

24/11/2004



Press Release GA/SHC/3811

Fifty-ninth General Assembly
Third Committee
53rd & 54th Meetings (AM & PM)

CONCLUDING CURRENT SESSION, THIRD COMMITTEE DECIDES TO TAKE NO ACTION

ON HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATIONS IN SUDAN, ZIMBABWE

Approves Draft on Human Rights in Democratic Republic of Congo; Texts on Racism, Regional Arrangements and Democracy, Poverty, Terrorism, Migrants, Disabled Persons

Returning to the controversy over its use of country-specific resolutions, the Third Committee (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) today decided to take no action concerning the human rights situations in Zimbabwe, and the Sudan, as it concluded its regular work for the fifty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

As support for the no-action motions coalesced, the representative of South Africa proposed -- on behalf of the African Group -- to adjourn the debates on Zimbabwe and the Sudan. Deploring what he referred to as the double standards witnessed in the tabling of country-specific draft resolutions before the Third Committee, which gave the impression that human rights were only violated in developing countries, he said the draft constituted a direct affront to the integrity of the African political leadership.

Attempts to name-and-shame certain countries -- often incorrectly -- had derailed the Commission on Human Rights from its stated mandate to cooperate in a constructive manner with States with the aim of eliminating violations of human rights, he stressed. Country-specific resolutions could not engender the cooperation of concerned countries, which remained crucial to the resolution of problems, but only exacerbated already-existing situations.

The Committee then approved the motion to adjourn the debate on Zimbabwe by a recorded vote of 92 in favour to 72 against, with 9 abstentions (Brazil, Colombia, Grenada, Honduras, Jamaica, Mongolia, Papua New Guinea, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Trinidad and Tobago) (see annex III), and on the Sudan by a recorded vote of 91 in favour to 74 against, with 11 abstentions (see annex IV).

Speaking in favour of the two motions to adjourn were the representatives of Cuba, Malaysia and Senegal, while the representatives of Australia, Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union) and the United States spoke against.

However, the Committee did approve a revised country-specific resolution on the situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo by a recorded vote of 72 in favour to two against, with 94 abstentions (see annex IX), after rejecting one proposal to amend the text and deciding to retain three other paragraphs by four separate recorded votes. (See annexes V, VI, VII, and VIII.)

The text would have the General Assembly welcome the extended mandate of the United Nations' mission and condemn continuing violations of human rights and international humanitarian law, as well as the lack of fair trial and due process guarantees for many detainees and defendants in the country. All parties to the conflict would

be urged to implement the Global and All-Inclusive agreement on the transition; to adhere fully to the Principles on Good-Neighbourly relations signed with Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda; immediately to cease all military activity that impeded further progress; and to end the use of child soldiers and to protect women, children and displaced persons, as well as all civilians, the United Nations personnel and human rights defenders.

The text would also have the Assembly call upon the Government to hold free and transparent elections, to reform the judicial system and to cooperate with the International Criminal Court and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda.

As the concerned country, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo concluded that the draft should have abided by the recommendations laid down by the Independent expert on his country, including for the establishment of an independent tribunal for the Democratic Republic of the Congo. As it stood, the draft did not provide an accurate reflection of the expert's conclusions. Thus, he would abstain on the vote and urged all others to do likewise.

Making general statements on the text on the human rights situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo were the representatives of the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union) and the United States. Speaking in explanation of vote on the text as a whole, and on the four related votes, were the representatives of the Uganda, Rwanda, Brazil, the United States and Barbados.

Also today, the Committee adopted the other outstanding texts before it for consideration, including a revised text on global efforts for the total elimination of racism and racial discrimination, approved by a recorded vote of 175 in favour to two against (Israel and the United States), with 2 abstentions (Australia and Canada) (see annex I), would have the General Assembly acknowledge that no derogation from the prohibition of racial discrimination, genocide, apartheid or slavery was permitted and emphasize the responsibility of States to adopt effective measures to combat criminal acts motivated by intolerance.

Making general statements on the text were the representatives of Qatar and South Africa. The representatives of Norway (on behalf of New Zealand) and Israel spoke in explanation after the vote. The representative of France made a general statement after the approval.

Approving the revised and amended text on the role of regional arrangements in promoting and consolidating democracy by a recorded vote of 161 in favour to none against, with 20 abstentions (see annex II), the Committee would have the General Assembly invite intergovernmental regional, subregional and other organizations and arrangements, as well as relevant non-governmental organizations, to engage actively in work at the local, national, subregional and regional levels for promotion and consolidation of democracy, and to initiate exchanges with the United Nations systems on their experiences.

Making general statements in connection with this draft were the representatives of Romania, the original text's main sponsor, and Cuba. The representative of Cuba also spoke in explanation both before and after the vote. The representative of Venezuela also spoke in explanation before the vote, while the representatives of Egypt, China and Belarus spoke in explanation afterwards. The representatives of Romania, Malaysia and the Sudan made general statements after the approval.

The Committee also adopted four other draft resolutions by consensus, including revised texts related to human rights and extreme poverty, protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, protection of migrants, and the Ad Hoc Committee elaborating a draft convention on persons with disabilities.

The Committee also approved three texts submitted by the Committee Chairperson on issues related to advancement of women, revitalization of the work of the Third Committee and the provisional programme of work for the sixtieth session by consensus.

In other action, the Committee took note of the reports of the Secretary-General on global efforts for the total 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; human rights and unilateral coercive measures; the right to development; protection of migrants; a subregional centre for human rights and democracy in Central Africa; strengthening the rule of law; and on the Khmer Rouge trials.

The Committee also took note of the notes by the Secretary-General transmitting the reports of the Special Rapporteurs on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, migrants, and violations of international humanitarian law and human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967. It also took note of the reports of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on human rights defenders, the Independent expert on the situation of human rights in Afghanistan, and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on assistance to Sierra Leone in the field of human rights, as well as of the note of the Secretary-General on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance.

The Committee also took note of the oral reports delivered by the relevant special procedures of the Commission on Human Rights on the situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the situation of human rights in the Sudan reported to the Committee, as well the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

In concluding remarks, Committee Chairperson Valeriy P. Kuchinsky of Ukraine expressed sincere thanks for the hard work of the Committee's bureau, as well as that of the interpreters, conference services and sound, the précis writers and the staff of the Department of Public Information.

Also making concluding statements were the representatives of Gambia (on behalf of the African Group), Indonesia (on behalf of the Asian Group), Belarus (on behalf of the Eastern European Group), Nicaragua (on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group) and New Zealand (on behalf of the Western European and other States Group).

Background

The Third Committee (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) met today to continue taking action on draft resolutions before it.

