



Press Release GA/SHC/3810

Fifty-ninth General Assembly
Third Committee
51st & 52nd Meetings (AM & PM)

THIRD COMMITTEE APPROVES DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON CHILDREN'S RIGHTS,

SELF-DETERMINATION, NEW INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN ORDER

In Seven Separate Recorded Votes, Delegates Reject Amendments to Omnibus Text on Rights of Child

Approving five draft resolutions today — including a controversial omnibus text on the rights of the child — the Third Committee (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) continued to take action on the wide range of issues before it.

After rejecting amendments to the omnibus text on the rights of the child in seven separate recorded votes, the Committee approved the original text, as orally revised by its sponsors, by a recorded of 170 votes in favour to 2 against (Palau, United States), with 3 abstentions (India, Indonesia, Iraq). (See annex X).

Among other provisions, the omnibus text would thus have the General Assembly urge States that had not yet done so to sign and ratify or accede to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, as well as its Optional Protocols. It would express concern about the growing number of reservations to the Convention and urge States parties to withdraw incompatible reservations. It would also welcome the efforts of the Committee on the Rights of the Child to reform its working methods.

By other terms, the Assembly would urge States to protect schoolchildren from violence, injury or abuse, as well as to take measures to eliminate the use of corporal punishment in schools. States would be urged also to take measures specific to protection of the girl child, children with disabilities, migrant children, children working and/or living on the street and refugee and internally displaced children. States would also be called upon to abolish by law the death penalty for children below 18 years of age at the time of the offence.

Making general statements on the omnibus draft were the representatives of Brazil, China and Argentina. Speaking in explanation of position before the vote were the representatives of the United States and India, while the representatives of Japan and Singapore spoke in explanation after the vote.

The representatives of the United States, Brazil, Egypt, Singapore, Barbados and Republic of Korea spoke in connection with the various amendments proposed to the draft on children's rights.

By a text on the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, approved by a recorded vote of 169 in favour, to 5 against (Israel, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, United States), with 4 abstentions (Australia, Honduras, Papua New Guinea, Tuvalu) the General Assembly would reaffirm that right for the Palestinian people, including their right to an independent State of Palestine. (See annex II).

Further by that text, the Assembly would recall the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice regarding the separation wall in the occupied Palestinian territory, and express the urgent need for the resumption of negotiations in the Middle East peace process.

Making general statements on that text before the Committee approved it were the representatives of Egypt, Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union) and Venezuela. Speaking in explanation after the vote were the representatives of Israel, Australia, Canada and Argentina. The observer for Palestine also made a general statement.

Also today, the Committee approved three draft resolutions by consensus, including texts relating to the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination; a new international humanitarian order; and a revised text on measures against political platforms and activities based on doctrines of superiority and violent nationalist ideologies.

Making general statements as the main sponsors of those drafts were the representatives of Pakistan, Jordan and Belarus, respectively. Speaking in explanation of position on the first text were the representatives of Algeria, Argentina and the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union).

Additionally, the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina made a general statement on the text relating to a new international humanitarian order, while the representatives of India and Cuba spoke in explanation of position after the text's approval. The representative of the United States spoke in explanation of position before the Committee's approval of the text on political platforms.

In another action this afternoon, as it concluded its consideration of the rights of the child, the Committee took note of the report of the Committee on the Rights of the Child.

The Third Committee will meet again at 10 a.m. tomorrow, Wednesday, 24 November, when it will continue to take action on draft resolutions before it.

Background

The Third Committee (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) met today to continue taking action on draft resolutions before it. It was expected to address a wide range of issues, including refugees, returnees and displaced persons; children's rights, racism and racial discrimination; right of peoples to self-determination; and human rights.

Introduction of Draft Resolution

Introducing a draft resolution on Measures to be taken against political platforms and activities based on doctrines of superiority and violent nationalist ideologies which are based on racial discrimination or ethnic exclusiveness and xenophobia, including neo-Nazism (A/C.3/59/L.67), the representative of Belarus said attention had been drawn, in the text, to extremely dangerous social phenomena. Recalling that the Organization had become an indisputable authority in combating racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, he nevertheless noted that scourges such as neo-Nazism continued to plague humanity and that the United Nations must take renewed steps to help combat them. For that purpose his delegation had submitted the present draft, and related drafts at previous meetings. He also noted an amendment to the draft resolution.

