Myanmar, respectively.

Ms. Nour Ali (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My country's delegation takes the floor to explain its vote after the voting on resolutions 77/226, 77/228, 77/229 and 77/230.

As a principled position, the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic rejects selectivity and politicization in addressing human rights issues. We consider it unacceptable to establish mandates, adopt reports and submit resolutions on certain countries without their consent or even without consulting and coordinating with them. My delegation also rejects confrontation, antagonization, making of accusations and isolation attempts through explicit double standards that seek to cover up the practices and crimes of certain States and their human rights violations.

The fact is that the adoption of such resolutions creates possibilities for confrontation that do not lead to undertaking constructive dialogue and totally run counter to the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, which emphasizes sovereign equality among Member States. My delegation stresses that the adoption of country-specific resolutions politicizes an otherwise noble issue that promotes and protects human rights and constitutes a flagrant violation of the principles of universality, objectivity, neutrality and non-selectivity, which should govern our relevant discussions

My country's delegation therefore dissociates itself from the consensus on adopting resolution 77/226 and voted against resolutions 77/228, 77/229 and 77/230.

(*spoke in English*)

We will only acknowledge and accept the mandate emanating from such resolutions once there are 193 similar resolutions, because that is our understanding of equality among Member States. What applies to others will apply to us, and what applies to us must also apply to others.

Mr. Poveda Brito (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): With regard to the reports submitted and resolutions 77/226, 77/227, 77/228 and 77/229, adopted under sub-item (c) of agenda item 68, the purpose of which is to assess the human rights situation in specific countries, Venezuela would like to reaffirm its principled position rejecting the adoption of any country-specific mechanism, report or resolution without the consent of the country's Government, which amounts to dealing with human rights in a selective and political manner. By failing

to include all the parties concerned in dialogue, such mechanisms tend to refer to secondary and even further-removed sources, and their reports are often used for political purposes by other actors, thereby violating the principles of impartiality, objectivity, transparency, non-selectivity, non-politicization, non-confrontation, equality, mutual respect and equal sovereignty among States. In that regard, we must prioritize and promote the Universal Periodic Review process as the best possible mechanism for dealing with this issue, as it is based on the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Therefore, Venezuela once again disassociates itself from resolution 77/226, on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote or position on the resolutions just adopted.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (c) of agenda item 68?

It was so decided.

(d) Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

**Report of the Third Committee
(A/77/463/Add.4)**

The Acting President: May I take it that the Assembly wishes to take note of the report of the Third Committee?

It was so decided (decision 77/542).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (d) of agenda item 68?

It was so decided

The Acting President: The General Assembly has concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 68.

Agenda item 109

Crime prevention and criminal justice

Report of the Third Committee (A/77/464)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it seven draft resolutions recommended by the Third

Committee in paragraph 31 of its report. We will now take decisions on draft resolutions I to VII, one by one.

Draft resolution I is entitled “Follow-up to the Fourteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and preparations for the Fifteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice”. The Third Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (77/231).

The Acting President: Draft resolution II is entitled “Reducing reoffending through rehabilitation and reintegration”. The Third Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (77/232).

The Acting President: Draft resolution III is entitled “Strengthening national and international efforts, including with the private sector, to protect children from sexual exploitation and abuse”. The Third Committee adopted draft resolution III without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (77/233).

The Acting President: Draft resolution IV is entitled “United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders”. The Third Committee adopted draft resolution IV without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (77/234).

The Acting President: Draft resolution V is entitled “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”. The Third Committee adopted draft resolution V without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution V was adopted (77/235).

The Acting President: Draft resolution VI is entitled “Strengthening and promoting effective measures and international cooperation on organ donation and transplantation to prevent and combat trafficking in persons for the purpose of organ removal

and trafficking in human organs”. The Third Committee adopted draft resolution VI without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (77/236).

The Acting President: Draft resolution VII is entitled “Strengthening the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme, in particular its technical cooperation capacity”. The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (77/237).

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 109.

Agenda item 110

Countering the use of information and communications technologies for criminal purposes

Report of the Third Committee (A/77/465)

The Acting President: May I take it that the Assembly wishes to take note of the report of the Third Committee?

It was so decided (decision 77/543).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 110.

It was so decided.

Agenda item 111

International drug control

Report of the Third Committee (A/77/466)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 12 of its report. We will now take a decision on the draft resolution, entitled “Addressing and countering the world drug problem through a comprehensive, integrated and balanced approach”.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia,

Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Belarus, Cameroon, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye

Abstaining:

Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Central African Republic, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Namibia, Oman, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen

The draft resolution was adopted by 124 to 9, with 45 abstentions (resolution 77/238).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Vanuatu informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation, who has asked to speak in explanation of vote on the resolution just adopted.

Mr. Kuzmin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The results of the vote speak for themselves. The text of previous iterations of the consensus-based omnibus annual resolution enjoyed unanimous support, whereas resolution 77/238 has lost the support of almost one third of all Member States, including those that voted against the resolution or abstained in the voting. The tone set by the coordinators in our work has deliberately led us towards a non-consensual, unbalanced and unacceptable text, despite the constructive attitude of most delegations. The resolution omits the most important element, namely, the fact that the world drug problem is a complex phenomenon that, in addition to its socioeconomic ramifications, poses a serious threat to national security. Our delegation will continue to believe in the importance of the entire international community working together to effectively fight narco-crime. We are not prepared to overlook traditional aspects of specialized international cooperation or continue the course toward reducing the role of law enforcement in fighting narcotics threat.

We would like to underscore that today the latest consensus document on fighting narcotics is the relevant omnibus resolution of 2021 (resolution 76/188). This resolution is the one that reflects the outcomes of many years of negotiations and efforts aimed at harmonizing the positions of delegations in New York. Therefore, if in future we want to return to the practice of consensus-based adoption of specialized anti-narcotics resolutions, then resolution 76/188 would be the best starting point for our work.

The 2021 omnibus resolution is based on a crucial principle: reaffirmation of agreements reached as part of the activities of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs, which sets policy on all aspects of efforts to combat the global narcotics problem. We strongly believe that any new initiatives are to be discussed in Vienna. Attempts to introduce

revolutionary ideas in New York would only lead to a breakdown of consensus.

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 111?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 124 (continued)

Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

Report of the Third Committee (A/77/467)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 8 of its report.

We will now take action on the draft decision entitled “Draft programme of work of the Third Committee for the seventy-eighth session of the General Assembly”. The Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 77/544).

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 124.

Agenda item 139 (continued)

Programme planning

Report of the Third Committee (A/77/468)

The Acting President: May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to take note of the report of the Third Committee contained in document A/77/468?

It was so decided (decision 77/545).

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 139.

The General Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of all the reports of the Third Committee before it for this meeting.

I would like to thank Ambassador José Alfonso Blanco Conde, Permanent Representative of the Dominican Republic to the United Nations and Chair of the Third Committee, the members of the Bureau, the Secretariat of the Third Committee, and all delegations from the Member States for the work they have accomplished.

During this session, the Third Committee held interactive dialogues with a record number — 71 — of special procedure mandate holders and other experts whose invaluable inputs are crucial for the deliberations of the Committee. Progress was made on key issues, including the rights of indigenous peoples; child, early and forced marriage; refugees; protecting children from bullying; safeguarding the rights of persons with disabilities; and many other relevant topics. I congratulate the Third Committee for delivering on the strengthening of international human rights law, and I commend the Committee for completing its work in a timely and efficient manner.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.