Action on Draft Resolutions

At the outset, the Committee turned its attention to a text, submitted by the Committee Chairperson, on follow-up to the Fourth World Conference on Women and full implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the outcome of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly, by which the Committee would have the General Assembly stress the need to undertake further action to ensure the full and accelerated implementation of the outcome documents of those events. Underlining the significance of the forty-ninth session of the Commission on the Status of Women, which would make the anniversary of the Beijing Conference and the fifth anniversary of the special session, the text would have the Assembly stress the importance of strong, sustained political will and commitment at the national, regional and international levels to achieve that full implementation, and encourage participation at a high political level at that meeting.

Recognizing the importance attached to the regional and subregional monitoring of global and regional platforms for action, the text would have the Assembly call for the promotion of further cooperation among Governments, and to incorporate gender perspectives in their preparations for the review of the Millennium Declaration. It would also strongly encourage them to support the role and contribution of civil society, and non-governmental organizations and women's organizations in particular, in implementation of the outcomes of the Beijing Conference and the General Assembly's special session.

Committee Rapporteur, CARLOS ENRIQUE GARCIA GONZALEZ (El Salvador) introduced the text. He also noted that the text was only currently available in English, but would be forthcoming in the other official languages.

Making a general statement, the representative of France noted that delegations should be permitted to speak to the texts in their own language. However, he would not prevent the text from being acted upon.

Speaking in explanation of position, the representative of the United States said her country was joining the consensus. However, she wished to stress the rights and duties of parents, and those legally responsible for adolescents, to provide guidance on reproductive matters and other issues of concern. She also underlined her Government's support for programmes such as the "ABC" model for HIV/AIDS education. The United States understood that none of the Beijing or "Beijing Plus 5" language supported abortion.

The United States supported treatment of women who had suffered injury or illness from abortion, whether legally or illegally performed, she said. It also supported the principle of voluntary choice in family planning. However, the United States did not recognize abortion as a method of family planning. Language in the present document concerning reproductive rights was understood not to promote abortion, and she reaffirmed that there was international consensus to that end. Moreover, she wished to underline that such documents were not legally-binding upon States. She also reiterated that the United States did not support quotas. Instead, it felt the best way to guarantee women's participation in policy-making was through legal reforms to end discrimination.

The Committee then approved the text without a vote.

The representative of Republic of Korea, speaking as the chair of the Commission on the Status of Women, thanked the facilitator and also key delegations who contributed to the meaningful text. The resolution showed strong support for the session next year. In due time, consultations with members would begin on the forty-ninth session.

The representative of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the European Union, said the EU considered the documents fundamental to promoting the rights of women and achieving gender equality. She looked forward to the forty-ninth session, which would enable the international community to take account of successes. The forty-ninth session on the Commission on the status of women would recommit to achieving their full implementation. The implementation of the documents was essential to achieving the Millennium Declaration. Women's empowerment must be a central concern.

Also making a general statement, the representative of New Zealand, speaking on behalf of Canada, Australia and New Zealand (CANZ), said that the review to be held during the forthcoming session of the Commission on the Status of Women would serve as a time to celebrate progress on women's rights, and to renew the world's attention to them. There was no need for further negotiations on expanded goals, he stressed, as so much remained to be done. Therefore, the Committee should reaffirm the outcomes of the Beijing Conference and of the special session. The international community had laboured too long over language; all the goals in those documents remained relevant. Finally, he stressed, it was critical to place women's rights at the forefront of major United Nations events, including the review of the Millennium Development Goals.

The representative of Japan said his country remained committed to promotion of steady efforts at the domestic, regional and international levels to further progress on the status of women and a gender-equal society. He welcomed the adoption of the text, which would promote a fruitful discussion at the forthcoming session of the Commission on the Status of Women.

Then, the Committee turned to a draft on global efforts for the total 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 (document A/C.3/59/L.71/Rev.1). According to that text, the General Assembly would acknowledge that no derogation from the prohibition of racial discrimination, genocide, apartheid

or slavery is permitted, as defined in relevant human rights instruments. It would emphasize that it is the responsibility of States to adopt effective measures to combat criminal acts motivated by intolerance.

Regarding the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the text would have the Assembly endorse the concerns expressed by the Commission on Human Rights that the deadline for its universal ratification will not be realized, and would urge action in that regard. It also would request resources to follow up on the Durban Declaration and call upon Member States to adopt measures in that effort. In addition, recognizing with deep concern the increase in anti-Semitism, Christianophobia and Islamophobia, it would call upon States to cooperate with the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights on contemporary forms of intolerance.

The representative of Qatar said he was able to reach consensus on the draft and thanked delegates for their work. He yielded the floor to the representative of South Africa.

The representative of South Africa said he wanted to know if the Committee would be ready to work on the basis of the text being circulated, which hadn't been translated. His delegation would explain the changes.

The representative of South Africa made amendments to the text.

The revised text was then adopted by a recorded vote of 175 in favour to 2 against (Israel, United States), with 2 abstentions (Australia, Canada). (See Annex I.)

Speaking in explanation after the vote, the representative of Norway, also speaking on behalf of New Zealand, said racism and racial discrimination were among the greatest challenges confronting the world. There was an urgent need to implement the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, and to base the global fight against racism on a consensual approach. However, she also noted that her delegation had to express some disappointment at the negotiations that had been conducted this year. The text's late presentation had not allowed sufficient time for discussion. It was to be hoped that negotiations would be better in future years. In conclusion, though, she noted that her delegation was satisfied with the text's outcome.

The representative of Israel said that the text lay in direct opposition to the principles it purported to defend. The history of the Jewish people was replete with examples of the most horrible acts of intolerance and genocide the world had ever witnessed, and the commitment of her country to opposing racism would not allow it to support the outcome of the Durban Conference. The text promoted a grossly distorted picture of events. This was disturbing, not just from the Jewish and Israeli point of view, but also from the point of view of any individual committed to the idea that the international community must work together to address the scourges of racism and racial discrimination.

What had transpired at Durban had constituted a regression in attempts to confront those scourges, she said. Delegations, including those of non-governmental organizations, had singled out and slandered one country, prompting her country's and the United States' withdrawal from the Conference. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict involved two peoples, both with rights, and could only be solved by a commitment to peaceful negotiation and to ending the violence. Regardless of the Committee's action today, Israel remained committed to confronting racism and racial intolerance, and held that all nations must stand as one to eliminate those scourges.

The representative of France, in a general statement, said his nation was not opposed to the draft resolution but regretted the fact that due to the late hour, the amendments were not made in the appropriate languages.

Before concluding its consideration on racism and racial discrimination, the Committee took note of the report of the Secretary-General on global efforts for the total 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 (document A/59/375).

The Committee then turned to the text on human rights and extreme poverty (document A/C.3/59/L.38), which would have the General Assembly reaffirm that extreme poverty constitutes a violation of human dignity and that urgent national and international action is required to eliminate it. It would reaffirm that it is essential for States to foster participation by the poorest people in the decision-making process in the societies in which they live, in the promotion of human rights and in efforts to combat extreme poverty. The draft would have the General Assembly call upon States, United Nations bodies, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations to continue to give appropriate attention to the links between human rights and extreme poverty.