Action on Draft Resolutions

The Committee then turned to a text on the New international humanitarian order (document A/C.3/59/L.74), which would have the General Assembly express its appreciation for the continuing efforts of the Secretary-General in the humanitarian field, and urge governments to assist him in promoting a new international humanitarian order corresponding to new realities and challenges, including the development of an agenda for humanitarian action. The text would also call for strengthening of the nexus between humanitarian issues and

human rights, as well as between emergency assistance and development aid, and invite Member States, the Secretary-General and the United Nations system to strengthen the capacities of regional and subregional organizations in the context of the response to complex humanitarian crises.

The representative of Jordan read out extensive amendments and additions to the text, strengthening language on the protection of civilians, women and children, as well as on development and other issues.

Action on the draft was postponed to the afternoon session.

The Committee then took up the text on the Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination (document A/C.3/59/L.75), which would have the General Assembly reaffirm the universal realization of the rights of all peoples, including those under colonial, foreign and alien domination, to self-determination as a fundamental condition for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights. Declaring its firm opposition to acts of foreign military intervention, aggression and occupation, the Assembly would call upon those States responsible to cease immediately their military intervention in an occupation of foreign countries and territories.

Making a statement as the draft's main sponsor, the representative of Pakistan recalled that the text had been adopted by the Third Committee, and the General Assembly, for the past 25 years. That long history was due to the text's subject matter, universal realization of the right to self-determination. The co-sponsors had held lengthy negotiations on the text, but time considerations had constrained discussion on many new aspects. It was to be hoped that next year they could be considered.

The draft resolution on universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination was then adopted without a vote.

After that action, the representative of Algeria said his country set great store by the issue due to its own history, which had been forged in a war of independence. Due to that painful experience, Algeria had chosen to become committed to the cause of self-determination for all and had continuously demonstrated its unstinting solidarity with those subject to foreign domination. Algeria would continue to support the right of peoples deprived of their right to self-realization.

The representative of Argentina expressed his country's support for the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination, especially for those subject to foreign domination. However, the same principles should be applied to the particular situation encountered in the Malvinas Islands, including with reference to relevant General Assembly resolutions on that issue. Argentina called for continued bilateral negotiations to find a fair and just solution to the controversy, taking into account the interests of the people of the islands.

The representative of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the principle of self-determination was crucial in the maintenance and strengthening of universal peace. All member States of the European Union were States parties to the two Covenants on self-determination. Elections, full-respect for civil and political human freedoms were important components of self-determination. Unfortunately, the thrust of the resolution was too narrow and the European Union would have preferred that it reflect more clearly and more accurately the right to self-determination under international law. Among other issues, it would have liked to have seen the right of return portrayed correctly. It was to be hoped that next year's text would be improved after consultations.

As the Committee turned its attention to the draft resolution on the Situation of human rights in the Sudan (document A/C.3/59/L.48*), the representative of South Africa requested that action on that draft be postponed until tomorrow -- following action on the text relating to the situation of human rights in Zimbabwe (document A/C.3/59/L.46) and in accordance with the rule that action should be taken upon draft resolutions in the order in which they were formally submitted.

The Committee thus proceeded to vote on the motion to postpone action on the draft. Two delegates were invited to speak in favour of the motion, and two against.

Speaking in favour, the representative of China said he supported the proposal by South Africa to take no action on the draft. The representative of Algeria also supported the proposal.

Speaking against, the representative of Canada recalled that the main co-sponsors of the draft remained ready to take action and their decision should be respected.

Also speaking against, the representative of the Netherlands said that the main sponsor of the draft stood ready to take action, and that in the interest of time constraints, that decision should be respected.

The motion was then approved by a recorded vote of 92 in favour to 67 against, with 12 abstentions (see annex I).

The Committee then resumed its consideration of a draft resolution on the new international humanitarian order (document/C.3/59/L.74), which had been circulated and orally revised by its main sponsor during the morning session.

As the afternoon meeting opened, that sponsor, the representative of Jordan, asked that the draft be approved by consensus.

The draft was then approved by consensus.

Making a general statement after that action, the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina expressed appreciation for the cooperative efforts during negotiations, which had retained consensus on the draft.

Also speaking after the action, the representative of India said that while she had gone along with the text, the scope of the resulting resolution had been enlarged too greatly, using language from other texts. The central challenge that needed to be addressed was effective action in the aid of affected States, in order to ease their humanitarian situations.

The representative of Cuba said that, unfortunately, natural disasters were underemphasized as humanitarian disasters, and some passages in the text were not suitable to the subject and to United Nations principles.

Before the Committee began its consideration of the next draft, the representative of Somalia said he had intended to vote this morning in favour of delaying action on the Sudan text.

The Committee then took up the revised text on measures to be taken against political platforms and activities based on doctrines of superiority and violent nationalist ideologies which are based on racial discrimination or ethnic exclusiveness and xenophobia, including neo-Nazism (document A/C.3/59/L.67/Rev.1). It would have the General Assembly urge States to take all available measures in accordance with their obligations under international human rights instruments to combat political platforms and activities based on doctrines of superiority and violent nationalist ideologies, which are based on racial discrimination. It would call on States to undertake activities aimed at educating young people in human rights and democratic citizenship and instilling values of respect and appreciation of diversity. By terms of the text, the Assembly would also call upon States to cooperate fully with the Special Rapporteur with a view to enabling him to fulfil his mandate.

Making a statement as the draft's main sponsor, the representative of Belarus said that the co-sponsor had attempted to take all points of view into consideration during negotiations on the text. It was hoped that the text would be adopted by consensus.

Speaking in explanation of position, the representative of the United States said his country had joined the consensus on the understanding that it in no way encouraged States to restrict the freedoms of expression and opinion. The best way to discourage bad ideas remained to encourage those freedoms.

The text on political platforms was then approved without a vote, as orally revised.

The text on the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination (document A/C.3/59/L.70/Rev.1) would have the General Assembly reaffirm the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including the right to their independent State of Palestine. Recalling the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the wall in occupied Palestinian territory, and expressing the urgent need for the resumption of negotiations within the Middle East peace process, it would urge all States, specialized agencies and organizations of the United Nations system to support and assist the Palestinian people in the early realization of their right to self-determination.

The representative of Egypt, the main sponsor, introduced the revised draft, expressing the hope that the text would be approved by consensus as a show of solidarity with the Palestinian people.

The representative of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the European Union, restated its firm commitment to the self-determination of the Palestinian people through the Quartet Road Map and the achieving of a two-State solution that would result in a viable, contiguous, sovereign and independent Palestine, existing side by side in peace with an Israel living within recognized and secure borders. In consequence, the Union was ready to support the electoral process in the Palestinian territories and called upon the Palestinian Authority to organize elections in accordance with international standards under the authority of an independent electoral commission. It called upon Israel to facilitate those elections.

The representative of Venezuela, expressing her condolences on the death of Yasser Arafat, said her country would support the draft in support of the Palestinian people.

The text was then approved by a recorded vote of 169 in favour to 5 against (Israel, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, United States), with 4 abstentions (Australia, Honduras, Papua New Guinea, Tuvalu). (See annex II.)

Speaking in explanation after the vote, the representative of Israel said her country recognized the right of peoples to self-determination, including that of the Palestinians. Israel also remained committed to the two-State solution to the conflict. As had been noted, Israel's disengagement plan held the potential to jump-start the peace process, which constituted a testament to those commitments. As Prime Minister Ariel Sharon had noted on the eve of the disengagement plan's ratification, he himself had repeatedly reiterated his commitment to the two-State solution and to making painful compromises to end the struggle and to bring peace. He had also noted that Israel had no desire permanently to rule over millions of Palestinians. However, that could neither be taken as a blank cheque, nor as authorization for terrorism.

The Israeli people too had rights, she affirmed, including the right to live in peace and security in their ancient homeland, side by side with their Palestinian and Arab neighbours. It was not appropriate for the draft to focus primarily upon one side and to invoke a highly-politicized advisory opinion, which had put the response to terrorism -- but not terrorism itself -- on trial. Today, there was a genuine opportunity for progress towards the goals contained in the Road Map. Yet that opportunity would be found in Gaza, not New York.