The representative of Peru read out several revisions to the text, saying that social exclusion and extreme poverty represented violations of human dignity. The international community must redress those scourges, including through putting in place appropriate policies at the domestic and international levels. Regarding the language related to innovative financing mechanisms for the fight against hunger, she noted that, given that this issue was still under discussion in other committees, the language had been withdrawn from the text. However, she expected that the text would be adopted by consensus.

The representative of Honduras thanked Peru for that country's leadership and said he wished to be included in the list of co-sponsors.

The Committee then adopted the orally revised text without a vote.

The representative of the United States was concerned that the resolution did not address human rights as an important tool in fighting poverty. Internationally, the advancement of development was a central commitment of United States foreign policy and sound economic policies helped unleash the powers of development. People in the developing world should live under governments that addressed and protected human rights.

The representative of Venezuela, in a general statement, said there were artificial distinctions made between poverty and extreme poverty. Different forms of attention were necessary for different forms of poverty.

Subsequently, the Committee took up the text on the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism (A/C.3/59/L.44), which would have the General Assembly reaffirm that States must ensure that any measure taken to combat terrorism complies with their obligations under international law, in particular international human rights, refugee and humanitarian law. It would encourage States, while countering terrorism, to take into account relevant United Nations resolutions on human rights and relevant comments and views of United Nations human rights treaty bodies.

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

The Committee then adopted the text as orally revised and without a vote.

Making a statement of position after the adoption, the representative of the United States said her delegation had been pleased to join the consensus on this issue. The United States set the highest priority on protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. While countering terrorism, the United States remained committed to protecting human rights and fundamental freedoms, as had been most recently demonstrated by the prompt action to investigate and bring to justice members of the Government and military, who had violated human rights while fighting terrorism. The United States called upon all States and organizations to review their efforts in the war on terrorism to see where more could be done. States that had not yet done so should review their counter-terrorism strategies and seek, if necessary, technical assistance from the United Nations.

Making a general statement, the representative of Venezuela said that he wished to stress his country's interest in co-sponsoring the text. For the first time, Venezuela had experienced an attempt at political assassination through a terrorist attack, which had cost the life of a high-level official. A draft law on terrorism was now under consideration.

The text on protection of migrants (A/C.3/59/L.51) would have the General Assembly strongly condemn manifestations and acts of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance against migrants, as well as all forms of discrimination and xenophobia related to access to employment, vocational training, housing, schooling, health services and social services. Welcoming the growing number of signatures and ratifications or accessions to the International Convention on the Protection on the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, it would call upon all States to consider reviewing and revising immigration policies with a view to eliminating all discriminatory practices against migrants and their families.

Among other provisions, the text would have the Assembly request all States firmly to prosecute violations of labour law regarding conditions of work of migrant workers, encourage all States to remove obstacles that may prevent the safe, unrestricted and expeditious transfer of earnings, assets and pensions of migrants to their country of origin and urge them to adopt effective measures to end the arbitrary arrest and detention of migrants. Also requesting States to adopt concrete measures to prevent the violation of the human rights of migrants while in transit, the Assembly would encourage States to enact domestic legislation to combat the international trafficking and smuggling of migrants.

The representative of Mexico said she was honoured to present the draft text. There had been revisions to the text, which she read, and had been made available by the Secretariat. She expressed gratification for the support of the co-sponsors and urged all delegations to support the draft without a vote.

The Committee adopted the resolution as orally revised without a vote.

The representative of the United States, in a statement of position, joined in consensus on the resolution after extensive negotiations. The United States was a nation of immigrants and drew its strength from the people who came to the country every year. Her nation welcomed them. In addition, the United States had more than a million of its own citizens living and working in other nations around the world, and they were urged to observe laws in other countries. Immigration, she said, would continue to be a force of progress in the world.

Also speaking in explanation of position, the representative of Singapore said, regarding the provision calling for States to review and revise their immigration policies to eliminate discrimination against migrants, that migrants in her country enjoyed the same legal protection as citizens. There was no discrimination, and Singapore fully acknowledged the contributions made by migrants. However, the State did require that migrants enter the country through legal channels. Those that entered otherwise were illegal immigrants, and subject to national laws.

Singapore was a small and densely populated country, with an ethnically and culturally heterogeneous society, she said. Preserving the social balance meant that the needs of many groups must be taken into consideration. Singapore also maintained that each State's immigration policy was its sovereign concern, and that it was outside the purview of the General Assembly to call for a review of immigration policies. Her country had gone along with the consensus on this issue, but reserved the right to change its position in the future on this and every text concerning a State's sovereign rights.

The Committee then turned to the text on the Ad Hoc Committee on a Comprehensive and Integral International Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights and Dignity of Persons with Disabilities (document A/C.3/59/L.58). It would have the General Assembly request that the Ad Hoc Committee increase its momentum in the current negotiations on the draft convention, with the aim of submitting it to the Assembly at its sixtieth session. The Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to provide the Ad Hoc Committee with the facilities necessary for the performance of its work and to reallocate resources to the United Nations Programme on Disability so as to provide support to the negotiations on a draft convention.

Making a statement as the draft's main sponsor, the representative of Mexico said that, regarding the budgetary implications that had been attributed to the text, her country had understood that such implications could be covered by reallocation of existing resources. She also read out several revisions to the text.

The Committee then adopted the text as orally revised and without a vote.

Making a general statement on the text, the representative of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the European Union, expressed gratitude to the main sponsor — Mexico — for the flexibility shown during negotiations. He reaffirmed the Union's commitment to elaborating a convention on the rights of persons with disabilities, which would help shape international opinion and serve as an agent for change over coming years. The Union felt that States needed to bear in mind that the convention must be enforceable and realistic. To ensure the widest possible adherence to the final document, States must have time to reflect upon others' positions. There was a responsibility to present a draft text of high quality to the General Assembly, one which took into account international human rights standards. The European Union would continue to participate actively in future meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee.

The representative of Costa Rica said he wished to thank the delegation of Mexico for its efforts to achieve consensus on this issue. The international community was committed to putting the Convention into practice as soon as possible. He called for a Convention that was realistic, of high quality and that managed to protect the rights of the person of people with disabilities in a holistic manner.

The representative of the Republic of Korea said he had signed on very early as co-sponsor of the resolution and was fully committed to the rights of peoples with disabilities.

The Committee then turned its attention to the text on Enhancing the role of regional, subregional and other organizations and arrangements in promoting and consolidating democracy (A/C.3/59/L.62/Rev.1), which would declare that the essential elements of democracy included respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It would have the General Assembly invite intergovernmental regional, subregional and other organizations and arrangements, as well as relevant non-governmental organizations, to engage actively in work at the local, national, subregional and regional levels for promotion and consolidation of democracy, and to initiate exchanges with the United Nations systems on their experiences.

By the text, the United Nations system would be invited to identify, develop and coordinate effective policies of assistance in the field of democracy and to support programmes of technical assistance to States, including those to develop a competent, independent and impartial judiciary and accountable government institutions; strengthen political party systems, free and independent media and civil society organizations; and to foster a democratic culture. The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights would be called upon to stimulate dialogue and interaction within the United Nations system and between the system and interested intergovernmental regional, subregional and other organizations and arrangements on the ways and means of promoting democratic values and principles.

Making a statement as the draft's main sponsor, the representative of Romania noted that delegations had presented a number of requests to revise the text, some of which had been incorporated. He read out those revisions. However, the co-sponsors had rejected some proposed amendments, as they wished to keep the focus on a specific issue. There had been no reason to resort to condemnatory language as the draft called for cooperation. All delegations were urged to vote in favour of the original text. He also noted that Costa Rica had withdrawn as a co-sponsor to the text.

The representative of Costa Rica noted that his country had been mistakenly included in the list of co-sponsors from the outset. He had not withdrawn as a co-sponsor; he had never been a co-sponsor. Costa Rica would vote in favour of the text.

Also before the Committee was a related text (document A/C.3/59/L.77), which proposed to amend the text on enhancing the role of regional, subregional and other organizations and arrangements in promoting and consolidating democracy. It would add an operative paragraph 5 bis to the original text, to include language from the Vienna Declaration to reaffirm that democracy, development and respect for all human rights and fundamental freedoms were interdependent and mutually reinforcing.

Introducing the text, the representative of Cuba noted that, given the revisions read out by Costa Rica, his country was prepared to withdraw most of its proposed amendments to the original text. However, Cuba wished to retain the amendment proposing to add language from the Vienna Declaration, contained in paragraph 4 of his text.

The representative of Romania said he wished to thank the representative of Cuba for withdrawing most of the amendments. Noting that the text's co-sponsors had been guided by the principles of novelty, brevity, non-repetition and relevance in drafting the text, he said that the amendment proposed by Cuba was relevant and reproduced language from the Vienna Declaration. As long as it reproduced the relevant paragraph of the Declaration in its entirety, the co-sponsors would accept the amendment. Therefore, Romania proposed an amendment to the Cuban text.

The representative of Cuba originally said he wished to see his amendment stand as submitted. However, in a subsequent statement, he accepted the Romanian proposal to amend his amendment, and withdrew the Cuban text (document A/C.3/59/L.77) from consideration on the understanding that the original text had been orally revised once more. However, he requested a recorded vote on the draft.

The Committee thus proceeded to take action on the amended text on enhancing the role of regional, subregional and other organizations and arrangements in promoting and consolidating democracy, with the representative of Cuba speaking in explanation before the vote. He said it was unfortunate that a large number of concerns had obliged him to request a vote. The text remained imbalanced and selective in the manner in which it decided which nations were democratic and which were not. Democracy had not been put in place for all, but had become a dogma.

The text also distorted the reference to the right of peoples to self-determination, and even denied that right in the first operative paragraph, he said. Moreover, no reference had been made in the text to economic, social and cultural rights. The text also made an attempt to green-light some organizations' pursuit of their own particular ideas -- which were shared by the main co-sponsors. His country had no reason to be ashamed of its record on promotion and protection of human rights, or of its record of regional cooperation. However, he noted, that such regional arrangements had often served the purpose of some to try to change his country's Government.

The representative of Venezuela said that his country would abstain on the draft because of the difficulties encountered by his Government in its attempts fully to understand the interpretation and usage of certain terms and wording, which had demonstrated ambiguity. If those interpretations were put into practice, they would lead to undesired effects.

The Committee then adopted the revised and amended text on regional arrangements by a recorded vote of 161 in favour to none against, with 20 abstentions (see Annex II).

The representative of Egypt, speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said the co-sponsors had accommodated some of the few, but crucial, concerns of his delegation. They included the insertion of references to rights, such as self-determination, which including the rights of people to be free to pursue their destinies as they saw fit. The fundamental principle of freedom was reflected in the result, thereby strengthening it and the conviction for democracy. He expressed his appreciation for the flexibility shown in deleting controversial terms and references in the text, and concluded by extending his thanks for the cooperation of all delegations.

The representative of Cuba, speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said there was a mistake in the interpretation. It was never their intention to vote against the draft, they would abstain.

Making a general statement, the representative of Romania noted he had forgotten to list Spain as a co-sponsor of the draft. He wished to thank all of those who had voted in favour, as well as the delegations which had contributed to the negotiating process.

Speaking in explanation after the vote, the representative of China said that her country held that promoting and consolidating democracy remained of great importance to all the countries of the world. Democratic systems,

due to different social, cultural and religious beliefs, were diverse and rich. Thus, while different democratic systems did have something in common, there was no fixed pattern of democratization. The foundation of democracy was for people to express their will and determine their own economic and social conditions. Based on that understanding, her delegation had abstained on the vote.

The representative of Belarus also noted that his country had abstained on the vote. Belarus remained in favour of conducting constructive dialogue on an equal footing, but felt that the draft contained paragraphs that were not balanced enough.

The representative of Malaysia, in a general statement, said she was supportive of the thrust of the text, but in the spirit of revitalization of the Committee, her delegation was not originally in favour of it being tabled in the Third Committee and then put forward to the General Assembly. However, upon learning that the resolution would only be tabled at the current session, and not in subsequent years, it was with that understanding that her delegation would go along with having it tabled in the Third Committee. Lastly, she reaffirmed her nation's support of the text and with that in mind had voted in favour of it.

The representative of the Sudan, in a general statement, said his delegation voted in favour of the draft based on the conviction that issues of democracy and human rights and the right to development were indivisible. Those were inter-dependent and complimentary. In addition, his nation was convinced that democracy was not a recipe that followed certain uniform criteria that applied to all States. There were matters of difference and diversification of cultures to consider, which enriched mankind. Based on that, his nation voted in favour of the resolution.

Before concluding its consideration of human rights under item 105(b) of the agenda, the Committee took note of the notes by the Secretary-General transmitting the reports of the Special Rapporteurs on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health (document A/59/422) and on migrants (document A/59/377), as well as of the report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on human rights defenders (document A/59/401) and the note on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance (document A/59/328).

The Committee also took note of the reports of the Secretary-General on human rights and unilateral coercive measures (document A/59/436), the right to development (A/59/255), protection of migrants (document A/59/328), a subregional centre for human rights and democracy in Central Africa (document A/59/403), strengthening the rule of law (document A/59/402) and on the Khmer Rouge trials (document A/59/432).

The representative of Armenia then drew the Committee's attention to document A/C.3/59/9, which set out her country's position with regard to the report on human rights and unilateral coercive measures.