Also speaking in explanation after the vote, the representative of Australia said he had voted in favour of a similar text last year, and that his country continued to support the two-State solution. Australia would have supported the text this year but for the inclusion of unhelpful language from the International Court of Justice's advisory opinion. Australia had voted against the decision to ask the Court to render an opinion on the issue of the wall and had voted against the resolution adopted by the General Assembly in its emergency special session of July 2004 as those steps were not helpful in making progress towards a resolution of the issue. Australia had done so out of concern that the Court's decision would distract the parties from the need to focus on negotiations -- as was actually happening.

The representative of Canada said her country fully supported the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the creation of an independent, sovereign and viable Palestinian State as the means by which to settle the question. Canada had voted in favour of the draft as it endorsed the right to self-determination and emphasized the importance of the negotiating process. However, the new references to the advisory opinion must reflect the non-binding status of that opinion. Moreover, the opinion should not be quoted selectively, especially not without reference to Israel's security concerns.

The representative of Argentina said he had voted in favour of the draft in support of the self-determination of the Palestinian people, who had to be named in the text since that right could not be invoked without a subject.

The observer for Palestine thanked those who had voted for the draft as well as its co-sponsors. The continuous reaffirmation of the right of Palestinian self-determination was necessary until it was fulfilled. Israel's vote against the text was regrettable since the recognition of the Palestinian right to self-determination was a prerequisite for a two-State solution. In the case of the United States, it was contradictory to support such a solution and not support the text. Hopefully, the draft would be approved unanimously next year.

The omnibus text on rights of the child (document A/C.3/59/L.29/Rev.1) would have the General Assembly urge States that had not yet done so to sign and ratify or accede to the Convention on the Rights of the Child as a matter of priority, and to the Optional Protocols to the Convention on the involvement of children in armed conflict and on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography. It would also express concern about the growing number of reservations to the Convention and urge States parties to withdraw incompatible reservations.

Also by the draft, States would be urged to intensify their efforts to ensure implementation of the right of the child to birth registration, preservation of identity and family relations. They would also be called upon to prevent and combat illegal adoptions and to address cases of international abduction of children.

Calling upon States and the international community to cooperate, support and participate in global efforts for poverty reduction, the Assembly would reaffirm investments in children and realization of their rights as among the most effective ways to eradicate poverty. States would also be called upon to recognize the right to education on the basis of equal opportunity and non-discrimination.

States would be called upon to take all measures to prevent and protect children from all forms of violence, including by protecting schoolchildren from violence, injury or abuse, as well as sexual abuse and intimidation or maltreatment in schools. They would also be called upon to take measures specific to protection of the girl-child, children with disabilities, migrant children, children working and/or living on the street and refugee and internally displaced children.

Regarding children infringing penal law, the Assembly would call upon all States to abolish by law the death penalty for those below 18 years at the time of the offence.

Under a section on the prevention and eradication of the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, the General Assembly would call upon States to criminalize and effectively penalize all forms of sexual exploitation and sexual abuse of children, including within the family or for commercial purposes, child pornography and child prostitution, child sex tourism, the sale of children and their organs, and the use of the Internet for those purposes. In addition, States would be called upon to combat the existence of a market that encouraged such criminal practices against children.

States would also be called upon to take all feasible measures to ensure the demobilization and effective disarmament of children used in armed conflict and implement effective measures for their rehabilitation and reintegration into society.

Finally, States that had not yet done so would be urged to complete national action plans incorporating the goals of "A world fit for children", while the Secretary-General would be requested to prepare an updated report on

progress achieved with regard to those goals. The Chair of the Committee on the Rights of the Child would be invited to present an oral report on the work of the Committee at the Assembly's sixtieth session.

Programme budget implications of the above draft were distributed in documents A/C.3/59/L.82 and Add.1.

Making a statement as the draft's main sponsor, the representative of Brazil read out several revisions to the text.

Before taking action, the Committee considered two related texts containing proposed amendments to the omnibus draft. The first (document A/C.3/59/L.81) would replace the second preambular paragraph and the second operative paragraph, the latter of which urged States that had not yet done so to consider as a matter of priority signing and ratifying or acceding to the Convention on the Rights of the Child and its Optional Protocols. The text also proposed to delete operative paragraphs 4 and 9 of the original text.