At the outset of its afternoon session, the Committee turned its attention to the text on the Situation of human rights in Zimbabwe (A/C.3/59/L.46). That text would have the General Assembly express its concern that the conditions did not exist in Zimbabwe for holding free and fair elections, as well as about restrictions on the freedom of members of parliament and parliamentary candidates, independent and civil society and human rights defenders to operate without fear of harassment or intimidation. The Assembly would urge the Government of Zimbabwe to take all appropriate measures to establish the conditions for free and fair elections, and encourage it to invite independent international observers, in good time for its parliamentary elections in 2005.

Also underlining its deep concern at the serious violations of human rights by the Government, including torture, ill-treatment, unlawful detention and extrajudicial executions and restrictions on freedom of expression and opinion and the independence of the judiciary, the Assembly would urge the Government to take all necessary measures to ensure that human rights were promoted and protected. It would call upon the Government to seek the assistance of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and to consider inviting relevant thematic rapporteurs to address the situation. The Government would also be urged to respond to the report of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, and not to obstruct international efforts to assess food security and other humanitarian challenges.

The representative of South Africa called for an adjournment of the debate on the above text. He deplored the double standards witnessed in the tabling of country-specific draft resolutions in the Third Committee, which gave the impression that human rights were only violated in developing countries. This constituted a direct affront to the integrity of the African political leadership. The policy of confrontation employed by the European Union was totally counter-productive; attempts to name-and-shame -- often incorrectly -- certain countries had derailed the Commission on Human Rights from its stated mandate to cooperate in a constructive manner with States with the aim of eliminating violations of human rights.

The European Union's policy of using confrontation to achieve political objectives could only detract from the discussion on promotion of human rights, he affirmed. The African Group held that the single biggest drawback to achievement of the human rights mandate remained the use of country-specific resolutions tabled by the European Union and other States. He also said that it seemed the text had been tabled in order to punish Zimbabwe for its failure to uphold its bilateral obligations. That issue should be addressed through negotiations between the countries concerned. Similar texts, also introduced by the European Union, had already been rejected by the Organization three times.

The Committee then proceeded to hear two statements in favour, and two against, the motion to adjourn the debate on the text on Zimbabwe.

Speaking in favour of adjourning the debate, the representative of Cuba said nations had no right to speak on behalf of others. The independence of Zimbabwe did not come about by divine inspiration but by years of arduous struggle. As a policy of support for African nations, Cuba would support the action of no action.

Also speaking in favour of adjournment, the representative of Malaysia said the Non-aligned Movement had emphasized that human rights issues should be addressed in a global context without the interference of nations in the internal affairs of other countries. Some States, however, continued to see themselves as the protector of human rights. As such, her nation had no choice but to support the no action motion.

Speaking against the motion to adjourn the debate on the human rights situation in Zimbabwe, the representative of Australia said he deeply regretted that the motion to adjourn had been called. Firstly, regardless of the content of any resolution, all texts submitted to the Committee should be reviewed on their merits and delegations should be allowed to comment on them. Delegations should be allowed to express their opinion on content of all texts. For that reason, Australia opposed all no-motion actions on principle.

Secondly, while there had been much talk about selectivity in the application of country-specific resolutions, the situation in Zimbabwe merited the consideration, the representative said. This was reflected by need for increased food handouts, and the reported oppression of the political opposition, among other factors. The international community's consideration of the situation was justified and warranted, Australia would oppose the no-action motion and urged all others to do likewise.

Also speaking against the motion, the representative of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the European Union, said the calling of that motion was aimed at preventing the Committee from dealing with a country-specific situation. No nation, large or small, could be regarded as being beyond or above consideration concerning international human rights. That ran counter to the principles of universality and interdependence of all human rights. There was nothing in the context that provided any excuse for the serious violations of human rights being committed by the Government of Zimbabwe, including torture and unlawful detention, serious restrictions on freedom of expression and opinion and the independence of the judiciary, among others. It was important, by means of action on the resolution, to signal common concerns about the current situation in that country, and he urged the Government of Zimbabwe to take all appropriate measures to ensure that free and fair elections could be held.

He went on to say that the motion to adjourn the debate, which undermined the principles of transparency and freedom of expression essential to the work of the Committee, would prevent it from even considering the different elements as mentioned in the resolution. That motion, he said, effectively wanted the Committee to turn a

blind eye to the human rights situation in Zimbabwe and to its people. The European Union believed that the situation in that nation merited being addressed by the Committee this year. In April, the Committee had been prevented from considering the situation of human rights in Zimbabwe when a “no action” motion adopted concerning the draft resolution. The tabling of such motions ran contrary to the spirit of dialogue, and therefore the EU urged delegations to vote against the motion to adjourn the debate for reasons of principle, regardless of their voting intentions on the resolution contained in document L.46 itself.

The Committee then approved the motion to adjourn the debate on the human rights situation in Zimbabwe by a recorded vote of 92 in favour to 72 against, with 9 abstentions (Brazil, Colombia, Grenada, Honduras, Jamaica, Mongolia, Papua New Guinea, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Trinidad and Tobago). (See annex III.)

The Committee then turned to the draft on the situation of human rights in Sudan (A/C.3/59/L.48*), by which the General Assembly would express grave concern at widespread violations of human rights and international humanitarian law in Darfur, including forced displacement and arbitrary executions. It would urge the Government of Sudan, the Sudan Liberation Movement and the Justice and Equality Movement to reach a political settlement in Darfur, through the implementation of the N^oDjamena agreement, and to put an immediate end to the use of child soldiers.

Welcoming the accession of the Government to the anti-Genocide Convention, it would remind it of its obligations to prevent and punish any crime of genocide. The Assembly would also call upon all parties to the conflict to cease all violence and cooperate fully with efforts of the African Union and the international community. It would call upon the Government to immediately take all steps necessary to stop violence and atrocities, including sexual violence against women and girls, and to ensure the protection of civilians, ceasing all support for the Janjaweed militias.

The representative of South Africa also proposed an adjournment of the debate on the human rights situation in the Sudan. The African Group had chosen to use this procedure, not to deny that violations of human rights occurred in Africa, but to counter the double standard of country-specific resolutions. The explanation of the African Group’s motivation for calling for a no-action motion on the human rights situation in Zimbabwe should be referenced in the current instance as well. The African Group remained unwavering in its total rejection of country-specific resolutions at the United Nations. The text added nothing to the spirit of cooperation, which should be the hallmark of the world body.

Country-specific resolutions could not engender the cooperation of concerned countries, which remained crucial to the resolution of problems, he stressed. Instead, they only exacerbated already-existing situations. He remained strongly convinced that, given the ongoing negotiations on the situation in Sudan, there was no need to burden the Committee with a pre-emptive resolution. The sponsors of the text were seriously undermining the highest African structures, as well as international structures. This constituted an unfriendly gesture, contrary to the principle of friendly relations among States in the Charter of the United Nations.