The text would also replace operative paragraph 12(c) of the original text with a paragraph guaranteeing the right of a child whose parents resided in different States to maintain, on a regular basis, save in exceptional circumstances, personal relations and direct contact with both parents by providing enforceable means of access and visitation in both States. Two new subparagraphs to be added after operative paragraph 12(d), related to ensuring as far as possible the right of the child to know and be cared for by his parents, and to respecting the right of a child who was separated from one or both parents residing in the same State to maintain personal relations and direct contact with both parents on a regular basis.

Operative paragraph 16 would be replaced with a paragraph calling upon States to address cases of international abduction of children, and encourage States to engage in multilateral and bilateral cooperation to ensure, inter alia, the return of the child to the country where he or she resided immediately before the removal or retention.

The text also proposed that the words "that is progressively realized" be inserted in operative paragraph 18, after the words "highest attainable standard of health", and that the words "appropriate forms of" be inserted before the words "attainable action" in operative paragraph 21(a).

Operative paragraph 23(b) would be replaced by "to take all appropriate measures to ensure that school discipline is administered in a manner consistent with the child's human dignity", and operative paragraph 25 would be replaced with a paragraph that called upon States to end impunity for perpetrators of crimes committed against children, and take note of the entry into force of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, and note that the conscription or enlistment of children under the age of 15 years constituted a war crime.

The call upon States to abolish the death penalty for children under the age of 18 years at the time of the crime would be deleted from operative paragraph 38(a), and the words "or if jurisdiction exists under applicable law" would be inserted after the words "where the crime was committed" in operative paragraph 41(b). The words "contrary to international law" would be added to the end of operative paragraph 47, and the request to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict to continue to submit reports to the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights, contained in operative paragraph 51(c), would be deleted.

The representative of the United States, who had proposed those amendments, read out several revisions of the text and requested that the text containing the resolutions be acted upon in its entirety, with the exception of the proposed new paragraphs 3 bis — concerning the deletion of the original draft's operative paragraph 9 — and 14 — which concerned the deletion of the original draft's operative paragraph 51(c). Those paragraphs should be acted upon separately.

The Committee then proceeded to take action on the proposed amendments contained in document A/C.3/59/L.81.

Speaking in explanation before the vote on the text as a whole, the representative of Brazil rejected the amendments proposed by the United States, noting that the proposals contained amendments that had been agreed in consultations without any disagreement from the sponsor of the amendments. Moreover, the inclusion of so many disparate elements in one package would undoubtedly create confusion.

The Convention on the Rights of the Child was one of the international instruments that had enjoyed the greatest adherence thus far and had thus, set the standard, he pointed out. The United States' proposals with regard to language would water down the original text to an unacceptable degree. With regard to the International Criminal Court, the proposals by the United States referred only to the entry into force and to one crime in particular, which was unacceptable. Finally, the main co-sponsors of the original text remained firmly opposed to the imposition of the death penalty on individuals who were under the age of 18 years at the time a crime was committed. For those reasons, the main co-sponsors remained firmly opposed to the proposals.

The amendments contained in the proposals by the United States, with the exception of operative paragraphs 3 bis and 14, were then rejected by a recorded vote of 2 in favour (Palau, United States), to 126 against, with 36 abstentions. (See annex III.)

Turning to operative paragraph 3 bis of the United States text, the representative of Brazil said that the decision to include paragraph 9 of the original text reflected the General Assembly's endorsement of the proposal that the Committee on the Rights of the Child work in parallel in two chambers as a temporary solution to its workload. Brazil urged all States to reject the deletion of operative paragraph 9 of the original text by voting against the United States proposal contained in operative paragraph 3 bis of the text presently under consideration.

The amendment contained in operative paragraph 3 bis of the United States text was rejected by a recorded vote of 30 in favour to 112 against, with 10 abstentions (Bahamas, Barbados, Burundi, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Fiji, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Israel, Suriname, Uganda). (See annex IV.)

Finally, with regard to the proposal contained in operative paragraph 14 of the United States text, the representative of Brazil said it was important to express support for the work of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Children and Armed Conflict, for which reason States should vote against the proposal contained in the proposed United States amendment.

The amendment contained in operative paragraph 14 of the United States proposal was then rejected by a recorded vote of 3 in favour (Japan, Palau, United States) to 139 against, with 16 abstentions.

The Committee then considered the second text (document A/C.3/59/L.83), which would replace operative paragraph 9 of the original text with a paragraph noting efforts by the Committee on the Rights of the Child to reform its working methods so as to consider reports of States parties in a timely manner. The original reference to specific reforms in the Committee's working methods would thereby be deleted.

The representative of Egypt said she would vote against the text because it was not for the General Assembly to change working methods, only States parties could do so. In addition, the Committee had not endorsed the two-chamber concept.

The representative of Brazil said there actually had been a request for the Committee to work in a two-chamber fashion.

The amendment was rejected by a recorded vote of 38 in favour to 97 against, with 22 abstentions. (See annex VI).

Returning to its consideration of the omnibus text on the rights of the child, the Committee was then informed that a separate vote had been requested on operative paragraph 9 of the text.

Speaking in explanation before the vote, the representative of Brazil said that, for the same reasons explained previously, the main co-sponsors would be voting in favour of the paragraph's retention and urged all other States to do the same.

The Committee then decided to retain operative paragraph 9 of the text by a recorded vote of 114 in favour, to 30 against, with 14 abstentions. (See annex VII.)

Referring to the inclusion of language on corporal punishment in the omnibus text, the representative of Singapore noted that her country maintained that every State had the right to decide policies on its own domestic problems. Unfortunately, the position of the main co-sponsors on references to corporal punishment in the omnibus text had been to refuse compromise. Thus, Singapore intended to call for separate votes on operative paragraph 23(b) as a whole, and on the inclusion of the words "corporal punishment" in the second line of operative paragraph 38(b).

Speaking in explanation of vote, the representative of Brazil said that for the reasons previously outlined, the main co-sponsors would be voting in favour of paragraph 23 b.

The retention of paragraph 23 b was approved by a recorded vote of 123 in favour to 7 against (Guyana, Malaysia, Nigeria, Palau, Singapore, United Republic of Tanzania, United States), with 32 abstentions.

The Committee then turned to operative paragraph 38 b.

In explanation of position before the vote, the representative of Brazil said was in favour of retaining the wording on corporal punishment.

The retention of paragraph 38 b was approved by a recorded vote of 130 in favour, 4 against (Malaysia, Nigeria, Singapore, United Republic of Tanzania), with 33 abstentions.

Speaking in explanation after the votes, the representative of Barbados noted that his country had traditionally co-sponsored similar resolutions in recent years. However, concern over the language on corporal punishment, which did not currently enjoy international consensus, had resulted in the decision not to co-sponsor the draft and to abstain on both votes. Yet, those votes should not be taken as lack of support for the overall text on the rights of the child.

Also speaking in explanation after the votes, the representative of the Republic of Korea said his Government held that corporal punishment, in principle, was neither good for the advancement of children's rights, nor for correcting their behaviour. However, it could be acceptable in schools if implemented in an appropriate manner. The Republic of Korea established guidelines in that regard and had abstained on the vote on operative paragraph 23(b). It had also voted in favour of including the words "corporal punishment" in paragraph 38(b), as the use of such punishment had been prohibited in the nation's juvenile corrective institutions. Having abstained on 23(b), the Republic of Korea could not join as co-sponsor to the resolution.

The representative of Singapore said her country remained committed to its obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Singapore had an excellent record regarding safety of the child, but also felt that every sovereign State had the right to decide on matters relating to school discipline and penal institutions for children. Every State had problems with regard to the discipline of children and Singapore did not hold it appropriate for the international community to micromanage the domestic policies of diverse societies. Singapore had voted against the references to corporal punishment in the omnibus text for those reasons.

The Committee then began its action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/59/L.29/Rev.1 as a whole.

In explanation of position before the vote, the representative of the United States said his Government was engaged in a range of activities around the world to protect children and promote their health and well-being. The United States supported many of the provisions of the draft resolution, but many errors and omissions needed to be adjusted, and the text contained unacceptable language that conflicted, for example, with the responsibilities of parents, and of legal systems with regard to the juvenile death penalty. The United States also opposed the extra costs of splitting the Committee on the Right of the Child into two chambers.