Moreover, he affirmed, the sponsors of the text had cast doubt on the integrity and capacity of the mechanisms currently operating in the Sudan. The sponsors were not even prepared to await their first reports. Only last Friday, the Security Council had concluded a historical meeting in Nairobi, Kenya, at which it had aimed to support the final negotiation of the peace process for the Sudan. The parties to the conflict had signed a memorandum of understanding, agreeing to conclude the peace agreement by the end of 2004. The European Union’s resolution only served to negate that spirit.

The Committee then proceeded to hear to statements in support of the motion to adjourn, and two against it.

Speaking in favour of the adjournment debate on the Sudan draft, the representative of Senegal said it supported the comments of South Africa with regard to adjournment.

Also speaking in favour of adjournment, the representative of Malaysia said human rights issues must be addressed in the global context with respect for non-interference in the internal state. Her delegation supported the tabling of countries-specific resolutions.

Speaking against the motion to adjourn, the representative of the United States said the no action vote, if successful, would disrupt the process of ending the suffering in the Sudan. The Security Council had held out the prospect for international support on the Sudan, condemned the atrocities in Darfur and demanded that they end. It was a unified way to bring peace to the region, he said. The failure of the Third Committee to take consideration would be short-sighted, weak and dangerous.

In addition, the General Assembly risked failing to admit the obvious: the Sudan's human rights abuses. In May of this year, the Sudan was nominated for re-election to the Commission, one that caused his nation to walk out of the meeting. In fact, there had been three consecutive failures against atrocities, and that represented the breakdown of bodies to act on human rights. If bodies could not act on an issue as clear as Darfur, what could they do? If the no action motion passed, today would be another bad day for the people of Darfur. The failure of the United Nations General Assembly to address the issue of suffering would render it ineffective. He urged a vote of no.

Speaking against the motion to adjourn, the representative of the Netherlands, on behalf of the European Union, said the no action motion was aimed at preventing the Committee from dealing with a country-specific situation. No nation, large or small, could be regarded as being beyond or above consideration on international human rights. That ran counter to the principles of universality and interdependence of all human rights. The EU believed that the resolution on the "situation of human rights in Sudan" should be addressed by the Third Committee, as had been the case on previous occasions. The EU, he said, was gravely concerned about the widespread human rights and humanitarian law violations and ongoing atrocities in Darfur.

He went on to say that that concern was expressed in the draft resolution, which called upon the Government of the Sudan, as well as other parties to the conflict in Darfur, to stop all violence and atrocities. In addition, convinced that the General Assembly should express itself on the human rights situation in the Sudan, he asked why some delegations would want to prevent the Assembly from speaking out against the violations throughout the country. The Assembly, as the only United Nations body dealing with human rights and with a universal membership, had an obligation to deal with the gravest human rights crises, including the Sudan. It was incumbent on the Third Committee, he concluded, to ensure that all proposals brought before it were considered on their merits.

The Committee then approved the adjournment of the debate on the human rights situation in the Sudan by a recorded vote of 91 in favour to 74 against, with 11 abstentions. (See annex IV.)

Subsequently, the Committee turned its attention to the text on the Situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (document A/C.3/59/L.54), which would have the General Assembly welcome the extended mandate of the United Nations Mission in that country regarding the protection of human rights and the measures taken by transitional institutions in that regard. It would condemn the continuing violations of human rights and international humanitarian law, as well as the lack of fair trial and due process guarantees for many detainees and defendants in the country.

Also by the text, the Assembly would urge all parties to the conflict in that country to further implement the Global and All-Inclusive agreement on the transition; to adhere fully to the Principles on Good-Neighbourly relations signed with Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda; to immediately cease all military activity that impedes further progress; to support the transitional government; to put an immediate end to the use of child soldiers; to take measures to protect women, children and displaced persons, and to promote their human rights and participation in post-conflict efforts; and to protect the human rights and security of all civilians, United Nations personnel and human rights defenders.

The text would also have the Assembly call upon the Government of National Unity and transition to achieve the holding of free and transparent elections; to strengthen transitional institutions; to comply fully with its obligations under human rights instruments; to reform the judicial system; to reinstate the moratorium on capital punishment; to put an end to impunity; and to cooperate with the International Criminal Court and the International tribunal for Rwanda.

The representative of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the European Union, read out several revisions to the original text. The European Union had worked hard to achieve consensus on the draft in order to demonstrate that consensus could be achieved on country-specific resolutions. Unfortunately, it had been unable to achieve that consensus. The serious violations of human rights witnessed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo merited the Committee's consideration of the issue.

The representative of the United States proposed amendments.

The representative of the Netherlands said the European Union and co-sponsors were strong supporters of the International Criminal Court. He called on delegations to vote no against the amendment.

The Committee was informed that a recorded vote had been requested on the amendment proposed by the United States.

Speaking in explanation before the vote, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo said that his country was a State party to the International Criminal Court and noted that the Court was operating in the national territory to investigate allegations of violations of human rights. His country would vote against the proposed amendment.

The Committee then rejected the amendment by a recorded vote of 2 (Palau and United States) in favour to 116 against, with 38 abstentions. (See annex V.)

Returning to the original text, the Committee was then informed that separate votes had been requested on preambular paragraphs 3 and 4, and on operative paragraph 5 in the revised text.

Regarding the vote on preambular paragraph 3, the representative of the Netherlands said the main sponsors favoured retaining the paragraph and would vote in its favour.

The representative of Uganda, in explanation of vote before the vote, said that her delegation asked for a separate vote on the three paragraphs. Regarding peace in the Great Lakes Region, her delegation was dismayed to see the resolution, L.54, disregard the positive efforts in the Great Lakes Region and said it was not in the spirit of goodwill of people in the region. The draft resolution, in subscribing to previous documents, was not credible and cast a dark cloud on development on the ground. The insinuation that her nation was a participant to the conflict in the DRC was unacceptable.

The conflict was internal, she said. A resolution in that regard should empower the positives steps taken in the region, to work in harmony and good faith. Those attempts would not stop Uganda from moving forward and should not discourage other nations from doing the same. The resolution should be taken as is. Her delegation engaged in negotiations in a transparent manner so that the goal could be achieved despite concerns on paragraphs in the draft resolution. She hoped future resolutions would reflect positive efforts in the Great Lakes Region. Her delegation would vote against the paragraph and the resolution as a whole.

The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in explanation of vote before the vote, said the resolution affected his nation, not Uganda. He was surprised that the resolution worried Uganda as if that nation had been the perpetrator of human rights violations in his nation. His nation would vote in favour of the paragraphs as they were of fundamental importance. The explanation in paragraph three was fundamental because it recalled previous resolutions on human rights as well as those on the Commission on Human Rights. Would Uganda like to

have a vacuum? That paragraph was fully relevant and should be retained in the text. He called on delegations to retain the paragraphs.