The representative of India said she would abstain from voting on the text. India was fully committed to protecting its children and promoting their well-being, but, by refusing to recognize that adequate resources were needed for the protection of children in developing countries, the sponsors had proposed an unacceptable draft resolution. Also, unacceptable new organizational elements had been introduced. In addition, India was disappointed that many of its suggestions had been rejected without sound reason.

The draft resolution was then approved as orally amended, by a recorded vote of 170 in favour, 2 against (Palau, United States), with 3 abstentions (India, Indonesia, Iraq).

After the vote, the representative of Japan said he could not vote in favour of the text despite his country's interest in the protection of children and the promotion of their well-being. Japan did not categorically oppose the Committee on the Rights of the Child meeting in two chambers, but the issue of the backlog of reports should be addressed in a more global way. Hopefully, there would be more work on improving the Committee's working methods. Regarding the Special Representative on Children and Armed Conflict, it was difficult to agree on funding from the regular budget, which was contradictory to previous understandings.

Speaking in explanation after the vote, the representative of Singapore noted -- regarding the provision urging States parties to the Convention on the Rights of the Child to review their reservations with a view to their removal -- that the Convention was subject to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. The Vienna Convention only forbade reservations that were incompatible with the Convention itself. It was unacceptable to insist that States regularly review their reservations with a view to removing them, as the purpose of such reservations was to allow as many States as possible to become parties to the instruments.

The practice of requesting such reviews could be counter-productive in discouraging some States to come on board, she said. Draft resolutions should encourage, not discourage countries from ratifying treaties. Furthermore, Singapore remained strongly of the view that, given the importance of the issue, the text on the rights of the child should only contain consensus issues, which would allow the General Assembly to pronounce with unanimity on the issue. The number of separate votes today showed the lack of consensus and compromised the strength of the text.

In a general statement after the vote, the representative of China said his country had always attached importance to the rights of the child and had participated as a co-sponsor of the text for several years. However, in this year's discussions, there had been many divergences of opinion. As a co-sponsor, China had hoped that before action was taken, such concerns would have been addressed. Regrettably, many issues had not been addressed, although some countries had put forward positive proposals to amend the text, which should have been absorbed. There had also been an unprecedented number of separate votes on the omnibus text this year. Hopefully, that would not be the case in the future.

The representative of Argentina expressed disappointment at the lack of consensus on the text. The promotion and protection of the rights of the child was certainly a concern shared by all. Moreover, that was not a controversial issue, as reflected by the fact that the Convention on the Rights of the Child had one of the highest numbers of States parties. Unfortunately, following lengthy and difficult negotiations, there had been an unprecedented number of votes on specific paragraphs, which had contained approved and previously adopted language. Moreover, the text had incurred additional programme budget implications, which had also reduced the consensus.

Before concluding its consideration of the rights of the child, the Committee took note of the report of the Committee on the Rights of the Child (document A/59/41).

Prior to the adjournment of the meeting, the representative of Mali said he would have voted in favour of the draft on the self-determination of the Palestinian people had he been present.

ANNEX I

Vote on Postponement of Action on Draft Resolution on Situation of Human Rights in Sudan

The proposal by South Africa to postpone action on the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in the Sudan (document A/C.3/59/L.48) was approved by a recorded vote of 92 in favour to 67 against, with 12 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syria, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Federated States of Micronesia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.

Abstain: Brazil, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Grenada, Iraq, Jamaica, Kyrgyzstan, Liberia, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu.

Absent: Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Chad, Dominica, Fiji, Haiti, Kiribati, Morocco, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu.

ANNEX II

Vote on Right to Self-Determination

The draft resolution on the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination (document A/C.3/59/L.70/Rev.1) was adopted by a recorded vote of 169 in favour to 5 against, with 4 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium,

Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Federated States of Micronesia, Israel, Marshall Islands, Palau, United States.

Abstain: Australia, Honduras, Papua New Guinea, Tuvalu.

Absent: Chad, Comoros, Dominica, Haiti, Kiribati, Lesotho, Mali, Nauru, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Tonga, Vanuatu.

ANNEX III

Vote on Amendments to Draft Resolution on Rights of Child

The amendments proposed by the United States to the draft resolution on the rights of the child (document A/C.3/59/L.29/Rev.1) was rejected by a recorded vote of 2 in favour to 126 against, with 36 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Palau, United States.

Against: Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstain: Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gambia, India, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mongolia, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syria, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen.