Preambular paragraph 3 of the text on the Democratic Republic of the Congo was retained by a recorded vote of 101 in favour to 2 against (Rwanda and Uganda), with 61 abstentions. (See annex VI.)

Preambular paragraph 4 of the text was retained by a recorded vote of 100 in favour to 2 against (Rwanda and Uganda), with 61 abstentions. (See Annex VII.)

Regarding the vote on operative paragraph 5 of the revised text paragraph 6 of the original, the representative of Rwanda said his delegation would vote against the revised operative paragraph 5, as it referred to his country and insinuated that Rwanda was a party to the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Rwanda was neither involved in that conflict, nor in the country's domestic affairs. The issue of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo was an internal issue and should not be used as an opportunity to attack other countries.

Operative paragraph 5 of the revised text was retained by a recorded vote of 93 in favour to 2 against (Rwanda and Uganda), with 67 abstentions. (See annex VIII.)

On the text on Democratic Republic of the Congo as a whole, the representative of Rwanda, said he regretted that the Committee was unable to attain a consensus and that would lead his nation to vote against draft resolution. The text did not provide an accurate reflection of the country or the dynamics on the ground. It referred to resolutions and texts on the situation on the conflict in the Great Lakes Regions. Those texts, however, had been tabled for political reasons and sought to seek scapegoats. The draft resolution was unrealistic and didn't take stock of the positive developments in the Great Lakes Region. It did not reflect on the ex-Rwanda army forces whereas those groups were responsible for many evils. His nation would vote against the draft resolution as a whole. His nation wished to live in a peaceful region respectful of human rights and would spare no efforts in restoring peace to the region. Once again, he called for future resolutions to take into account positive efforts.

The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo said the situation marked by human rights abuses had led to the deaths of 3.5 million people, yet the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo had achieved serious success since December 2002, when a transitional government had been established. Yet there was a lack of discipline in the eastern part of the nation. Reinforcing the rule of law was a challenge, and his nation hoped to end impunity and resolve the situation that led to conflict. The request for a sincere reconciliation called for light to be shed on crimes committed and for perpetrators to be brought to justice.

He noted that the Human Right Commission had chosen to alter its strategy regarding human rights violations in his country. The Commission had, in fact, decided to put an end to the mandate of the Special Rapporteur in order to appoint a special expert. Since that nomination, the independent expert had been responsible for technical assistance in the area of human rights. As a result, it was crucial that the resolution take on board the spirit of a new mandate for the independent expert to promote good governance, justice and the rule of law. However, that was not reflected by the co-sponsors who chose to draw upon earlier draft resolutions undermining the authority of the transitional government to assure democracy and justice. The text did not demonstrate a willingness to understand the mandate of the independent expert.

Regarding the call upon the Democratic Republic of the Congo to end the illegal exploitation of the country's natural resources, he said that such activities had been carried out by the perpetrators of the war in his country — Rwanda and Uganda — in order to harvest diamonds and other raw materials. The country had become a battlefield due to the actions of neighbours, who had sown discord to garner wealth for themselves. For that reason, they should be addressed in the text. Moreover, it was unacceptable that his Government should be accused of the illegal exploitation of its own natural resources.

He also stressed that the draft should have abided by the recommendations laid down by the independent expert on the situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Independent expert had

recommended the establishment of an independent tribunal for the Democratic Republic of the Congo, as well as reform of the nation's judiciary. The focus of the international tribunal would be war crimes, as those crimes that did not fall under the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court must not go unpunished.

The draft did not provide an accurate reflection of the conclusions of the Independent expert, he concluded. Moreover, the sponsors had deliberately prolonged negotiations to satisfy Rwanda and Uganda, who were embarrassed to face up to the consequences of their involvement in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Thus, he would abstain on the vote and urged all others to do likewise.

The representative of Brazil reiterated that his country had serious doubts about the use of country-specific resolutions, except in situations of serious gravity. Instead, Brazil supported the strengthening of the Commission on Human Rights' thematic mechanisms. For those reasons, Brazil would abstain on the draft. The draft, which would be interpreted by the public as a condemnation of the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, nevertheless welcomed the progress that had been made in the country. His country remained concerned by the conflict there, including related violence against women, the recruitment of child soldiers, refugees and internally displaced persons.

The text on the human rights situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo was then approved by a recorded vote of 72 in favour to two against, with 94 abstentions.

Speaking in explanation after the vote, the representative of the United States said her country remained concerned about the continuing violations of human rights and rule of law in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. An estimated three million civilians had lost their lives over the past three years, and sexual violence and a lack of fair trials continued to be rampant.

She appealed to all parties to stop the violence and to the transitional Government to respond and end impunity. The current text did not express disfavour towards properly composed truth and reconciliation commissions. However, the United States had longstanding concerns about the International Criminal Court. Thus, the proposed amendment had called for holding individuals responsible through appropriate national and international mechanisms. For those reasons, the United States had voted in favour of the draft.

The representative of Barbados wanted to clarify his nation's position. His nation was aspiring to the International Criminal Court, and his abstention was based on his country's principle of abstaining on country-specific resolutions.

The representative of Bolivia said he had been absent at the time of the vote but would have voted in favour of the resolution.

Before concluding consideration of agenda item 105, the Committee took note of the notes by the Secretary-General transmitting the reports of the independent expert on the situation of human rights in Afghanistan (document A/59/370); and of the Special Rapporteur on violations of international humanitarian law and human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967 (document A/59/256).

It also took note of a note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on assistance to Sierra Leone in the field of human rights; as well as the oral reports on the situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, delivered at the twenty-ninth meeting of the Committee; the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, delivered at the twenty-ninth meeting of the Committee; and the situation of human rights in the Sudan reported to the Committee, delivered at the thirtieth meeting of the Committee.

It also took of the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (document A/59/36).

The Committee then turned its attention to two texts submitted by the Chairperson for consideration.

The first text (document A/C.3/59/CRP.1/Rev.1), which concerned Revitalization of the work of the Third Committee, would have the Assembly reorganize several of the items before the Committee for consideration. It would merge the items currently entitled “Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly”, “Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family” and “Follow-up to the International Year of Older Persons: Second World Assembly on Ageing” into one new agenda item entitled “Social development”.

The items entitled “Advancement of women” and “Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women and of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly, entitled “Women 2000: gender equality, development and peace for the twenty-first century” would be merged into one new agenda item, “Advancement of women”. Similarly, the current items “Follow-up to the special session on children” — normally considered in the General Assembly plenary — and “Promotion and protection of the rights of children” would be merged into one new agenda item, “Promotion and protection of the rights of children”, to be considered by the Third Committee.

The text would also rename the item “Programme of activities for the International Decade of the World’s Indigenous People, 1995-2004” as “Indigenous issues”. The sub-items “Implementation of human rights instruments”, “Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms”, “Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives”, “Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action” and “Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights” into one new agenda item, “Promotion and protection of human rights”.