Absent: Afghanistan, Cape Verde, Chad, Comoros, Dominica, Eritrea, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Marshall Islands, Mozambique, Nigeria, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Liberia.

ANNEX IV

Vote on Amendment to Draft Resolution on Rights of Child

The amendment proposed by the United States to the draft resolution on the rights of the child (document A/C.3/59/L.29/Rev.1) was rejected by a recorded vote of 30 in favour to 112 against, with 10 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Djibouti, Egypt, Gambia, Ghana, India, Iran, Japan, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Palau, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syria, United Arab Emirates, United States, Viet Nam, Yemen.

Against: Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Kenya, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstain: Bahamas, Barbados, Burundi, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Fiji, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Israel, Suriname, Uganda.

Absent: Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Dominica, Eritrea, Federated States of Micronesia, Gabon, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mozambique, Nigeria, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Tajikistan, Tonga, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu.

ANNEX V

Vote on Amendment to Draft Resolution on Rights of Child

The amendment proposed by the United States to the draft resolution on the rights of the child (document A/C.3/59/L.29/Rev.1) was rejected by a recorded vote of 3 in favour to 139 against, with 16 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Japan, Palau, United States.

Against: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstain: Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Burundi, Iraq, Lebanon, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Suriname, Syria, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Absent: Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Cape Verde, Chad, Comoros, Dominica, Eritrea, Federated States of Micronesia, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Israel, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nigeria, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Tajikistan, Tonga, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu.

ANNEX VI

Vote on Amendment to Draft Resolution on Rights of Child

The amendment proposed by the United States to replace operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution on the rights of the child (document A/C.3/59/L.83) was rejected by a recorded vote of 38 in favour to 97 against, with 22 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syria, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United States, Viet Nam, Yemen.

Against: Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia,

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstain: Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Bhutan, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iraq, Jamaica, Kyrgyzstan, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Uganda.

Absent:

Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Dominica, Eritrea, Federated States of Micronesia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Israel, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mozambique, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Tajikistan, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu.

ANNEX VII

Vote on Draft Resolution on Rights of Child

The proposed retention of operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution on the rights of the child (document A/C.3/59/L.29/Rev.1) was approved by a recorded vote of 114 in favour to 30 against, with 14 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syria, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United States, Viet Nam, Yemen.

Abstain: Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Brunei Darussalam, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gambia, Ghana, Guyana, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Malaysia, Myanmar, Sierra Leone, Uganda.

Absent: Afghanistan, Belarus, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Eritrea, Federated States of Micronesia, Gabon, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic,

Lesotho, Liberia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Nigeria, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Tajikistan, Tonga, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu.

ANNEX VIII

Vote on Draft Resolution on Rights of Child

The amendment proposed by the United States to the draft resolution on the rights of the child (document A/C.3/59/L.29/Rev.1) was approved by a recorded vote of 123 in favour to 7 against, with 32 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Guyana, Malaysia, Nigeria, Palau, Singapore, United Republic of Tanzania, United States.

Abstain: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Myanmar, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Absent: Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Dominica, Eritrea, Federated States of Micronesia, Guinea, Honduras, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Marshall Islands, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Syria, Tajikistan, Tonga, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu.

ANNEX IX

Vote on Draft Resolution on Rights of Child

The amendment proposed by the United States to the draft resolution on the rights of the child (document A/C.3/59/L.29/Rev.1) was approved by a recorded vote of 130 in favour to 4 against, with 33 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador,

Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Malaysia, Nigeria, Singapore, United Republic of Tanzania.

Abstain: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Absent: Afghanistan, Chad, Comoros, Dominica, Eritrea, Federated States of Micronesia, Guinea, Honduras, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Liberia, Marshall Islands, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Syria, Tajikistan, Tonga, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu.

ANNEX X

Vote on Draft Resolution on Rights of Child

The draft resolution on the rights of the child as a whole (document A/C.3/59/L.29/Rev.1) was approved by a recorded vote of 170 in favour to 2 against, with 3 abstentions, as follows:

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, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Federated States of Micronesia, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Palau, United States.

Abstain: India, Indonesia, Iraq.

Absent: Chad, Comoros, Dominica, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, Honduras, Kiribati, Lesotho, Liberia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu.

* * * * *