Among other provisions regarding the Committee’s methods of work, the text would approve the introduction — on a pilot basis — of interactive debates in an informal setting during the sixtieth session, on the understanding that the Committee would not meet at the same time.

The Committee Secretary read out several corrections to the text.

Committee Vice-Chairperson ASTANAH BANU SHRI ABDUL AZIZ (Malaysia) introduced the Chairperson’s text, noting that constructive participation had enabled the Committee to respond to the General Assembly’s request for the Committee to consider ways to revitalize its work. The text’s adoption did not constitute the end of the process. The Committee must ensure follow-through on the terms of the text, including by the Committee, the Secretariat and all other concerned parties.

The Committee then approved the revised text on revitalization of the work of the Third Committee without a vote, deciding to transmit it to the General Assembly plenary for consideration.

The second text set forth the Provisional programme of work (document A/C.3/59/CRP.2) for the Third Committee during the General Assembly’s sixtieth session.

The Committee Secretary also read out several corrections to that text.

The representative of Portugal also corrected the text.

The Committee then approved the corrected provisional programme of work for the sixtieth session without a vote, deciding to transmit it to the General Assembly plenary for consideration.

Informing the Committee on progress on negotiations, Committee Vice-Chair MAVIS ESI KUSORGBOR (Ghana) said that more time was needed to conclude consultations on the issue of establishing new standards for the invitation of special procedures of the Commission on Human Rights to address the Committee. It was to be hoped that an agreement would be reached when the Committee took up this issue again during the sixtieth session of the General Assembly.

The Committee then agreed to resume its consideration of criteria for the invitation of additional individuals serving as special procedures of the Commission on Human Rights during the sixtieth session of the General Assembly.

VALERIY P. KUCHINSKY, Chairman of the Third Committee, expressed his sincere thanks to the members of the bureau who worked consistently, and to the Member States for their everyday statements. He also wished to thank all the interpreters and conference services colleagues; the precis writers, who reflected the proceedings of the meetings, and to the Department of Public Information for producing press releases on a daily basis. In addition, he thanked the Secretary of the Committee for the support given to him and to delegations. Lastly, he reminded delegates to attend the final reception at 6:30 p.m. in the mission of Ukraine.

The representatives of Gambia, on behalf of the African Group; Indonesia, on behalf of the Asia Group; Belarus, on behalf of the Eastern European Group; Nicaragua, on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group; New Zealand, on behalf of the Western European and other States thanked delegations for their efforts on the work of the Third Committee.

ANNEX I

Vote on Global Efforts to Eliminate Racism

The draft resolution on global efforts to eliminate racism and racial discrimination (document A/C.3/59/L.71) was adopted by a recorded vote of 175 in favour to 2 against, with 2 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, 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, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, 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, 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, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States.

Abstain: Australia, Canada.

Absent: Benin, Cape Verde, Dominica, Equatorial Guinea, Georgia, Kiribati, Palau, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Tonga, Vanuatu.

ANNEX II

Vote on Enhancing Role of Regional Organizations

The draft resolution on enhancing the role of regional and subregional organizations in promoting democracy (document A/C.3/59/L.62) was adopted by a recorded vote of 161 in favour to none against, with 20 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, 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, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Yemen.

Against: None.

Abstain: Belarus, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Myanmar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Absent: Benin, Cape Verde, Dominica, Kiribati, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Togo, Tonga, Vanuatu.

ANNEX III

Vote on No Action -- Human Rights in Zimbabwe

The no action motion on the draft resolution on human rights in Zimbabwe (document A/C.3/59/L.46) was adopted by a recorded vote of 92 in favour to 72 against, with 9 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar,

Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syria, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstain: Brazil, Colombia, Grenada, Honduras, Jamaica, Mongolia, Papua New Guinea, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago.

Absent: Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cape Verde, Dominica, Equatorial Guinea, Iraq, Kiribati, Morocco, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Yemen.

ANNEX IV

Vote on No Action -- Human Rights in Sudan

The no-action motion on the draft resolution on human rights in the Sudan (document A/C.3/59/L.48*) was adopted by a recorded vote of 91 in favour to 74 against, with 11 abstentions, as follows:

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

Against: Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Federated States of Micronesia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, 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, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.

Abstain: Belize, Brazil, Colombia, Grenada, Honduras, Jamaica, Lesotho, Liberia, Namibia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago.

Absent: Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Cape Verde, Dominica, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Tonga, Turkey, Ukraine, Vanuatu.

ANNEX V

Vote on United States on International Criminal Court

The (document A/C.3/59/L.54) was rejected by a recorded vote of 2 in favour to 116 against, with 38 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Palau, United States.

Against: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstain: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, China, Colombia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Rwanda, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania.

Absent: Afghanistan, Angola, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Benin, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Comoros, Dominica, Gambia, Iran, Israel, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Maldives, Papua New Guinea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Tonga, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam.

ANNEX VI

Vote on Preambular Paragraph 3 of Democratic Republic of Congo Draft

Preambular paragraph 3 of the draft resolution on human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (document A/C.3/59/L.54) was adopted by a recorded vote of 101 in favour to 2 against, with 61 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.

Against: Rwanda, Uganda.

Abstain: Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Absent: Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Benin, Cape Verde, Comoros, Dominica, Gambia, Guinea, Iraq, Israel, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Maldives, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Tonga, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam.

ANNEX VII

Vote on Preambular Paragraph 4 of Democratic Republic of Congo Draft

Preambular paragraph 4 of the draft resolution on human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (document A/C.3/59/L.54) was adopted by a recorded vote of 100 in favour to 2 against, with 61 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.

Against: Rwanda, Uganda.

Abstain: Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Absent: Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Benin, Cape Verde, Comoros, Dominica, Gambia, Guinea, Iraq, Israel, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Maldives, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Tonga, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam.

ANNEX VIII

Vote on Operative Paragraph 6 of Democratic Republic of Congo Draft

Operative paragraph 6 of the original (op. 5 of the revised text) draft resolution on human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (document A/C.3/59/L.54) was adopted by a recorded vote of 93 in favour to 2 against, with 67 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.

Against: Rwanda, Uganda.

Abstain: Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Absent: Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Benin, Cape Verde, Comoros, Congo, Dominica, Gambia, Guinea, Iraq, Israel, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Tonga, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam.

ANNEX IX

Vote on Draft Resolution on Human Rights in Democratic Republic of Congo

The revised draft resolution, as whole, on human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (document A/C.3/59/L.54) was adopted by a recorded vote of 72 in favour to 2 against, with 94 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.

Against: Rwanda, Uganda.

Abstain: Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Absent: Afghanistan, Armenia, Benin, Burundi, Cape Verde, Dominica, Gambia, Iraq, Israel, Kiribati, Nicaragua, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen.

* * * * *